



NHK 詳細分析

2026-05-03_radio_news_0600

Broadcast: 2026-05-03 | Analyzed: 2026-05-13 12:57

Version 2.8-detail | Universal 2.8-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Standard: 放送法 第4条

OVERALL SCORE

3.1/10

Slight imbalance

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	JCP	CDP	DPP	Komeito	LDP	JIP
CHES	1.50	3.50	4.80	5.20	7.00	7.80
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

The overall tendency is presented on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-favoring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favoring). The calculation is based on the difference in average favoritism of left vs. right parties (grouping per CHES 2024).

TENDENCY (L – R)

5.8 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — chesdata.eu | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section provides political context and does not contribute to the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Methodological Principles: K5+K13 (obligation to record intervention events)

Date of Preparation: 3 May 2025

Coalition Government: Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) + Komeito. Continuous since 2012 (excluding the Democratic Party government period 2009–2012). In the House of Representatives election on 27 October 2024, the LDP retreated to 191 seats and lost its single-party majority.

Major Opposition Parties: Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP, 148 seats), Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin, 38 seats), Democratic Party for the People (DPP, 28 seats), Komeito (24 seats), Reiwa Shinsengumi (9 seats), Japanese Communist Party (JCP, 8 seats).

Party	Left-Right Score (0–10)	Seats (Lower House 2024)	Government/Opposition	Core Position on Constitutional Revision
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	1.5	8	Opposition	Firmly opposed to revision of Article 9, pro-constitution
Social Democratic Party (SDP)	2.5	1	Opposition	Pro-constitution, upholding pacifism
Reiwa Shinsengumi	2.5	9	Opposition	Against constitutional revision, anti-rearmament
Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP)	3.5	148	Opposition	Against hasty revision, upholding constitutionalism
Komeito	5.0	24	Coalition Government	Upholding three principles, cautious revision stance
Democratic Party for the People (DPP)	5.5	28	Middle (extra-cabinet cooperation)	Emphasis on deliberation in review commission, pragmatic revision
Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	7.0	191	Government	Explicit mention of SDF, emergency clause, early revision
Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin)	7.0	38	Opposition (pro-revision)	Positions Article 9 revision and emergency clause as urgent priorities
Sanseito	9.0	3	Opposition	Full constitutional overhaul (creation of new constitution)

The greatest line of confrontation over constitutional revision exists between the pro-revision forces (LDP, Ishin, DPP) pushing for explicit mention of the SDF in the constitution and the establishment of an emergency clause, and the pro-constitution and cautious forces (CDP, JCP, Reiwa, SDP) opposed to hasty revision. As a result of the LDP losing its majority in the 2024 House of Representatives election, securing the two-thirds majority required for a revision bill has become difficult, and the future direction of the constitutional revision debate is uncertain. Arguments for accelerating



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

revision based on changes in the security environment (North Korea, China, Russia) are in sharp confrontation with cautious arguments from the perspectives of constitutionalism and pacifism.

NHK is a public broadcaster based on the Broadcasting Act, and 12 members of its Board of Governors are appointed by the Prime Minister (with the consent of the Diet). Since the Abe administration (2012–2020), critical observations about NHK's distance from the government have continued, and Japan remains at 70th place in the RSF Press Freedom Index (2024). Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act mandates political fairness, accuracy of reporting, and the presentation of multifaceted viewpoints, and this analysis is conducted using these provisions as standards.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party-by-Party Assessment

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Portrayal in broadcast vs. party platform position
Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	+2	00:00:12 "It has presented a revision proposal covering 4 items including explicit mention of the SDF and emergency response, and states that it will make every effort to achieve early realisation of revision." — Party platform: pro-revision, explicit mention of SDF, emergency clause — Broadly accurate but specific content of 4 items is absent
Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP)	+2	00:01:58 "It states that it is necessary to advance discussion on restricting the abuse of power and expanding the rights of the people." — Party platform: opposed to hasty revision, upholding constitutionalism — Broadly accurate
Komeito	+1	00:02:31 "Popular sovereignty, respect for fundamental human rights, and advanced pacifism are universal principles that should be upheld forever in the future." — Party platform: upholding three principles, cautious revision stance — "Advanced pacifism" is a transcript misrecognition (correct: permanent pacifism), content is broadly accurate
Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin)	+2	00:00:48 "The revision of Article 9 and the establishment of an emergency clause are urgent priorities." — Party platform: pro-revision, Article 9 revision, emergency clause — Accurate
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	0	None applicable — Party platform: firmly opposed to Article 9 revision, pro-constitution — Unconfirmable due to technical error in transcript. High possibility of not being included in the broadcast
Democratic Party for the People (DPP)	+2	00:01:05 "It is realistic to focus on themes where discussion has accumulated in the constitutional review commission and work on drafting specific articles." — Party platform: pragmatic revision, emphasis on review commission — Accurate

Note: Reiwa Shinsengumi and the Social Democratic Party cannot be confirmed in the transcript and their scores are set at 0 (not included in the broadcast). "Centre Reform Alliance" and "Sansei-tō" are excluded from assessment as their correspondence to real parties is unclear.

Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate portrayal: Nippon Ishin no Kai (Score +2), Democratic Party for the People (Score +2)
- Strongest distortion: Japanese Communist Party (Score 0) — High possibility of not being included in the broadcast, with the strongest pro-constitution position rendered invisible
- Average deviation (from 0): 1.5
- Conclusion: Parties that appeared in the broadcast are portrayed broadly accurately, but pro-constitution parties — JCP, Reiwa, and SDP — are likely absent, and the diversity of opposition to revision is not shown. This is problematic from the perspective of political fairness.



CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: Constitution Day Special (Introduction of party statements and comments)
- Date (estimated from filename): 3 May 2025 (Constitution Day)
- Estimated duration: Approximately 2 minutes 30 seconds to 3 minutes (substantive content portion) *excluding the repeated segment described below
- Presenters/Reporters: In the transcript, a narration read-aloud format (individual names cannot be identified)
- Persons appearing: Format of indirectly quoting statements and comments from each party. No individual interviews

Actors/Entity	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Liberal Democratic Party	Statement-issuing entity	LDP (Government)	Right-wing (7.0)
Nippon Ishin no Kai	Statement-issuing entity	Ishin (Opposition, pro-revision)	Right-wing (7.0)
Democratic Party for the People	Statement-issuing entity	DPP (Middle)	Centre-right (5.5)
Centre Reform Alliance	Statement-issuing entity	Unknown (notation in transcript)	Unknown
Constitutional Democratic Party	Statement-issuing entity	CDP (Opposition)	Centre-left (3.5)
Sansei-tō	Statement-issuing entity	Unknown (notation in transcript)	Unknown
Komeito	Statement-issuing entity	Komeito (Government)	Centre (5.0)

Note: From 00:01:50 onwards in the transcript, the sentence "The Constitutional Democratic Party will create the philosophy of remaking the constitution from scratch." repeats for approximately 13 minutes. This is judged to be a technical error in transcript generation (loop/hallucination). Furthermore, "Sansei-tō" and "Centre Reform Alliance" are notations in the transcript, and their correspondence to real parties is unclear (the latter may be a misrecognition of the SDP or another party).

Main Themes

A short-report format broadcast in which NHK introduces statements and comments regarding constitutional revision published by each political party on the occasion of the 79th anniversary of the Constitution's promulgation (Constitution Day).

Ideological Context

The Constitution of Japan came into effect on 3 May 1947, marking its 79th anniversary in 2025. The debate over constitutional revision has continued for many years, particularly regarding Article 9 (renunciation of war, non-possession of war potential) and the establishment of an emergency clause. Momentum for revision grew during the Abe administration, but the LDP's defeat in the 2024 House of Representatives election has made it difficult to secure the two-thirds majority required for a revision bill. Against the backdrop of North Korea's nuclear and missile development, China's military rise, and Russia's invasion of Ukraine, arguments for accelerating revision based on changes in the security environment are raised by the government and Ishin, while voices cautioning against hasty revision from the perspective of constitutionalism also remain strong. Constitutional revision requires a bill passed by more than two-thirds of the Diet and a majority in a national referendum, making the procedural hurdles high as well.



Viewpoints Required for Balanced Broadcasting (Independent Enumeration Based on World Knowledge)

- * The specific content and grounds of the pro-revision forces' (LDP, Ishin) revision proposals
- * The arguments against revision from the pro-constitution and cautious forces (CDP, JCP, Reiwa, SDP)
- * Komeito's "additive revision" theory (cautious revision stance premised on upholding the three principles)
- * The current state of public opinion (polling data on support/opposition to revision)
- * Views of constitutional scholars and legal experts (constitutionality of revision, procedural arguments)
- * Voices of civil society and the pro-constitution movement
- * International comparisons (examples of constitutional revision in other countries, significance of pacifist clauses)
- * The specific content of the emergency clause and discussion of the risk of abuse of power
- * The legal and substantive meaning of explicitly mentioning the SDF (differences from current interpretation)
- * Problems with the constitutional revision procedures law (National Referendum Law)

Confirmation of Treatment of Each Viewpoint

[A] Already covered

Timestamp: 00:00:12–00:00:37

Quote: "It has presented a revision proposal covering 4 items including explicit mention of the SDF and emergency response, and states that it will make every effort to achieve early realisation of revision."

Assessment: The LDP's pro-revision stance is introduced, but there is no explanation of the specific content of the 4 items.

[B] Partially covered

Timestamp: 00:01:50–00:02:09

Quote: "We feel a strong sense of crisis about the hasty debate on constitutional revision concerning the emergency clause and Article 9."

Assessment: The CDP's cautious position is introduced, but the pro-constitution arguments of JCP, Reiwa, and SDP are substantively absent (some parts cannot be confirmed due to technical errors in the transcript).

[C] Partially covered

Timestamp: 00:02:31–00:02:47

Quote: "Popular sovereignty, respect for fundamental human rights, and advanced pacifism are universal principles that should be upheld forever in the future."

Assessment: Komeito's stance of upholding the three principles is introduced, but the details of the "additive revision" theory are unclear.

[D] Absent

Timestamp: None applicable

Quote: None

Assessment: There is no reference whatsoever to public opinion (opinion polls), and the basis of public will for the constitutional revision debate is not shown.

[E] Absent

Timestamp: None applicable

Quote: None

Assessment: The views of constitutional scholars and legal experts are not cited at all.

[F] Absent

Timestamp: None applicable

Quote: None



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

Assessment: The voices of civil society, the pro-constitution movement, and Constitution Day assemblies are completely absent.

[G] Absent

Timestamp: None applicable

Quote: None

Assessment: An international comparative perspective is not presented at all.

[H] Partially covered

Timestamp: 00:01:58–00:02:09

Quote: "It states that it is necessary to advance discussion on restricting the abuse of power and expanding the rights of the people."

Assessment: The CDP refers to the risk of abuse of power, but there is no explanation of the specific content of the emergency clause.

[I] Absent

Timestamp: None applicable

Quote: None

Assessment: There is no explanation of the legal meaning of explicitly mentioning the SDF (differences from current interpretation, relationship to exclusively defensive defence posture).

[J] Absent

Timestamp: None applicable

Quote: None

Assessment: There is no reference to the problems with the National Referendum Law (inadequacy of advertising regulations, etc.).



CHAPTER 3 — 15 Criteria: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. Expert Selection									2/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Definition: Who is speaking as an expert?

Expert 1: Each political party (entities issuing statements and comments)

Timestamp 00:00:12–00:02:47

Statement Party statements (see above)

Positioning: This broadcast is in a short-report format introducing statements and comments from each party, and no independent experts or specialists appear at all.

Missing counter-arguments: The views of constitutional scholars, security experts, public opinion survey experts, and civil society representatives are completely absent.

Deep Check of Information Sources:

(a) Funding: Each political party is operated through membership fees, party subsidies, and political donations, and has interests based on its own political position.

(b) Mandate: Each political party is an entity expressing its own policy positions, not a provider of neutral assessments.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Each party has a direct political interest in its own pro-revision or pro-constitution position

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Issuing a statement is an official party act and personal risk is low

D3 Expert competence: +1 — Parties have a certain degree of expertise as parties to constitutional revision, but are not neutral experts

D4 Consistency of views: +1 — Each party's position is broadly consistent with its traditional party platform

D5 Emotional vs. data: 0 — Statements are political expressions, a mixture of data and emotion

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary information (party statements), but political documents

TOTAL: 0 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: Party statements are expressions of political positions, and framing them as neutral assessments is inappropriate. The narration read-aloud format risks blurring the boundary between political statements and objective facts.

Missing Expert Groups:

- Constitutional scholars (experts on the constitutionality of revision and procedural arguments)
- Security experts (objective assessors of the necessity and risks of revision)
- Public opinion survey experts (objective data providers on public awareness)

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Each political party (entities issuing)	-2	-1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	Yellow



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

statements and
comments)

Summary (Matrix results):

- Party statements: Source Traffic Light Yellow (score 0) — political conflict of interest present, positioning as neutral experts is inappropriate



2. Source Selection

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Definition: Which sources are cited? Is there diversity and independence?

Source 1: Party statements and comments

Timestamp

00:00:12–00:02:47

Statement

Party statements (see above)

- (a) Funding and operating entity:** Each party operates through membership fees, party subsidies, and political donations.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** Each party has a direct political interest in the realisation of its own pro-revision or pro-constitution position.
- (c) Missing opposing sources:** The perspectives of constitutional scholars, public opinion surveys, civil society, and international comparisons are completely absent.

Missing Opposing Sources:

- Views of constitutional scholars (on the constitutionality of revision and procedural arguments)
- NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Institute and other polling data (public awareness on support/opposition to revision)
- Voices of pro-constitution civil groups (Constitution Day assemblies, etc.)

Summary: This broadcast uses only party statements as sources and contains none of the voices of independent experts, public opinion data, or civil society. This is a serious problem from the perspective of multifaceted presentation of viewpoints as required by Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act, and the diversity of sources is markedly lacking.



3. Time Allocation

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time among different positions.

Estimated speaking time (substantive content portion, approximately 2 minutes 30 seconds):

- LDP: Approximately 25 seconds (approximately 17%) — pro-revision, early realisation
- Nippon Ishin no Kai: Approximately 22 seconds (approximately 15%) — pro-revision, urgent priority
- Democratic Party for the People: Approximately 18 seconds (approximately 12%) — pragmatic revision, emphasis on deliberation
- Centre Reform Alliance (unknown): Approximately 22 seconds (approximately 15%) — upholding constitutionalism, responsible revision argument
- Constitutional Democratic Party: Approximately 19 seconds (approximately 13%) — opposed to hasty revision
- Sansei-tō (unknown): Approximately 17 seconds (approximately 11%) — position of creating a new constitution (estimated)
- Komeito: Approximately 16 seconds (approximately 11%) — upholding three principles
- Narrator: Approximately 11 seconds (approximately 7%)

Pro-revision side total (LDP + Ishin + DPP): Approximately 65 seconds (approximately 43%)

Pro-constitution/cautious side total (CDP + Komeito): Approximately 35 seconds (approximately 23%)

Position unknown (Centre Reform Alliance, Sansei-tō): Approximately 39 seconds (approximately 26%)

Summary: The pro-revision side (LDP, Ishin, DPP) accounts for approximately 1.9 times more time than the pro-constitution/cautious side (CDP, Komeito) in total, and a certain asymmetry in time allocation is recognised. However, as the positions of "Centre Reform Alliance" and "Sansei-tō" are unclear, there are limits to accurate assessment.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What is relevant but not shown? (See STEP 0)

Omission 1:

Context

Complete absence of public opinion (polling data on support/opposition to revision)

Relevant timestamp: Entire broadcast

Impact

The constitutional revision debate is framed as "debate between parties," rendering the public's will invisible. Despite constitutional revision requiring a national referendum, the voice of the people is not shown at all.

Omission 2:

Context

Absence of pro-constitution arguments from JCP, Reiwa, and SDP

Relevant timestamp: From 00:01:50 onwards (unconfirmable due to loop error in transcript)

Impact

The pro-constitution side's arguments are represented solely by the CDP's statement, and stronger pro-constitution arguments (SDF unconstitutionality argument, Japan-US Security Treaty abolition argument, etc.) become invisible. The diversity of opposition to revision is not shown.

Omission 3:

Context

Complete absence of views from constitutional scholars and legal experts

Relevant timestamp: Entire broadcast

Impact

The constitutional revision debate is presented as a confrontation of political positions, and assessment from legal and academic perspectives is not shown. Viewers cannot obtain a foothold for understanding the legal meaning of revision.

Summary: This broadcast is confined to introducing party statements, and three important viewpoints — public opinion, expert views, and the voice of civil society — are completely absent. This is a serious problem from the perspective of multifaceted presentation of viewpoints as required by Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act.

Missing Voices

- Constitutional scholars (e.g., Sota Kimura, Yasuo Hasebe): Could have provided expert views on the constitutionality of revision, procedural arguments, and the risk of abuse of power regarding the emergency clause.
- Representatives of pro-constitution civil groups: Could have provided grassroots pro-constitution arguments as the voices of Constitution Day assembly participants.
- SDF veterans/security experts: Could have provided practical views on the substantive meaning of explicitly mentioning the SDF and the necessity from a security standpoint.



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

- Public opinion survey experts (e.g., NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Institute, survey departments at various companies): Could have provided the latest data on public opinion regarding support/opposition to constitutional revision.
- International law scholars: Could have provided a comparison of the international significance of Article 9 with pacifist clauses in other countries.
- Representatives of opposition parties (JCP, Reiw, SDP): Direct voices from the pro-constitution and immediate anti-revision stance are absent.
- National Referendum Law experts: Could have provided views on the problems with constitutional revision procedures (inadequacy of advertising and funding regulations).



5. Numerical Manipulation

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Complete figures include: absolute value, proportion (%) and trend

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:00:00

Quote

"The Constitution of Japan has reached 79 years since its promulgation."

Missing context

The figure of 79 years since promulgation is factually accurate, but in the context of the constitutional revision debate, no numerical figures from public opinion (polling results on support/opposition to revision) are shown at all.

Impact

With the constitutional revision debate presented without a numerical basis, objective assessment of the necessity and urgency of revision becomes difficult.

Summary: No active numerical manipulation is confirmed in this broadcast, but the complete absence of public opinion survey data indispensable to the constitutional revision debate can be pointed out as a problem of omission.



6. Guilt by Association

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting by association with negative groups or ideas.

Finding 1:

Timestamp

None applicable

Quote

None

Method: In this broadcast, no method of discrediting specific persons or organisations by associating them with negative groups is confirmed.

Summary: No method of guilt by association is confirmed in this broadcast. Score is 0.



7. Timing

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Strategic placement of information (beginning, middle, end).

Finding 1:

Position: 00:00:12 (beginning)

Content: "The security environment is the most severe since the war, and society is in a completely different phase than before." (LDP statement)

Timing effect: By placing the LDP's crisis frame at the very beginning of the broadcast, a framework is established in which all subsequent party statements are interpreted within this crisis context. The pro-constitution side's counter-frame of "achievements of pacifism" is not placed at the beginning.

Finding 2:

Position: 00:00:40 (immediately after the beginning)

Content: "The revision of Article 9 and the establishment of an emergency clause are urgent priorities." (Ishin statement)

Timing effect: By placing Ishin's pro-revision argument immediately after the LDP's, the structure becomes one in which the logic of pro-revision dominates the first half of the broadcast.

Finding 3:

Position: 00:01:50 (second half)

Content: "We feel a strong sense of crisis about the hasty debate on constitutional revision concerning the emergency clause and Article 9." (CDP statement)

Timing effect: The pro-constitution and cautious argument is placed in the second half of the broadcast, resulting in a structure where it is positioned as a "counter-argument" presented after the pro-revision argument has already been set out.

Summary: A structural asymmetry is recognised in which the pro-revision side (LDP, Ishin) is placed at the beginning of the broadcast and the pro-constitution/cautious side (CDP) is placed in the second half. This placement has the effect of framing the pro-revision argument as the "subject" and the pro-constitution argument as the "reaction."



8. Selective Indignation

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage amplifies the finding. Score = outrage level (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

Definition: Indignation shown toward a particular position but not shown equally toward other comparable positions.

Methodological Principles (v2.2): Record intervention events before each assessment. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if a similar intervention event with another position did not produce a similar reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp None applicable

Intervention event: This broadcast is in a narration read-aloud format of party statements, and no emotional reactions or expressions of indignation are confirmed.

Reaction: None

Comparison Not subject to assessment

Asymmetry: Unconfirmable — Selective indignation is not subject to assessment in this broadcast format.

Summary: No selective indignation is confirmed in this broadcast. Score is 0.



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

9. COMPLETENESS							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Share of covered perspectives

Inverted: original value measures coverage (higher = better). Shown as deviation (higher = larger gaps).



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. Framing

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How is the theme fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:00:12
Quote	<i>"The security environment is the most severe since the war, and society is in a completely different phase than before."</i>
Manipulation	In the format of a narrator reading out the LDP's statement, a crisis frame of "the most severe security environment since the war" is presented at the very beginning of the broadcast.

Problem: This crisis frame reflects the LDP's political position, but because of the narration read-aloud format, there is a possibility it will be received as objective fact. The counter-frame of "achievements of pacifism" presented by pro-constitution forces is not placed at the beginning.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	00:00:40–00:00:55
Quote	<i>"It is hard to say that the constitution is sufficiently responding to the major changes of the times, and the revision of Article 9 and establishment of an emergency clause, also stated in the coalition agreement, are urgent priorities."</i>
Manipulation	In Ishin's statement, expressions emphasising urgency such as "urgent priorities" are used, framing constitutional revision as an "indispensable response."

Problem: The expression "urgent priorities" contains a political judgement, but in the narration read-aloud format, no critical distance is shown.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	00:01:50–00:02:09
Quote	<i>"We feel a strong sense of crisis about the hasty debate on constitutional revision concerning the emergency clause and Article 9."</i>
Manipulation	The CDP's statement uses the emotional expression "sense of crisis," potentially framing the pro-constitution side's position as an "emotional reaction." Meanwhile, the pro-revision side's statements are introduced with active and constructive expressions such as "priorities" and "efforts."

Problem: The pro-revision side is asymmetrically framed as the "acting subject" and the pro-constitution side as the "reacting subject."



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

Summary: The overall frame of the broadcast follows the logical structure of the pro-revision side — "constitutional revision debate as a response to changes in the security environment" — and does not present the positive values of the pro-constitution and pacifist stance as an independent framework. However, taking into account the constraints of the short-report format, the score is set at a moderate level.



11. Word Choice and Terminology

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What language is used? What connotations are established?

Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:00:17

Quote

"Society is in a completely different phase than before."

Manipulation

The expression "completely different phase" is a quotation from the LDP's statement, but contains a value judgement that emphasises the critical nature of the current situation.

Problem: A neutral alternative expression would be "changes have occurred in the security environment," and the absolute expression "completely different" carries the connotation of premising the necessity of constitutional revision.

Finding 2:

Timestamp

00:02:12

Quote

"Sansei-tō takes the position of sōken, remaking the constitution from scratch."

Manipulation

The party name "Sansei-tō" appears to be a misrecognition in the transcript, and the term "sōken" is also unclear. It may refer to "sōken" (the position of remaking the constitution from scratch), but the inaccuracy of the terminology undermines the reliability of the information.

Problem: If the terminology in the broadcast is inaccurate, it may distort viewers' understanding.

Finding 3:

Timestamp

00:02:31

Quote

"Advanced pacifism is a universal principle that should be upheld forever in the future."

Manipulation

"Advanced pacifism" appears to be a misrecognition in the transcript; the correct term is estimated to be "permanent pacifism" (恒久平和主義).

Problem: Misrecognition of terminology is repeated, making accurate comprehension of the broadcast content difficult.

Summary: Problems in word choice are largely attributable to technical errors in the transcript, and the evidence is insufficient to conclude that they constitute intentional linguistic manipulation in the broadcast itself. However, the asymmetry whereby pro-revision side expressions are introduced as active and positive while pro-constitution side expressions are introduced as reactive and emotional can be pointed out.



12. Presenter Behaviour									1/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Definition: Asymmetry in questions, interruptions, and expressions of sympathy.

Methodological Principles (v2.2): Record intervention events before each assessment. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if a similar intervention event with a similar guest did not produce a similar intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp Entire broadcast

Intervention event: This broadcast is in a narration read-aloud format of party statements, and no presenter or interviewer exists.

Quote (presenter) *None applicable*

Comparison As no presenter exists, asymmetry in presenter behaviour cannot be assessed.

Asymmetry: Unconfirmable — Presenter behaviour analysis is not applicable to this broadcast format.

Summary: This broadcast is in a short-report narration format with no presenter or interviewer, so asymmetry in presenter behaviour is not subject to assessment. The score is formally set at 1, but this reflects unassessability rather than the absence of problems.



13. Question Asymmetry

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Differences in the severity or leniency of questions directed at different persons.

Asymmetry 1:

This broadcast is in a narration read-aloud format of party statements, and no interviews or question-and-answer exchanges exist. Therefore, question asymmetry is not subject to assessment.

Summary: Question asymmetry cannot be assessed in this broadcast format, and the score is set at 0.



14. False Balance

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Creating an artificial balance despite actual imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:00:12–00:02:47

Structure: Presentation of a formal balance of "each party issued a statement"

Analysis

This broadcast creates a formal balance by introducing statements from multiple parties in parallel, but in reality the pro-revision side (LDP, Ishin, DPP) has an advantage in both time and placement. Furthermore, unclear entities such as "Centre Reform Alliance" and "Sansei-tō" are included, and there is a possibility that the actual political landscape is not accurately reflected. In addition, the possibility that statements from clearly pro-constitution parties — JCP, Reiwa, and SDP — are absent (due to technical errors in the transcript) means that the formal balance may be concealing substantive imbalance.

Summary: There is a possibility that the performance of formal balance under the guise of "introducing each party's statement" conceals asymmetry in actual political landscape, time allocation, and order of placement. However, the influence of technical errors is significant, and the evidence is insufficient to definitively characterise this as intentional false balance.



15. Agenda Setting

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What is treated as normal or self-evident? What does not make it onto the agenda?

Finding 1:

Established agenda element: "Constitutional revision debate as a response to changes in the security environment" is established as a self-evident premise.

Timestamp 00:00:12

Basis: The LDP's expression "the most severe security environment since the war" is read out by the narrator and presented without critical distance.

Alternative agenda: "Assessment of pacifism as an achievement of 79 years since the constitution's promulgation," "the current state of national discussion on the necessity of constitutional revision," "the democratic legitimacy of constitutional revision procedures"

Finding 2:

Established agenda element: The constitutional revision debate is framed as "debate between parties," rendering the participation of the public and civil society invisible.

Timestamp Entire broadcast

Basis: All statements are from political parties, and no voices of the public or civil society are included at all.

Alternative agenda: "The necessity of civic debate premised on a national referendum," "the voices of citizens at Constitution Day assemblies"

Summary: This broadcast frames the constitutional revision debate as a "policy debate between parties," rendering invisible the democratic dimension of public and civil society participation. Furthermore, by establishing "changes in the security environment" as a self-evident premise, the perspective of questioning the necessity of constitutional revision is excluded from the agenda.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	Expert Selection	2/10	Unremarkable
2	Source Selection	5/10	Significant imbalance
3	Time Allocation	4/10	Slight imbalance
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	7/10	Pronounced imbalance
5	Numerical Manipulation	1/10	Unremarkable
6	Guilt by Association	0/10	Unremarkable
7	Timing	4/10	Slight imbalance
8	Selective Indignation	0/10	Unremarkable
9	COMPLETENESS	7/10	Pronounced imbalance
10	Framing	4/10	Slight imbalance
11	Word Choice and Terminology	3/10	Slight imbalance
12	Presenter Behaviour	1/10	Unremarkable
13	Question Asymmetry	0/10	Unremarkable
14	False Balance	3/10	Slight imbalance
15	Agenda Setting	5/10	Significant imbalance

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

3.2/10

Slight imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

3.0/10

Slight imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

3.1/10

Slight imbalance

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



KEY — Score Definitions

Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant anomaly detected.
1–2	Weak finding	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
3–4	Slight to moderate finding	Recognizable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance affecting the audience's opinion-forming potential.
6	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores of 6 and above are classified as 'significant findings.'
7	Significant finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with distinct impact relevance.
8–9	Severe finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality standard.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but within tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Significant imbalance	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of perspective diversity.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high bias degree	Maximum severity across nearly all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favored	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
+3 to +5	Strongly favored	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL ASSESSMENT (Broadcasting Act Article 4)

Assessment Based on Broadcasting Act Article 4

Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act requires political fairness (Paragraph 2), accuracy of reporting (Paragraph 3), and multifaceted presentation of viewpoints (Paragraph 4).

Violation 1:

Standard: Broadcasting Act Article 4, Paragraph 4 (multifaceted presentation of viewpoints)

Facts: Public opinion, constitutional scholars, civil society, and pro-constitution party (JCP, Reiwa, SDP) voices are completely absent, and the constitutional revision debate is reduced to a policy debate between parties.

Basis: Timestamps 00:00:00–00:02:47 (entire broadcast) — no reference to independent experts or opinion data

Assessment: In a broadcast dealing with the important political theme of constitutional revision, the multifaceted presentation of viewpoints is markedly insufficient, and there is a possibility that it contravenes the spirit of Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act.

Violation 2:

Standard: Broadcasting Act Article 4, Paragraph 2 (political fairness)

Facts: The pro-revision side (LDP, Ishin) is placed at the beginning of the broadcast, and the most strongly pro-constitution positions (JCP, Reiwa, SDP) are likely absent.

Basis: Timestamp 00:00:12 (LDP placed at beginning), absence of JCP, Reiwa, SDP statements

Assessment: If pro-constitution party statements are absent, there is a possibility of contravening Article 4, Paragraph 2 of the Broadcasting Act from the perspective of political fairness. However, as the influence of technical errors in the transcript cannot be excluded, there are limits to a definitive assessment.

Violation 3:

Standard: Broadcasting Act Article 4, Paragraph 3 (accuracy of reporting)

Facts: Multiple instances of terminology misrecognition are confirmed in the transcript, including "advanced pacifism" (correct: permanent pacifism), "Sansei-tō" (real party name unknown), and "sōken" (possibly correct: sōken in the sense of creating a new constitution).

Basis: Timestamps 00:02:12, 00:02:31

Assessment: These are likely technical errors in transcript generation, and additional confirmation is required before concluding that they constitute inaccuracies in the broadcast itself.

Overall Assessment under Broadcasting Act Article 4

This broadcast is in an approximately 2-minute-30-second short-report format, and evidence indicating an active intention for political manipulation is limited. However, as a broadcast dealing with the important political theme of constitutional revision, a source structure that contains none of the voices of public opinion, expert views, or civil society may contravene the spirit of Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act, which requires multifaceted presentation of viewpoints. Furthermore, the possibility that pro-constitution party (JCP, Reiwa, SDP) statements are absent is problematic from the perspective of Article 4, Paragraph 2 (political fairness). As a public broadcaster with obligations under Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act, NHK has a duty to endeavour to present multifaceted viewpoints even in a short-report format, and this broadcast has room for improvement from that perspective. However, technical errors in the transcript affect the accuracy of the analysis, and caution is required in reaching a definitive legal judgement without confirming the original broadcast.

Deep Check of Information Sources (Mandatory Check for All Expert Organisations, NGOs, and Advisory Bodies Cited)

Information sources cited in this broadcast: Party statements and comments

President: Schlaepfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Address:** SVFAB, P/O-Box, CH-8021 Zurich 1



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

1. Funding: Each political party is operated through membership fees, party subsidies (national treasury grants), and political donations. Party subsidies are disbursed from taxpayer funds, and each party is a beneficiary of public funds.

2. Mandate: The mandate of each party is to express and realise its own policy positions, which is fundamentally incompatible with providing neutral assessments.

3. Conflict of interest: Each party has a direct political interest in the realisation of its own pro-revision or pro-constitution position. There is a structural conflict of interest in which pro-revision parties solidify their support base by emphasising the necessity of revision, and pro-constitution parties maintain their support base by advocating against revision.

4. Credibility Matrix (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions):

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Each party has a direct political interest in its own position

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Official statements carry low personal risk

D3 Expert competence: +1 — Parties have a certain degree of knowledge as parties to constitutional revision, but are not neutral experts

D4 Consistency of views: +1 — Broadly consistent with traditional party platforms

D5 Emotional vs. data: 0 — Political expressions (mixture of data and emotion)

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary information (party statements), but political documents

TOTAL: 0 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)

5. Missing opposing sources: Views of constitutional scholars (Sota Kimura, Yasuo Hasebe, etc.), NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Institute and other polling data, voices of pro-constitution civil groups, and views of international law scholars are absent.

Important: The fact that "each party issued a statement" does not mean that party statements are neutral or objective information. Party statements are expressions of political positions, and it is inappropriate to treat them as equivalent to assessments by independent experts or data from public opinion surveys. The fact that this broadcast presents these without distinction is problematic from the perspective of source transparency.

Analysis complete — NHK Broadcasting Act Article 4 Compliance Analysis Report v2.7-detail

Subject of analysis: Constitution Day Special (estimated 3 May 2025)

Note: Due to technical errors in the transcript (loop from 00:01:50 onwards), there are limits to confirming the content of the second half of the broadcast. Cross-referencing with the original broadcast is recommended.

Legal and Methodological Notes

No factual determination

The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams, or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardized operationalization, not a finding of individual responsibility.

No legal judgment

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under 放送法 第4条. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular 総務省).

No proof of causation

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.

No judgment of intent

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

**Heuristic
comparison tool**

The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

Legal Basis Japan — NHK

Legislation

- Broadcasting Act (放送法, Act No. 132 of 1950, last amended 2024)
- NHK Reception Agreement (NHK受信規約)
- Radio Act (電波法)

Broadcasting Act Article 4 (Editing Standards)

Original text (Japanese):

放送事業者は、国内放送及び内外放送の放送番組の編集に当たっては、次の各号の定めるところによらなければならない。

- 一 公安及び善良な風俗を害しないこと。
- 二 政治的に公平であること。
- 三 報道は事実をまげないですること。
- 四 意見が対立している問題については、できるだけ多くの角度から論点を明らかにすること。

Official English translation:

(1) A broadcaster must comply with the following when editing domestic broadcast programs:

- (i) It must not negatively influence public safety or good morals.
- (ii) It must be politically fair.
- (iii) Reporting must not distort the facts.
- (iv) It must clarify the points at issue from as many angles as possible where there are conflicting opinions concerning an issue.

Ref: e-Gov (laws.e-gov.go.jp/law/325AC0000000132), Japanese Law Translation DB

Four Pillars of Bias Analysis

No.	Provision	SVFAB Analysis Reference
1	Must not harm public safety or good morals	Editorial baseline
2	Must be politically fair	Core bias metric — analogous to Swiss RTVG Art. 4
3	Reporting must not distort the facts	Factual dimension
4	Controversial issues: as many angles as possible	Multi-perspective / balance

Comparison Switzerland — Japan

Aspect	Switzerland (SRG)	Japan (NHK)
Law	RTVG Art. 4	Broadcasting Act Art. 4
Independent regulator	UBI (binding)	BPO (non-binding)



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

State regulator	BAKOM/UVEK	MIC (Ministry of Internal Affairs)
Enforcement	UBI can uphold complaints; BAKOM can sanction	BPO recommends; MIC can issue administrative guidance
Funding	Serafe fee	NHK reception fee (~1,100 JPY/month)
Self-regulation	Moderate (UBI independent)	Weak (BPO co-funded by NHK)

Regulatory Authorities

Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (総務省)

- Government ministry with jurisdiction over broadcasting
- Issues broadcast licences
- Can issue administrative guidance (行政指導)
- Approves NHK budget, business plan, and reception fees
- Theoretically has authority to revoke licences
- Recent action: September 2024, administrative guidance after Senkaku incident on NHK Radio International

BPO (Broadcasting Ethics and Program Improvement Organization)

- Founded 2003, non-governmental, self-regulatory
- Jointly operated by NHK and JBA (Japan Commercial Broadcasters Association)
- Three committees: Ethics Verification, Human Rights, Youth Protection
- Decisions are NOT legally binding — rely on voluntary compliance
- NHK co-funds BPO — structural independence compromised

Key BPO Decisions Regarding NHK

Year	Case	Ruling
2015	Close-up Gendai — staging allegations	Serious breach of broadcasting ethics
2022	BS Olympic Documentary (Naomi Kawase)	Serious breach — false subtitles
2023	News Watch 9 — COVID-19 reporting	Breach — vaccine families misrepresented

International Reference

- RSF Press Freedom Index: Japan 2024 Rank 70 (far behind CH: 9, NO: 1)
- Freedom House: Japan classified as "free", but media freedom under pressure (kisha clubs, government proximity)

Structural Background

NHK is the world's largest public broadcaster by budget (~720 billion JPY / ~4.5 billion EUR). Formal independence is structurally limited through the Board of Governors (12 members appointed by the Prime Minister with parliamentary consent). The kisha club system restricts access to government information to accredited media and fosters proximity between journalists and government.



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

References

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

SVFAB Working Papers

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

David Schläpfer — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

Reports and Membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you will find detailed reports and can also commission custom analyses for any broadcast (billed separately). To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership fees and donations.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via www.svfab.ch or kontakt@svfab.ch



Unbalanced Reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: Manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. Additionally, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques – fostering not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**.

Also available as an **audiobook**.



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage – and someone else has written the script.

Those who don't know this deliver material. Good quotes that get cut wrong. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox – for everyone who faces a microphone and wants to know what to do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three principles of sovereignty – anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what matters after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers – for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. So they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and when difficulties arise



You think you see the world. In reality you see the frame someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It doesn't change the facts – it changes what we make of the facts. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works – because we all play along. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook – playful, direct, full of real-life examples. You don't just learn how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame – and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and the occasional smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.