



## NHK 詳細分析

2026-05-03\_radio\_news\_1800

Broadcast: 2026-05-03 | Analyzed: 2026-05-13 13:32

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**3.0/10**

*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)

**4.7 / 10**

**Balanced**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — [chesdata.eu](https://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

Current Government: Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) + Komeito coalition government. Continuous since 2012 (excluding the Democratic Party government period from 2009–2012). In the House of Representatives election on 27 October 2024, the LDP fell back to 191 seats, dropping below an overall majority. Current Prime Minister: Shigeru Ishiba (took office October 2024).

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

Party	LR Value (0–10)	Seats (House of Representatives)	Government/Opposition	Core Position
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	1.5	8	Opposition	Uphold Article 9, immediate abolition of nuclear power, dissolution of the Japan-US Security Treaty
Social Democratic Party (SDP)	2.5	1	Opposition	Protect the constitution, anti-rearmament, emphasis on welfare
Reiwa Shinsengumi (Reiwa)	2.5	9	Opposition	Abolish consumption tax, anti-military expansion, anti-establishment
Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP)	3.5	148	Opposition	Protect the constitution, oppose revision of Article 9, promote renewable energy
Komeito	5.0	24	Government	Pacifism, emphasis on social security, a brake on the LDP within the coalition
Democratic Party for the People (DPP)	5.5	28	Centre	Reduce consumption tax, pragmatic use of nuclear power
Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	7.0	191	Government	Constitutional revision (Article 9 and emergency provisions), increase in defence spending
Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin)	7.0	38	Opposition	Constitutional revision, deregulation, reform agenda originating from Osaka
Sanseito	9.0	3	Opposition	Ultra-nationalism, anti-globalism

Note: Japan is not covered by CHES (Chapel Hill Expert Survey). LR values are composite figures based on MANIFESTO, the University of Tokyo–Asahi Survey, the progressive-conservative scale, and Laver/Benoit (2017). Pew threshold: below 4.5 = left, 4.5–5.5 = centre, above 5.5 = right.

Constitutional revision is the greatest fault line, with the ruling parties and the opposition sharply divided especially over inscribing the Self-Defence Forces in Article 9 (renunciation of war) and creating new emergency provisions. The LDP's loss of an overall majority in the 2024 House of Representatives election has made it difficult to secure the two-thirds majority required to submit a revision proposal, and the debate over revision has entered a new phase. Other



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

major issues include increasing the defence budget to 2% of GDP, the question of restarting nuclear power plants, and the introduction of separate surnames for married couples. With the 2025 House of Councillors election approaching, the contest among parties over constitutional and security policies is intensifying.

NHK is a public broadcaster based on the Broadcasting Act; the 12 members of its Board of Governors are appointed by the Prime Minister (subject to Diet approval). Since the Abe administration (2012–2020), criticism of "Abe's NHK" has persisted, and the press club system has created a structural proximity to the government. Japan ranks 70th in RSF's Press Freedom Index (2024), and the obligation under Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act to maintain political fairness and present issues from multiple angles is constantly scrutinised.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Scores by Party

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Depiction in broadcast vs. party's programmatic position
LDP	0	No direct mention. The pro-revision rally was covered, but was not presented explicitly as the LDP's position. The LDP's programmatic position of promoting revision is indirectly reflected, but neither accurately nor distortedly.
CDP	0	No direct mention. The pro-constitution rally was covered, but was not presented explicitly as CDP's position. CDP's pro-constitution position is indirectly reflected, but neither accurately nor distortedly.
Komeito	0	Not mentioned.
Ishin	0	Not mentioned.
JCP	0	Not mentioned.
DPP	0	Not mentioned.

#### Score legend:

+5 = Programmatic position depicted accurately and fully

0 = Party/topic does not appear in the broadcast

-5 = Programmatic position actively distorted or misrepresented

### Party Bias Summary

- Most accurately depicted: N/A (all parties score 0)
- Most strongly distorted: N/A (all parties score 0)
- Average deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: In this broadcast, no specific party names are explicitly mentioned, and the rallies of the pro-revision and pro-constitution camps are reported separately from political parties. While this avoids party-political bias, it results in an absence of information in that the specific positions of each party are not conveyed to viewers. From the standpoint of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act, an opportunity to deepen viewer understanding by explicitly stating each party's position has been lost.



## CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Data

- Title: NHK News, 6 p.m.
- Date (estimated from filename): 3 May 2025 (Constitution Memorial Day)
- Estimated Broadcast Duration: Approx. 4 minutes 49 seconds (00:00:00–00:04:49)
- Presenter/Reporter: Taniguchi (announcer)
- Persons Appearing:

Actors	Position/Title	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Mononchi Akira	Professor Emeritus, Nihon University	Private Constitutional Council (pro-revision)	Leans right (LDP support base)
Yoshioka Shino	Non-fiction writer	Speaker at a pro-constitution rally	Leans left (pro-constitution)
Male participant, 70s	Private citizen	Participant at pro-revision rally	Leans right
Female participant, 40s	Private citizen	Participant at pro-constitution rally	Leans left
The family of Prince Akishino (mentioned only)	Imperial family	Non-political	Neutral

### Main Themes

Coverage of rallies held by both pro-revision and pro-constitution groups on Constitution Memorial Day (3 May 2025), and an introduction to the family of Prince Akishino attending a concert.

### Perspectives Required for Balanced Reporting (Independent Enumeration Based on World Knowledge)

- \* The specific content and legal effect of revising Article 9 (the significance of inscribing the SDF)
- \* International comparison of emergency provisions and their impact on democracy
- \* The current state of the procedures required for revision (submission requirements and national referendum)
- \* The impact of the 2024 House of Representatives election result on the revision debate (absence of a two-thirds majority)
- \* The specific legal and pacifist arguments of the pro-constitution camp
- \* The specific security arguments of the pro-revision camp (e.g. the Strait of Hormuz case)
- \* The distribution of public opinion for and against revision in polling data
- \* A comparison of each party's specific position on constitutional revision
- \* The diverse views of constitutional scholars and legal experts
- \* The history of past revision debates and their international context

### Confirmation of How Each Perspective Is Handled

[A] Partially mentioned

Timestamp: 01:37–01:53



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

Quotation: "Regarding the Strait of Hormuz, it has been stated that our country, due to constitutional constraints, cannot dispatch vessels during active combat. He appealed that, in order to fulfil our responsibilities on a par with other nations, we must promptly work toward revising Article 9 of the Constitution."

Assessment: The constraints of Article 9 were mentioned as an argument of the pro-revision camp, but there was no explanation of the specific content of an Article 9 revision or its legal effects; it remained a one-sided presentation of claims.

[B] Not mentioned (omitted)

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: The content, problems, and international comparison of emergency provisions were not touched upon at all. Only the content of a statement, "promotion of deliberations toward establishing emergency provisions," was introduced at 01:57–02:07.

[C] Omitted

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: There was no explanation whatsoever of the revision procedures (approval by two-thirds or more of each house of the Diet + a national referendum).

[D] Omitted

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: The important context that the LDP's loss of an overall majority in the 2024 House of Representatives election has made a revision submission realistically difficult is completely absent.

[E] Partially mentioned

Timestamp: 02:46–02:53

Quotation: "It is the Constitution of Japan that gives us the foundation from which to move society. Is it not necessary to build up the knowledge to keep from being swayed by the information that flies around, using the constitution as a foundation?"

Assessment: A civil society perspective was presented as an argument of the pro-constitution camp, but there was no specific explanation of legal or pacifist arguments.

[F] Mentioned (pro-revision only)

Timestamp: 01:37–01:53

Quotation: "Regarding the Strait of Hormuz, it has been stated that our country, due to constitutional constraints, cannot dispatch vessels during active combat."

Assessment: The pro-revision camp's security argument was presented specifically, but no counter-argument from the pro-constitution camp on security grounds was provided.

[G] Omitted

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: No polling data on the distribution of public opinion for and against revision was cited.

[H] Omitted

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: No comparison of each party's specific position was conducted.

[I] Omitted



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

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: No views of constitutional scholars or legal experts appear. Professor Emeritus Mononchi is not a legal scholar, and confirmation of his field of expertise is required.

[J] Omitted

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: There is no reference to the history of past revision debates or their international context.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 Criteria: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

#### 1. Selection of Experts

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Expert 1: Mononchi Akira (Professor Emeritus, Nihon University)

##### Timestamp

01:36–01:53

##### Statement

"Regarding the Strait of Hormuz, it has been stated that our country, due to constitutional constraints, cannot dispatch vessels during active combat. He appealed that, in order to fulfil our responsibilities on a par with other nations, we must promptly work toward revising Article 9 of the Constitution."

Positioning: Speaking as a presenter at a pro-revision rally (Private Constitutional Council). The title of Professor Emeritus at Nihon University confers academic authority, but his field of expertise (whether law or otherwise) is not specified.

Missing counter-argument: The views of a pro-constitution constitutional scholar (e.g. Professor Yasuo Hasebe of Waseda University) are not provided as a counterpart.

Deep verification of source:

**(a) Funding:** The Private Constitutional Council is a private organisation promoting constitutional revision. Nihon University is a private university. The fact that Mononchi is invited as a presenter at a pro-revision rally makes it clear that he holds a pro-revision position.

**(b) Suitability of commission:** He is speaking as a presenter at a pro-revision rally, which is incompatible with the position of a neutral assessor.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — holds a clear position as a presenter at a pro-revision rally

D2 Personal risk: +1 — already established as professor emeritus, loss from speaking is limited

D3 Competence: +1 — holds the title of university professor, but field of expertise unknown

D4 Consistency of views: 0 — no comparative data with past statements

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — the Strait of Hormuz example is specific, but no detailed legal basis given

D6 Source level: 0 — statement at a rally (secondary information)

**TOTAL: -1 → Source traffic light: Yellow (-4 to +4)**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** There is a risk that by being introduced as "Professor Emeritus at Nihon University," a presenter at a pro-revision rally is received as a neutral academic expert. This corresponds to Technique 12 (source selection).

#### Expert 2: Yoshioka Shino (Non-fiction writer)

##### Timestamp

02:46–02:53

##### Statement

"It is the Constitution of Japan that gives us the foundation from which to move society. Is it not necessary to build up the knowledge to keep from being swayed by the information that flies around, using the constitution as a foundation?"

Positioning: A presenter at a pro-constitution rally. She is a non-fiction writer and not an expert in law or security.



Missing counter-argument: Specific legal arguments from a pro-revision legal scholar are not provided as a counterpart.

Deep verification of source:

**(a) Funding:** A presenter at a pro-constitution rally. Income from writing activities. It is clear she holds a pro-constitution position.

**(b) Suitability of commission:** Speaking as a presenter at a pro-constitution rally; she is not a neutral assessor.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — holds a clear position as a presenter at a pro-constitution rally

D2 Personal risk: 0 — speaking as a writer, risk is moderate

D3 Competence: -1 — a non-fiction writer is not an expert in constitutional law or security

D4 Consistency of views: 0 — no comparative data with past statements

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — centred on metaphorical and emotional expressions such as "foundation" and "information that flies around"

D6 Source level: 0 — statement at a rally (secondary information)

**TOTAL: -4 → Source traffic light: Yellow (-4 to +4)**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** There is a risk that by positioning a non-fiction writer as the "expert" spokesperson for the pro-constitution camp, the arguments of the pro-constitution camp are made to seem emotional and abstract.

Missing expert groups:

- Constitutional scholars (both pro-constitution and pro-revision): essential for objective explanation of legal arguments
- Security experts: to verify the facts of the Strait of Hormuz case and present alternatives
- National referendum/electoral system experts: for a realistic explanation of revision procedures

### Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Mononchi Akira (Professor Emeritus, Nihon University)	-2	+1	+1	0	-1	0	-1	Yellow
Yoshioka Shino (Non-fiction writer)	-2	0	-1	0	-1	0	-4	Yellow

*Summary (matrix results):*

- Mononchi Akira (pro-revision professor): Source traffic light Yellow (total -1), position clear as presenter at a pro-revision rally
- Yoshioka Shino (pro-constitution writer): Source traffic light Yellow (total -4), mismatch of competence is conspicuous



## 2. Selection of Sources

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: Private Constitutional Council

**Timestamp** 01:21–01:27

**Statement** "At a rally held in Chiyoda, Tokyo by the Private Constitutional Council and others who seek constitutional revision,"

**(a) Funding and operating body:** The Private Constitutional Council is a private organisation promoting constitutional revision. It is known to have close ties with LDP and pro-revision politicians.

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** It is an organisation whose purpose is to promote revision, and it is not an appropriate source for neutral constitutional debate.

**(c) Missing counter-source:** The views of legal scholars and civic organisations opposed to revision are not provided as a counterpart.

**Missing counter-source** The Japan Federation of Bar Associations (cautious toward revision), the majority opinion of constitutional scholars, etc.

### Source 2: Pro-constitution rally (organiser unnamed)

**Timestamp** 02:37–02:44

**Statement** "At a rally held in Taito, Tokyo by those who seek to protect the constitution,"

**(a) Funding and operating body:** The organiser's name is not specified (only "those who seek to protect the constitution").

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Presumed to be an organisation aimed at promoting the protection of the constitution, but details are unknown.

**(c) Missing counter-source:** The views of pro-revision legal scholars and experts are not provided as a counterpart.

Summary: Organiser information for both rallies is incomplete (in particular, the organiser of the pro-constitution rally is unnamed), making it difficult to verify the independence and neutrality of the sources. Sources from both the pro-revision and pro-constitution camps have been selected, but both are organisations with a stated position, and neutral expert sources (constitutional scholars, security experts) are absent.



3. Allocation of Speaking Time									3/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Estimated speaking time:

- Pro-revision (statement by Professor Mononchi, official statement, male participant in 70s): Approx. 60 seconds (01:36–02:07, 02:09–02:23), approx. 21% of total
- Pro-constitution (statement by Ms. Yoshioka, demonstration, female participant in 40s): Approx. 55 seconds (02:26–03:22), approx. 19% of total
- Announcer (narration): Approx. 115 seconds (approx. 40% of total)
- Imperial family-related news: Approx. 75 seconds (03:31–04:42), approx. 26% of total
- Weather information: Approx. 65 seconds (00:04–01:08), approx. 23% of total

Summary: The speaking time for the pro-revision and pro-constitution camps is nearly equal (approx. 60 seconds vs. 55 seconds), and a formal balance is maintained. However, the substantive asymmetry—that the pro-revision camp's content is more specific (the Strait of Hormuz case) while the pro-constitution camp's content is abstract—cannot be captured by time allocation alone.



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

The reality that the LDP lost its overall majority in the 2024 House of Representatives election and has been unable to secure the two-thirds majority required to submit a revision proposal

Relevant timestamp: 01:10–02:07 (pro-revision rally coverage as a whole)

###### Impact

By reporting the pro-revision camp's appeals without the realistic political context, the impression is created that revision could be realised in the near future. In reality, the current seat distribution makes a revision submission difficult.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

Distribution data from public opinion polls on support for and against revision

Relevant timestamp: Overall

###### Impact

Viewers are unable to learn about the social distribution of support for and against revision; with only the number of rally participants shown (pro-revision: 850; pro-constitution: 50,000), the impression may arise that the pro-constitution camp has a numerical advantage.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

An explanation of revision procedures (approval by two-thirds or more of each house of the Diet + a national referendum)

Relevant timestamp: 01:57–02:07

###### Impact

The statement calling for "drafting a constitutional revision proposal as soon as possible" is reported without any reference to the realistic difficulties of the revision procedures, which could lead to the misconception that revision can be easily achieved.

Summary: The realistic context of the revision debate (seat distribution, public opinion polls, procedural requirements) is completely absent, and the information necessary for viewers to form independent judgements is not provided. This may contravene the obligation under Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act to "clarify issues from as many angles as possible."

#### Missing Voices

- Constitutional scholar (pro-constitution): Could have specifically explained the legal interpretation of Article 9 and the problems with revision
- Constitutional scholar (pro-revision): Could have academically discussed the legal basis and necessity of revision
- Security expert: Could have verified the facts of the Strait of Hormuz case and presented alternative security measures
- National referendum/electoral system expert: Could have explained the realistic difficulties of the revision procedure
- Public opinion polling expert: Could have presented the distribution of public opinion on revision with objective data



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

- Opposition representatives (CDP, JCP, etc.): Could have directly stated the political and legal arguments for protecting the constitution
- Ruling party representative (LDP): Could have directly stated the policy basis for promoting revision
- International law expert: Could have provided an international legal interpretation of Japan's security obligations



<b>5. Numerical Manipulation</b>									<b>2/10</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

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

<b>Finding 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	01:27–01:31
Figure: "Approximately 850 people participated according to the organisers' announcement." (pro-revision rally)	
<b>Missing context</b>	The expression "organisers' announcement" (written as "disaster victims' announcement" in the original, apparently a transcription error) is used without noting that organiser-reported attendance figures tend to be overestimates.
<b>Impact</b>	The credibility of the attendance figure is reported without verification.

<b>Finding 2:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	02:42–02:44
Figure: "Approximately 50,000 people participated according to the organisers' announcement." (pro-constitution rally)	
<b>Missing context</b>	The approximately 59-fold difference between pro-revision (850) and pro-constitution (50,000) is reported in parallel without contextual explanation. There is no explanation of whether this numerical difference reflects the degree of social support for the pro-constitution camp, a difference in mobilisation capacity, or a difference in venue size.
<b>Impact</b>	The numerical contrast may suggest that the pro-constitution camp has overwhelming social support, but in reality the difference may reflect the differing nature, scale, and methods of mobilisation of the two rallies.

Summary: The parallel reporting of the attendance contrast (850 vs. 50,000) without contextual explanation may mislead viewers. However, fabrication of figures or clear manipulation is not confirmed.



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

## 6. Guilt by Association

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

In this broadcast, no technique of discrediting a particular person or position by associating them with a negative group is confirmed. The statements of both the pro-revision and pro-constitution camps are presented neutrally as representative opinions of their respective positions.

No labelling such as "conspiracy theorist" or "conspiracy ideologue" is confirmed either.

Summary: The technique of guilt by association is not used in this broadcast.



## 7. Timing

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 01:10– (approx. 23% into the broadcast, immediately after the weather information)

Content: "Today, Constitution Memorial Day, those who seek constitutional revision and those who seek to protect the constitution each held rallies."

Timing effect: The constitutional debate is presented immediately after the weather information (which has urgency and specificity), ensuring viewer attention is secured when the constitutional issue is introduced. This is more of a standard news programme structure (breaking news → political news → social news) than an intentional placement.

### Finding 2:

Position: 03:31–04:42 (end)

Content: The family of Prince Akishino attending a concert

Timing effect: Placing mild imperial family-related news after the constitutional debate creates a "warm" impression at the end of the programme. This has the effect of alleviating political tension, but is standard practice in news programme structure.

Summary: Timing manipulation is minor and follows the standard structure of a news programme. No timing manipulation as intentional information manipulation is confirmed.



## 8. Selective Indignation

1/10

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)

*Methodological principle (v2.2): Record the triggering event before each assessment. A response can only be assessed as selective if an equivalent trigger involving another position did not produce a similar response.*

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

Overall

Triggering event: This broadcast is in news-reading format, and emotional responses or expressions of indignation by the announcer do not structurally occur.

Response: None

#### Comparison

Both pro-revision and pro-constitution statements are read in an equivalent tone.

Asymmetry: Cannot be confirmed — as this is a news-reading format, assessment of selective indignation is not applicable.

Summary: As this is a news-reading format, selective indignation is not confirmed. The score of 1 takes into account the possibility that the substantive asymmetry between the pro-revision statement (a specific Strait of Hormuz example) and the pro-constitution statement (abstract appeal) may produce subtle differences in the announcer's reading tone.



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

Japan's Constitution has been in force since 3 May 1947—78 years—and has never been revised. The debate over revision has been a long-standing political issue, particularly centred on Article 9 (renunciation of war / non-possession of war potential), with the LDP and Ishin advocating revision and the CDP, JCP, SDP, and Reiwa advocating for protecting the constitution. The LDP's loss of an overall majority in the 2024 House of Representatives election has made it difficult to secure the two-thirds majority required to submit a revision proposal, reducing the realistic prospect of revision. With the international situation as a backdrop (the invasion of Ukraine, tensions in the Taiwan Strait), security debates have become more active, and the question of whether to revise the constitution has become one of national identity that goes beyond a mere legal issue.

*Share of covered perspectives*

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



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. Framing

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 01:10–01:19

Quotation: "Those who seek constitutional revision and those who seek to protect the constitution each held rallies."

Manipulation technique: A contrastive frame of "seeking revision" versus "protecting" is established. The word "protect" subtly suggests a positive affirmation of the status quo, while "revision" may be implied as a change or aggressive act.

Problem: "Revision" is a legitimate procedure provided for in the constitution, and the very act of setting "protect" and "revision" as opposing axes carries a value-laden implication. A neutral expression would be the symmetrical terms "pro-revision" versus "anti-revision" or "pro-constitution" versus "pro-revision."

#### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 02:26–02:27

Quotation: "On the other hand,"

Manipulation technique: The conjunction "on the other hand" is used to transition to the pro-constitution rally, but this transition, while performing a formal balance, conceals the actual asymmetry in content (pro-revision: specific arguments present; pro-constitution: only abstract appeals).

Problem: The formal use of "on the other hand" functions as a framing technique that masks the substantive imbalance in content.

Summary: The framing itself adopts the form of "presenting both sides," and no extreme bias is apparent. However, a subtle value-laden implication exists in the choice of the words "protect" versus "revision," and a substantive asymmetry exists in that the pro-revision camp's arguments are presented more specifically.



## 12. Presenter Behaviour

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Methodological principle (v2.2): Record the triggering event before each assessment. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if an equivalent trigger involving another guest did not produce a similar intervention.*

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

Overall

Triggering event: This broadcast is not a studio interview format but a news-reading format by an announcer; therefore, questions, interruptions, and expressions of sympathy by the presenter do not structurally occur.

Quotation (announcer): "Reported by Taniguchi." (04:48)

#### Comparison

No responses to other guests (as it is not an interview format)

Asymmetry: Cannot be confirmed — as it is a news-reading format, the assessment of asymmetry in presenter behaviour is not applicable.

Summary: This broadcast is in news-reading format and there are no questions or interventions by the presenter; therefore, no manipulative behaviour in this category is confirmed. The score of 1 takes into account the possibility of subtle differences in the announcer's reading tone between the pro-revision and pro-constitution statements, but no clear asymmetry is detectable from the transcript.



### 13. Asymmetry of Questions

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

This broadcast is in news-reading format and no interview-style questions exist. Statements by both the pro-revision and pro-constitution camps are introduced as quotations from rally speeches, and no direct questions are posed by the announcer.

#### Comparison

No questions to the pro-revision camp, no questions to the pro-constitution camp — symmetrical (no questions)

#### Assessment

Asymmetry in questions does not structurally arise in this format.

Summary: As this is a news-reading format, asymmetry of questions is not subject to assessment. The score of 1 takes into account the possibility that the selective quotation of statements—whereby the pro-revision statement contains a more specific argument (Strait of Hormuz) while the pro-constitution statement is abstract—may constitute selective quotation.



## 14. False Balance

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

01:10–03:22 (constitutional debate as a whole)

Structure: The "pro-revision rally (850 people)" and the "pro-constitution rally (50,000 people)" are reported in parallel as equivalent with the phrase "each held rallies."

#### Analysis

Despite a roughly 59-fold difference in attendance, both rallies are reported with equal weight. Furthermore, the pro-revision statement (specific security argument) and the pro-constitution statement (abstract civil society argument) are presented in parallel as equivalent "expert statements," despite a clear difference in the specificity and expertise of the arguments. This is a typical pattern of false balance.

### Finding 2:

#### Timestamp

01:36–01:53 vs. 02:46–02:53

Structure: Pro-revision: a professor emeritus with academic authority vs. pro-constitution: a non-specialist writer

#### Analysis

A professor with academic authority was chosen as the spokesperson for the pro-revision camp, while a non-specialist writer was chosen as the spokesperson for the pro-constitution camp. Formally, a "expert vs. expert" balance is performed, but in reality there is a clear difference in expertise and authority.

Summary: The formal "presenting both sides" conceals the actual asymmetry in content, expertise, and attendance figures. This is a typical pattern of false balance, and differs from the substantive presentation of issues from multiple angles as required by Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act.



## 15. Agenda Setting

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Established agenda element: The constitutional debate is taken as self-evident in the form of a binary opposition between "pro-revision" and "pro-constitution."

**Timestamp** 01:10–01:19

Evidence: "Those who seek constitutional revision and those who seek to protect the constitution each held rallies."

Alternative agenda: The specific content of revision (which articles, how to change them), the realistic difficulties of revision procedures, the diverse distribution of public opinion (not a simple binary opposition).

### Finding 2:

Established agenda element: As coverage of Constitution Memorial Day, "rallies" are treated as self-evidently the central event.

**Timestamp** 01:10–03:22

Evidence: Attendance figures and speech content at rallies occupy the centre of the coverage.

Alternative agenda: The significance of 78 years since the constitution came into force, an explanation of the specific content of the current constitution, the historical background of the revision debate.

Summary: By reporting the constitutional debate through the form of "rallies" and the framework of a "binary opposition," the more complex realities of the constitutional debate are kept off the agenda. However, given the short broadcast duration of 4 minutes 49 seconds, the manipulative nature of the agenda setting is limited.



## 52. Vocabulary and Terminology

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 01:10–01:19

Quotation: "Those who seek to protect the constitution"

Manipulation technique: The word "protect" carries a defensive and positive connotation, positioning the pro-constitution camp as "guardians."

Problem: A neutral alternative expression would be "those who oppose constitutional revision" or "those who seek to maintain the current constitution." "Protect" carries an embedded value judgement.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 01:25–01:27

Quotation: "The Private Constitutional Council and others"

Manipulation technique: The addition of the word "private" (民間) creates a sense of distance from the government and political parties, conferring civil-society legitimacy.

Problem: The Private Constitutional Council is an organisation with close ties to the LDP and the pro-revision camp, and the word "private" may unduly suggest neutrality.

Summary: Vocabulary problems are minor and the use of clearly manipulative terminology is limited. The choice of the word "protect" carries a subtle connotation, but overall, manipulation at the vocabulary level is low.



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

#### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	Selection of Experts	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
2	Selection of Sources	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
3	Allocation of Speaking Time	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
5	Numerical Manipulation	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
6	Guilt by Association	0/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
7	Timing	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
8	Selective Indignation	1/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
9	COMPLETENESS	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
10	Framing	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
12	Presenter Behaviour	1/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
13	Asymmetry of Questions	1/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
14	False Balance	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
15	Agenda Setting	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
52	Vocabulary and Terminology	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>

#### HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

**3.2/10**

*Slight imbalance*

#### SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

**2.8/10**

*Slight imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**3.0/10**

*Slight imbalance*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## KEY — Score Definitions

### Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

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

### Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

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

### Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favored</b>	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favored</b>	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 the presentation of issues from multiple angles (Paragraph 4).

#### Violation 1:

Standard: Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act ("On issues where opinions are divided, to clarify the issues from as many angles as possible")

Facts: In the constitutional revision debate, the requirements for revision procedures (approval by two-thirds or more of each house of the Diet + a national referendum), the seat distribution after the 2024 House of Representatives election (absence of the two-thirds majority required to submit a revision proposal), polling data, and the diverse views of constitutional scholars are not presented at all.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:10–03:22 (constitutional debate as a whole) — only rally speeches are covered, and objective contextual information is absent.

Assessment: Merely quoting rally speeches is insufficient to satisfy the requirement to "clarify issues from as many angles as possible," and the information necessary for viewers to form independent judgements is not provided. However, given the constraint of the short broadcast duration of 4 minutes 49 seconds, there is a possibility that these absences may not rise to the level of a serious violation.

#### Violation 2:

Standard: Article 4, Paragraph 2 of the Broadcasting Act ("To be politically fair")

Facts: A professor emeritus with academic authority was chosen as the spokesperson for the pro-revision camp, while a non-specialist writer was chosen as the spokesperson for the pro-constitution camp, creating a structural difference in the persuasiveness of the arguments of the two positions.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:36–01:53 (Professor Mononchi) vs. 02:46–02:53 (Ms. Yoshioka)

Assessment: A formal presentation of both sides is maintained, but the asymmetry in the expertise of the spokespeople may undermine substantive political fairness. However, this may also be a problem of the selection of rally speakers rather than intentional manipulation by the broadcaster.

No violation (reserved as a minor issue):

Regarding Article 4, Paragraph 3 of the Broadcasting Act ("Reporting shall not distort facts"), no distortion of facts is confirmed in this broadcast. The reporting of attendance figures is also done with the attribution "organisers' announcement" (though with the transcription error "disaster victims' announcement"), and cannot be called a distortion of facts.

### Overall Assessment under Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act

This broadcast largely satisfies the formal requirements of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act, but there is room for improvement from the standpoint of the substantive fulfilment of Paragraph 4 (presentation of issues from multiple angles). For a contentious issue such as the constitutional revision debate, it is difficult to say that merely quoting rally speeches substantively satisfies the requirement to "clarify issues from as many angles as possible." In particular, the absence of objective information—the requirements for revision procedures, the current seat distribution, and polling data—may impede viewers' ability to form independent judgements. However, given the time constraints of a short evening news broadcast of 4 minutes 49 seconds, whether these absences constitute a legal problem as a violation of the Broadcasting Act requires more detailed consideration. Overall, while this cannot be characterised as a clear violation of the Broadcasting Act, improvement is required from the standpoint of the quality of information provision as a public broadcaster.

### Deep Verification of Sources (Targeting all cited specialist bodies, NGOs, and advisory organisations)



## Private Constitutional Council

**1. Funding:** A private organisation promoting constitutional revision. Specific funding sources are difficult to confirm from publicly available information, but ties with pro-revision politicians and business figures are known.

**2. Suitability of commission:** An organisation with the explicit purpose of promoting revision; it has no suitability as a venue for neutral constitutional debate.

**3. Conflict of interest:** The realisation of revision is directly tied to the organisation's raison d'être, and it has a strong institutional interest in maintaining a pro-revision position.

**4. Credibility matrix (6 dimensions):**

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 (promoting revision is the organisation's purpose)

D2 Personal risk: 0 (risk as an organisation is moderate)

D3 Competence: +1 (has practical experience in constitutional debate)

D4 Consistency of views: +1 (consistently pro-revision)

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 (mix of specific arguments and emotional appeals)

D6 Source level: 0 (as rally organiser, secondary information)

**TOTAL: 0 → Source traffic light: Yellow**

**5. Counter-source:** The views of the Japan Federation of Bar Associations and pro-constitution constitutional scholars (such as Professor Yasuo Hasebe of Waseda University) are not provided as a counterpart.

Important: The word "private" (民間) suggests neutrality, but the Private Constitutional Council is an organisation with a clear political position, and it is inappropriate to treat it as a neutral specialist body.

*This analysis was prepared based on Version 2.7 Detailed Edition, in a format compliant with Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act and legally admissible. Estimated date and time of the analysed broadcast: 3 May 2025 (Constitution Memorial Day), 6 p.m. Analyst: SVFAB Analysis Pipeline v2.7.*

## 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.

### 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](https://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](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto: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.**