



## NHK 詳細分析

2026-05-04\_radio\_news\_1600

Broadcast: 2026-05-04 | Analyzed: 2026-05-13 15:00

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)

**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](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

Coalition Government: Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) + Komeito. Continuing since 2012 (with a brief interruption from 2009 to 2012). After the House of Representatives election on 27 October 2024, the LDP fell back to 191 seats, losing its majority. It is seeking partial cooperation with the Democratic Party for the People (DPP) to maintain the coalition.

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	L-R Score	Seats (House of Representatives)	Government/Opposition	Core Position
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	1.5	8	Opposition	Uphold Article 9, immediate phase-out of nuclear power, anti-military expansion
Social Democratic Party (SDP)	2.5	1	Opposition	Pacifism, protect the constitution, phase out nuclear power
Reiwa Shinsengumi (Reiwa)	2.5	9	Opposition	Abolish consumption tax, anti-austerity, anti-military expansion
Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP)	3.5	148	Opposition	Protect the constitution, redistribution, separate surnames for married couples
Komeito	5.0	24	Coalition Government	Pacifism, social security, moderating role on LDP
Democratic Party for the People (DPP)	5.5	28	Partial Cooperation	Consumption tax reduction, pragmatic use of nuclear power
Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	7.0	191	Government	Constitutional revision, defence build-up, economic security
Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin)	7.0	38	Opposition	Deregulation, regional autonomy system, constitutional revision
Sanseito	9.0	3	Opposition	Ultra-nationalism, anti-globalism

Pew threshold: Score < 4.5 = left-wing, 4.5–5.5 = centre, > 5.5 = right-wing

Japan's current major fault lines can be summarised in four points: ① the question of constitutional revision (particularly Article 9); ② increases in defence spending and the scope of the exclusively defence-oriented policy; ③ the consistency between nuclear power plant restarts and decarbonisation policy; and ④ the balance between relations with China and the United States in economic security. The LDP's loss of its majority in the 2024 general election has created new tensions through the destabilisation of the government's foundation and the expansion of opposition influence. Japan's growing role in the Indo-Pacific strategy is also an important point of contention between the government and opposition parties.

NHK is a public broadcaster based on the Broadcasting Act, and Article 4 of that Act obliges it to maintain political fairness, accuracy in reporting, and the presentation of diverse viewpoints. Since the 12 members of the Board of

**President:** Schlaepfer, David - **Contact:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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

Governors are appointed by the Prime Minister (with the consent of the Diet), structural proximity to the government has been pointed out, and criticism of NHK as "the government's NHK" has been continuously raised by academics and civil society since the Abe administration. Japan ranks only 70th in the RSF Press Freedom Index (2024), and the asymmetry of information access caused by the press club (kisha club) system is also recognised as a structural challenge.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Scores by Party

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Depiction in broadcast vs. party's policy position
LDP	+1	00:00:04–00:01:22 "confirmed that they would jointly promote" — Policy position: promoting economic security and defence equipment transfers — Report consistent with party's position, but without critical context. Slightly favourable depiction.
CDP	0	No relevant timestamp — Policy position: cautious on defence equipment transfers, prioritises diplomatic solutions — Not mentioned at all. Score 0 means "does not exist," not "accurate depiction."
Komeito	0	No relevant timestamp — Policy position: pacifism, moderating role on LDP — Not mentioned at all.
Ishin	0	No relevant timestamp — Policy position: supports defence build-up — Not mentioned at all.
JCP	0	No relevant timestamp — Policy position: opposes defence equipment transfers, anti-military expansion — Not mentioned at all.
DPP	0	No relevant timestamp — Policy position: pragmatic defence — Not mentioned at all.

### Party Bias Summary

- Most accurate depiction: LDP (Score +1) — though "favourable" rather than "accurate" is the intended meaning
- Strongest distortion: CDP and JCP (Score 0, complete omission) — positions critical of defence equipment transfers are structurally excluded
- Average deviation from 0: 0.17 (numerically small, but this is because all opposition parties "do not exist," and the actual deviation is large)
- Summary: This report covers only the policy activities of the ruling party (LDP), and structurally excludes the positions of opposition parties. The complete absence of any introduction to opposition party positions on the important partisan issue of defence equipment transfers is problematic in light of the requirements of Article 4, Paragraph 2 of the Broadcasting Act regarding political fairness. In particular, the complete disregard of the positions of the CDP, JCP, and Reiwa — parties critical of defence equipment transfers — constitutes an asymmetric presentation of policy fault lines.



## CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Data

- Title: NHK News (4:00 PM)
- Date (estimated from filename): 2025 (specific date not stated in filename)
- Estimated duration: Approximately 4 minutes 56 seconds (based on final timestamp in transcript)
- Presenter/Reporter: Not identifiable (no names recorded in transcript)
- Persons appearing:

Actors	Position	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Mr Kobayashi (LDP Policy Research Council Chairman)	LDP Policy Research Council Chairman	Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	Centre-right to right-wing (L-R: 7.0)
President Navin	President of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)	BJP (India's ruling party)	Right-wing to nationalist right-wing

### Main Theme

A diplomatic and inter-party exchange news item in which LDP Policy Research Council Chairman Kobayashi visited India, held talks with BJP President Navin, and confirmed the deepening of inter-party exchanges between the two parties, cooperation in the fields of economic security (energy and semiconductors), the introduction of Shinkansen, and the promotion of defence equipment transfers.

### Ideological Context

The strengthening of relations between Japan and India is progressing in the context of the Quad (Japan-US-Australia-India) framework and the Indo-Pacific strategy, and is positioned as part of a strategy to diversify security and economic security with an eye to deterring China. The inter-party exchange between the LDP and the BJP is grounded in the conservative and nationalist values shared by both parties, as well as their economic complementarity (Japanese technology × Indian manufacturing). The confirmation of defence equipment transfers carries important policy significance as a concrete development following the revision of Japan's "Three Principles on Transfer of Defence Equipment and Technology" (2023). On the other hand, India also maintains its relationship with Russia, creating a complex diplomatic context regarding consistency with Japan's sanctions against Russia.

### Perspectives Required for Balanced Reporting

The following perspectives are necessary for the multi-faceted presentation of viewpoints required by Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act:

- [A] The specific content of economic security cooperation (energy and semiconductors) and the benefits and risks for Japan
- [B] The legal basis, items covered, and implications under international law of the defence equipment transfers
- [C] The issue of consistency between India's continued relationship with Russia and Japan's sanctions against Russia
- [D] The positions of opposition parties (CDP, JCP, Reiwa, etc.) on defence equipment transfers and economic security policy
- [E] The current status, delays, and cost burden issues of the Shinkansen introduction project
- [F] The state of democracy and human rights in India under the BJP government (press freedom, minority issues)
- [G] The impact of the strengthening of Japan-India relations on Japan-China and Japan-South Korea relations
- [H] The democratic legitimacy of inter-party exchanges (inter-party diplomacy) and its relationship to government diplomacy



[I] China's reaction and geopolitical impact regarding Japan-India cooperation in the field of economic security

[J] The impact on domestic industry and workers (employment effects of cooperation with India in semiconductors and energy)

### **Confirmation of How Each Perspective Was Handled**

---

[A] Specific content of economic security cooperation: Partially mentioned

Timestamp: 00:00:53–00:01:07

Quote: "In addition to cooperation in the field of economic security such as energy and semiconductor lines,"

Assessment: The names of the areas of cooperation were mentioned, but there was no explanation of specific content, conditions, or risks.

[B] Legal basis and implications of defence equipment transfers: Not mentioned (omitted)

Timestamp: 00:01:02–00:01:07

Quote: "confirmed that they would jointly promote efforts such as the transfer of defence equipment"

Assessment: Despite being a significant policy matter, there was no mention of the legal basis, items covered, or the status of Diet deliberations.

[C] Consistency with India-Russia relations: Completely omitted

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: The fact that India has not participated in sanctions against Russia was not mentioned at all, and an important diplomatic context is absent.

[D] Opposition party positions: Completely omitted

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: The policy positions of opposition parties on defence equipment transfers and economic security were not introduced at all.

[E] Current status and problems of the Shinkansen project: Omitted

Timestamp: 00:01:00–00:01:02

Quote: "the introduction of Japan's Shinkansen into the high-speed railway currently under construction in India, and"

Assessment: No mention of the project's significant delays, cost overruns, or land acquisition problems.

[F] State of democracy and human rights in India: Completely omitted

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: No mention of the decline in press freedom or minority issues under the BJP government.

[G] Impact on Japan-China and Japan-South Korea relations: Completely omitted

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: The geopolitical context is completely absent.

[H] Democratic legitimacy of inter-party exchanges: Completely omitted

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: No mention of the relationship between inter-party diplomacy and government diplomacy, or accountability to the Diet.

[I] China's reaction and geopolitical impact: Completely omitted

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: Despite the context of China deterrence being implied, there is no explicit discussion.

[J] Impact on domestic industry and employment: Completely omitted

Timestamp: Not applicable

Assessment: No mention of the domestic economic implications of economic cooperation.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

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

#### 1. Expert Selection

5/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

#### Expert 1: LDP Policy Research Council Chairman Kobayashi (LDP)

**Timestamp** 00:01:10–00:01:22

**Statement** "I want to properly concretise the inter-party exchanges. He stated that he would develop bilateral relations by skillfully combining Japanese technology with Indian manufacturing."

Positioning: The policy planning officer of the ruling LDP. A promoter of the policy, not a neutral expert.

Missing counter-opinions: Opposition party policy officers, independent foreign affairs and security researchers, critical economic security experts.

#### Information Source Depth Check:

**(a) Funding:** A member of the Diet belonging to the LDP. Active through party subsidies (public funds) and political funds. **(b) Mandate:** The role of Policy Research Council Chairman is policy planning, promotion, and communication, which is structurally incompatible with neutral, independent policy assessment. **(c) Credibility Matrix** (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions, each -2 to +2):

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct party to the policy being promoted

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Has political responsibility for policy failure, but risk from the content of statements themselves is low

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Has practical experience in policy planning, but independent academic expertise is unclear

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No comparative data with past statements

D5 Emotional appeal vs. data: -1 — Many emotional expressions such as "properly" (しっかり), no specific data

D6 Source level: +1 — Is a primary source (party to the matter), but objectivity is low

**TOTAL: -2 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** Mr Kobayashi's statements function as policy communication for the ruling party, and it is structurally problematic for him to be framed as a neutral expert. This is also an issue under Criterion 12 (Source Selection).

#### Missing Expert Groups:

- Independent foreign affairs and security researchers (affiliated with universities or think tanks)
- Legal experts on defence equipment transfers
- India regional researchers

#### Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
LDP Policy Research Council Chairman Kobayashi (LDP)	-2	-1	+1	0	-1	+1	-2	Yellow



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

*Summary (Matrix results):*

- LDP Policy Research Council Chairman Kobayashi: Source Traffic Light Yellow (total -2) — Although a primary source as a party to the matter, he does not function as a neutral expert. Counter expert opinions are completely absent, resulting in one-sided information provision.



## 2. Source Selection

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: LDP Policy Research Council Chairman Kobayashi (LDP)

#### Timestamp

00:01:10–00:01:22

#### Statement

"I want to properly concretise the inter-party exchanges. He stated that he would develop bilateral relations by skillfully combining Japanese technology with Indian manufacturing."

- (a) Funding and operating body:** A member of the Diet belonging to the LDP. Active through party subsidies (public funds), political funds, and Diet members' salaries.
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** He is a direct party to the policy being promoted, and the neutrality of his policy assessment is structurally not guaranteed.
- (c) Absence of counter sources:** No opposition party policy officers, independent foreign affairs researchers, or critical experts are cited at all.

#### Missing Counter Sources:

- Official positions of opposition parties such as CDP and JCP on defence equipment transfers
- Independent foreign affairs and security researchers (e.g., National Institute for Defence Studies, university researchers)
- India regional specialists (character of the BJP government, multi-directional nature of Indian diplomacy)
- Critical assessments of the Shinkansen project (e.g., Board of Audit, independent economists)

*Summary: The only source cited in this report is a ruling party politician, and sources from independent experts, opposition parties, and critical positions are completely absent. This is a structural problem contrary to the requirements of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act for the multi-faceted presentation of viewpoints.*



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Quoted statements of Mr Kobayashi (LDP, ruling party): Approximately 15 seconds (00:01:10–00:01:22) (approximately 5%)
- Narration (NHK presenter): Approximately 67 seconds (approximately 23%)
- Repeated "in the run-up to the meeting" section (technical issue): Approximately 210 seconds (approximately 72%)
- Opposition parties / critical positions: 0 seconds (0%)

Note: The section from 00:01:25 to 00:04:56 in the transcript is a repetition of "in the run-up to the meeting," which is judged to be a clear technical error in transcript generation (malfunction of speech recognition, or a still/silent section in the video). The substantive news content is estimated to be approximately 85 seconds.

*Summary: In the substantive news content, only the position of the ruling party/government is presented, and the time allocation for opposition parties and critical positions is zero. However, given the constraints of the breaking news format, there are limits to demanding equal time allocation for all positions, and the score is kept at a moderate level.*



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

Specific content, legal basis, and status of Diet deliberations on defence equipment transfers

Relevant timestamp: 00:01:02–00:01:07

###### Quote

*"confirmed that they would jointly promote efforts such as the transfer of defence equipment"*

###### Impact

The transfer of defence equipment is a major policy shift following the 2023 revision of the Three Principles, and is the subject of ongoing Diet debate. Reporting without specific items, conditions, or legal basis severely limits viewers' ability to assess the policy.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

India's continued relations with Russia and the contradiction with Japan's sanctions against Russia

Relevant timestamp: 00:00:53–00:01:07

###### Impact

India has continued to import oil from Russia since the invasion of Ukraine, and the diplomatic contradiction of Japan cooperating with India in the energy sector while maintaining its sanctions against Russia is completely ignored.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

The significant delays and problems of the Mumbai-Ahmedabad High Speed Rail project

Relevant timestamp: 00:01:00–00:01:02

###### Quote

*"the introduction of Japan's Shinkansen into the high-speed railway currently under construction in India, and"*

###### Impact

The project, which was originally scheduled to open in 2023, has been significantly delayed, with reports of land acquisition problems and cost overruns. Reporting on the "confirmation of support" without this context distorts the reality of the project.

*Summary: Three important contexts — the legal basis of defence equipment transfers, the complexity of India's diplomacy, and the problems of the Shinkansen project — are completely omitted, and the report is close to a verbatim reproduction of the ruling party's official announcement. This is contrary to the requirements of Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act for the multi-faceted presentation of viewpoints.*

#### Missing Voices

- Policy officers of opposition parties (CDP, JCP, Reiwa): Could have provided alternative proposals and critical perspectives on defence equipment transfers and economic security policy
- Defence law scholars: Could have explained consistency with the Three Principles on Transfer of Defence Equipment and Technology and implications under international law



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

- India researchers (regional specialists): Could have explained the character of the BJP government and the multi-directional nature of Indian diplomacy (including its relationship with Russia)
- Shinkansen project officials or critical experts: Could have explained the current status and problems of the project
- Economic security researchers: Could have analysed the specific risks and benefits of semiconductor and energy cooperation
- Human rights and democracy experts: Could have contextualised the political situation in India under the BJP government
- Ministry of Finance/Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry officials or critical economists: Could have assessed the cost-effectiveness of economic cooperation
- China and South Korea diplomacy experts: Could have analysed the impact of the Japan-India rapprochement on regional security



## 5. Numerical Manipulation

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

In this broadcast, no use of specific numerical data or statistics is confirmed. The names of policy areas such as "energy and semiconductors," "high-speed railway," and "defence equipment" are mentioned, but no specific figures (investment amounts, scale, timescales, etc.) are presented at all.

*Summary: No active manipulation of figures is confirmed, but the fact that no specific figures are presented at all for important policy matters itself limits viewers' ability to assess policy, and is linked to the problem of omission (Criterion 4).*



**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 specific individuals or positions by associating them with negative groups or ideas is confirmed. The report conveys the ruling party's activities positively, and has a structure that is the opposite of the direction of guilt by association.

*Summary: No manipulation technique corresponding to this criterion is confirmed.*



## 7. Timing

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:00:04–00:00:27 (opening, lead)

Content: "LDP Policy Research Council Chairman Kobayashi met with BJP President Navin of the Indian People's Party during his visit to India, and confirmed that they would jointly promote the deepening of exchanges between the two parties, as well as cooperation between the two countries in the field of economic security such as energy and semiconductors"

Timing effect: By presenting the established fact of "confirmed" in the opening lead, the interpretive framework for subsequent detailed reporting is fixed as "successful diplomacy." Critical context is not placed at the beginning, influencing the formation of viewers' initial impressions.

### Finding 2:

Position: 00:01:14–00:01:22 (end, closing)

Content: "stated that he would develop bilateral relations by skillfully combining Japanese technology with Indian manufacturing"

Timing effect: By placing Mr Kobayashi's positive statement at the end, the viewer's final impression is concluded with the positive frame of "development and cooperation." Critical comments or reservations are not placed at the end.

*Summary: Positive messages from the ruling party are placed at both the beginning and the end, giving the ruling party's position an advantage in forming the overall impression of the report. However, this is within the standard structure of breaking news (lead → details → comment), and the degree of manipulation is moderate.*



## 8. Selective Outrage

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)

*Methodological principle (v2.2): Before assessment, the specific event (trigger event) that caused the reaction must be recorded. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if a similar trigger event involving another position did not produce a similar reaction.*

In this broadcast, no expression of outrage or critical reaction towards a specific position is confirmed. The report proceeds in a neutral narration format, and there is no subject for assessing asymmetry in emotional reactions.

*Summary: No manipulation technique corresponding to this criterion is confirmed. A score of 0 indicates the absence of a subject to assess, not a positive evaluation.*



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

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

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

<b>Timestamp</b>	00:00:04–00:00:27
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"LDP Policy Research Council Chairman Kobayashi met with BJP President Navin of the Indian People's Party during his visit to India, and confirmed that they would jointly promote the deepening of exchanges between the two parties, as well as cooperation between the two countries in the field of economic security such as energy and semiconductors"</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	The outcomes of the talks are presented as an established fact by using the word "confirmed," setting a frame that eliminates room for policy debate.
<b>Why problematic</b>	The verb "confirmed" causes viewers to accept the legitimacy of the agreement as self-evident, depriving them of the opportunity to critically assess the policy content.

#### Finding 2:

<b>Timestamp</b>	00:01:19–00:01:22
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"stated that he would develop bilateral relations by skillfully combining Japanese technology with Indian manufacturing"</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	Mr Kobayashi's statement is adopted directly as the conclusion of the report, establishing a positive frame of "development" without independent assessment.
<b>Why problematic</b>	The official position of the government and ruling party becomes the framework of the report without verification, and critical distance is absent.

*Summary: The report as a whole uncritically adopts the ruling party's policy frame that "strengthening Japan-India relations is desirable," and alternative interpretations or critical perspectives are structurally excluded. However, given the nature of a breaking news broadcast, there are limits to demanding in-depth analysis, and the score is kept at a moderate level.*



## 11. Word Choice and Terminology

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

00:00:42–00:00:48

#### Quote

*"agreed to deepen inter-party exchanges between the LDP and the BJP"*

#### Manipulation

The expression "agreed" emphasises the completeness and mutuality of the agreement, concealing the complexity of negotiations and any reservations.

#### Why problematic

Neutral alternatives would be "discussed" or "exchanged views," and "agreed" overly emphasises policy success.

### Finding 2:

#### Timestamp

00:01:14–00:01:22

#### Quote

*"I want to properly concretise the inter-party exchanges"*

#### Manipulation

The adverb "properly" (しっかり) emotionally reinforces the certainty and reliability of the policy, making critical assessment difficult.

#### Why problematic

"Properly" (しっかり) in politicians' statements is a typical impression-manipulation word in Japanese political discourse, serving to conceal the absence of specific content.

*Summary: The linguistic manipulation is minor and remains within the range of standard news reporting. However, there is a tendency to adopt the language frame of the government and ruling party directly.*



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

*Methodological principle (v2.2): Before assessment, the specific event (trigger event) that caused the intervention must be recorded. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if a similar trigger event involving another guest did not produce a similar intervention.*

**Finding 1:**

**Timestamp** 00:00:04–00:01:22

Trigger event: One-directional factual reporting by a news presenter (not in interview format)

**Quote (presenter)** *(Cannot be quoted directly — narration format)*

**Comparison** This broadcast is in breaking news format rather than interview format, so the concept of presenter questioning and interruption structurally does not apply.

Asymmetry: Not confirmable — Structurally, there is no subject to assess in terms of presenter intervention behaviour.

*Summary: This broadcast is in breaking news format and not in studio discussion or interview format; therefore, conditions for assessing asymmetry in presenter behaviour are not in place. The score is kept at the minimum.*



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

### 13. Question Asymmetry

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

This broadcast is in breaking news format, and there are no interview or question-and-answer segments. Since the act of questioning by the presenter itself does not occur, there is structurally no subject for assessing question asymmetry.

*Summary: Since there are no questions to assess, this criterion is not applicable. A score of 0 means "not assessable," not "no problem."*



#### 14. False Balance

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

No problem of false balance is confirmed in this broadcast. Rather, the problem is in the opposite direction, and the lack of balance (one-sided presentation of the ruling party's position) is the main problem. False balance arises when both sides of an issue are presented in parallel even though one side is actually correct, but in this report, the counter position itself is not presented.

*Summary: No problem of false balance is confirmed. The main problem of this report is a lack of balance, and it has a structural problem that is the opposite of false balance.*



## 15. Agenda Setting

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The strengthening of Japan-India relations, economic security cooperation, and defence equipment transfers are treated as self-evidently "desirable policy directions."

#### Timestamp

00:00:04–00:00:27

Basis: The expression "confirmed that they would jointly promote" constructs the report with the legitimacy of the policy as a given.

Alternative agenda: The pros and cons of defence equipment transfers, the state of democracy in India, and the geopolitical risks of Japan-India cooperation are excluded from the agenda.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Inter-party exchange between the LDP and BJP is treated as self-evidently a "legitimate diplomatic activity."

#### Timestamp

00:00:42–00:00:48

Basis: The expression "agreed to deepen inter-party exchanges" reports on the inter-party exchange without questioning its democratic legitimacy.

Alternative agenda: The relationship between inter-party diplomacy and government diplomacy, accountability to the Diet, and the character of the BJP government are excluded from the agenda.

*Summary: This report sets the policy direction of the ruling party as a self-evident premise, and structurally excludes perspectives that question its legitimacy from the agenda. This is contrary to the requirements of Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act for the multi-faceted presentation of viewpoints.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

#### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	Expert Selection	5/10	Significant imbalance
2	Source Selection	6/10	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	2/10	Unremarkable
8	Selective Outrage	0/10	Unremarkable
9	COMPLETENESS	8/10	Pronounced imbalance
10	Framing	3/10	Slight imbalance
11	Word Choice and Terminology	2/10	Unremarkable
12	Presenter Behaviour	1/10	Unremarkable
13	Question Asymmetry	0/10	Unremarkable
14	False Balance	1/10	Unremarkable
15	Agenda Setting	6/10	Significant imbalance

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

**3.6/10**

*Slight imbalance*

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

**2.4/10**

*Unremarkable*

#### 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 obliges broadcasters to maintain political fairness (Paragraph 2), accuracy in reporting (Paragraph 3), and the multi-faceted presentation of viewpoints (Paragraph 4).

#### Violation 1:

Standard: Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act (multi-faceted presentation of viewpoints)

Facts: Regarding the significant policy shift of defence equipment transfers, only the position of the promoting side (LDP) is presented, and critical positions and alternative perspectives are not presented at all.

Basis: Timestamp 00:01:02–00:01:07 — Quote: "confirmed that they would jointly promote efforts such as the transfer of defence equipment"

Assessment: The transfer of defence equipment is a significant policy shift following the 2023 revision of the Three Principles, and is the subject of ongoing Diet debate. Presenting only one side of this policy does not meet the requirements of Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act to "clarify the issues from as many angles as possible."

#### Violation 2:

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

Facts: Only the policy activities of the ruling party (LDP) are reported, and the positions of opposition parties on the same policy are structurally excluded.

Basis: Timestamps 00:00:04–00:01:22 overall — Zero mentions of opposition parties

Assessment: The requirements of political fairness do not necessarily require equal treatment of all parties in individual broadcasts, but the complete failure to introduce the positions of opposition parties on the important partisan issue of defence equipment transfers may be contrary to the requirements of political fairness when assessed as a continuing pattern of reporting.

### Overall Assessment Under Broadcasting Act Article 4

This broadcast adopts a standard reporting format within the formal constraints of breaking news, but the complete absence of any legal or political context for the significant policy matter of defence equipment transfers is problematic in light of the requirements of Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act for the multi-faceted presentation of viewpoints. The reporting pattern of using only ruling party politicians as sources and structurally excluding independent experts and opposition party positions requires ongoing monitoring regarding its consistency with the requirements of political fairness under Paragraph 2 of the same Article. When assessed as an individual broadcast, the degree of violation is minor, but it contains structural problems that should be assessed in the context of NHK's overall reporting patterns.

### Information Source Depth Check (Mandatory verification for all expert organisations, NGOs, and advisory bodies cited)

#### LDP Policy Research Council Chairman Kobayashi (LDP)

- 1. Funding:** A member of the Diet belonging to the LDP. Active through party subsidies (public funds), political funds, and Diet members' salaries. While active through public funds, he has a clear interest-advancing position of ruling party policy promotion.
- 2. Mandate:** The role of Policy Research Council Chairman is policy planning, promotion, and communication, which is structurally incompatible with neutral and independent policy assessment.
- 3. Conflict of interest:** He is a direct party to the policies being promoted (Japan-India economic security cooperation and defence equipment transfers), and stands to gain political benefit from the success of the policy. His function as an objective assessor is structurally not guaranteed.
- 4. Credibility Matrix (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions):**



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

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct party to the policy being promoted
  - D2 Personal risk: -1 — Has political responsibility for policy failure, but risk from the content of statements themselves is low
  - D3 Professional competence: +1 — Has practical experience in policy planning, but independent academic expertise is unclear
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No comparative data with past statements
  - D5 Emotional appeal vs. data: -1 — Many emotional expressions such as "properly" (しっかり), no specific data
  - D6 Source level: +1 — Is a primary source (party to the matter), but objectivity is low
- TOTAL: -2 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow (-4 to +4)**

**5. Counter expert opinions:** No counter assessments by independent foreign affairs and security researchers (National Institute for Defence Studies, university researchers), opposition party policy officers, or India regional specialists are cited. This is a structural deficiency contrary to the requirements of Article 4, Paragraph 4 of the Broadcasting Act for the multi-faceted presentation of viewpoints.

Important note: The title "Policy Research Council Chairman" confers social authority, but does not in itself signify qualification as a neutral expert. In this analysis, the assessment was conducted from the perspectives of conflict of interest, expertise, and data use, not from the title.

*This analysis was prepared in accordance with Version 2.7-detail and methodological principles K5+K13 (trigger event documentation). Limitations of analysis: The section from 00:01:25 to 00:04:56 in the transcript is judged to be a technical error (repetition of "in the run-up to the meeting"), and the analysis of substantive news content is based on an effective section of approximately 85 seconds. No direct verification of footage or audio was conducted, and visual analysis remains estimated.*

## Legal and Methodological Notes

<b>No factual determination</b>	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.
<b>No legal judgment</b>	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).
<b>No proof of causation</b>	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.
<b>No judgment of intent</b>	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.
<b>Heuristic comparison tool</b>	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.**