



## NHK 詳細分析

2026-05-05\_radio\_news\_0100

Broadcast: 2026-05-05 | Analyzed: 2026-05-13 15:38

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**3.4/10**

*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)

**5.5 / 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 Administration: Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) + Komeito coalition government. In the House of Representatives election on 27 October 2024, LDP won 191 seats (a significant reduction) and Komeito won 24 seats. Having failed to secure a majority, it operates as a minority government. The Prime Minister is Shigeru Ishiba (took office October 2024).

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

Party	L-R Score	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core Position
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	1.5	8	Opposition	Uphold Article 9, immediate abolition of nuclear power, abrogation of the Japan-US Security Treaty
Social Democratic Party (SDP)	2.5	1	Opposition	Pacifism, defence of the constitution, nuclear phase-out
Reiwa Shinsengumi (Reiwa)	2.5	9	Opposition	MMT economics, abolition of consumption tax, anti-rearmament
Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP)	3.5	148	Opposition	Opposition to revision of Article 9, renewable energy, separate surnames for married couples
Komeito	5.0	24	Government	Peace-oriented, social welfare, LDP coalition partner
Democratic Party for the People (DPP)	5.5	28	Neutral	5% consumption tax, pragmatic energy policy
Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	7.0	191	Government	Constitutional revision, defence budget at 2%, continuation of Abenomics
Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin)	7.0	38	Opposition	Deregulation, decentralisation, promotion of constitutional revision
Sanseito	9.0	3	Opposition	Ultra-nationalism, right-wing populism

The major fault lines in Japanese politics are: whether to revise Article 9 of the Constitution, the increase of the defence budget and the scope of exclusively defence-oriented policy, nuclear energy policy, and the issue of economic redistribution versus prioritising growth. The LDP's failure to secure a majority in the 2024 general election has given DPP a "casting vote" role, increasing political fluidity. In the field of diplomacy and security, against the backdrop of deepening US-China confrontation, tensions continue between those favouring reinforcement of the Japan-US alliance and those prioritising multilateral diplomacy.

NHK is a public broadcaster based on the Broadcasting Act, and Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act mandates political fairness, accuracy of reporting, and the presentation of multifaceted viewpoints. Since 12 members of the Board of Governors are appointed by the Prime Minister (with Diet approval), criticism of a "pro-government" bias has been continuously raised from academic circles and civil society, particularly since the Abe administration period (2012–



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

2020). Japan ranks 70th in the RSF Press Freedom Index (2024), and it has been pointed out that the press club (kisha club) system creates structural bias in access to information.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Party-by-Party Assessment

Party	Score (-5 to +5)	Representation in Broadcast vs. Party Platform
Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	0	Not mentioned in this broadcast — Party platform: defence budget at 2%, strengthening of the Japan-US alliance — Assessment: Outside scope
Constitutional Democratic Party (CDP)	0	Not mentioned in this broadcast — Party platform: prioritising diplomatic resolution, cautious on rearmament — Assessment: Outside scope
Komeito	0	Not mentioned in this broadcast — Party platform: peace-oriented, emphasis on dialogue — Assessment: Outside scope
Nippon Ishin no Kai (Ishin)	0	Not mentioned in this broadcast — Party platform: strengthening defence, pragmatic diplomacy — Assessment: Outside scope
Japanese Communist Party (JCP)	0	Not mentioned in this broadcast — Party platform: anti-militarism, abrogation of the Japan-US Security Treaty — Assessment: Outside scope
Democratic Party for the People (DPP)	0	Not mentioned in this broadcast — Party platform: moderate strengthening of defence, maintenance of the Japan-US alliance — Assessment: Outside scope

### Party Bias Summary

- Most accurately represented: None (all parties score 0 = not mentioned)
- Greatest distortion: None
- Average deviation from 0: 0.0
- Summary: This broadcast does not directly address domestic politics or party politics, and all Japanese parties are absent from the broadcast. Direct assessment of party-political bias is therefore impossible. However, the complete absence of the Japanese government's and Foreign Ministry's response indirectly impedes the contextual presentation of the ruling LDP's diplomacy and security policy (strengthening of the Japan-US alliance, energy security).



## CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Data

- Title: NHK News (scheduled news bulletin)
- Date: Estimated from transcript timestamps — 4 June 2025 (based on local time)
- Estimated Duration: Approximately 4 minutes 33 seconds (from transcript end point 00:04:33)
- Anchor/Reporter: Not identifiable (no names recorded in transcript)
- Participants: Studio anchor only (no interview guests)

Actors	Role	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
NHK Anchor (anonymous)	News reading	NHK (public broadcaster)	Neutral (institutionally)
President Trump (mentioned only)	US President	Republican Party	Right-wing
Iranian Central Command Commander (mentioned only)	Military commander	Iranian government	N/A
Iranian Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Baghaei (mentioned only)	Spokesperson	Iranian government	N/A
South Korean Foreign Ministry (mentioned only)	Government body	South Korean government	N/A
UAE Foreign Ministry (mentioned only)	Government body	UAE government	N/A

### Main Theme

Reporting on the commencement of the "Project Freedom" navigation support operation in the Strait of Hormuz announced by US President Trump, Iran's military warnings in response, and related vessel attack incidents.

### Perspectives Necessary for Balanced Reporting (Independent Assessment Based on World Knowledge)

- \* The legal status of the Strait of Hormuz under international maritime law (right of transit passage vs. Iran's sovereignty claims)
- \* The international legal basis and legitimacy of the US "Project Freedom"
- \* The specific content of Iran's 14-point proposal in nuclear negotiations
- \* The specific impact on Japan's energy security and the government's response
- \* Independent verification of the attribution of responsibility for the South Korean vessel explosion and UAE vessel attack
- \* The positions and reactions of regional countries (Saudi Arabia, UAE, Oman, etc.)
- \* The positions of China and Russia (possible responses at the UN Security Council)
- \* Comparison with past similar cases (Tanker War, 2019 tanker attacks, etc.)
- \* Expert assessment of military escalation risk
- \* The official position and response policy of the Japanese government and Foreign Ministry

### Confirmation of Treatment of Each Perspective

[A] Not mentioned



Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: The legal status of the Strait of Hormuz (the international legal basis for the right of transit passage) is not mentioned at all, and the legal validity of Iran's claim of "control" is not examined.

[B] Partially mentioned

Timestamp: 00:00:09–00:00:18

Quotation: "Efforts to guide vessels stranded inside the Persian Gulf and escort them through the Strait of Hormuz began on the 4th"

Assessment: The existence of the operation is reported, but there is no reference whatsoever to its international legal basis.

[C] Extremely fragmentary

Timestamp: 00:03:55–00:04:17

Quotation: "The 14 points that Iran is said to have presented to the United States are being navigated"

Assessment: Only the existence of "14 points" is mentioned; the content is not reported at all.

[D] Not mentioned

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: The impact on Japan's energy security and the response policy of the Japanese government are completely absent.

[E] Partially mentioned

Timestamp: 00:02:58–00:03:51

Quotation: "Strongly condemning the UAE attack as being carried out by Iran"

Assessment: Only the UAE's statement is conveyed as-is; no independent verification or counter-argument is presented.

[F] Not mentioned

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: The positions of regional countries are completely absent.

[G] Not mentioned

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: The positions of China and Russia, and developments at the UN Security Council, are not reported at all.

[H] Not mentioned

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: No reference to historical context (Tanker War, etc.).

[I] Not mentioned

Timestamp: N/A

Quotation: None

Assessment: No expert assessment of military escalation risk is presented.

[J] Not mentioned

Timestamp: N/A



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

Quotation: None

Assessment: The official position of the Japanese government and Foreign Ministry is completely absent.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 Criteria: DETAILED ANALYSIS

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

#### 1. Expert Selection

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

This broadcast is in the format of a scheduled news bulletin, consisting solely of a studio anchor's reading. No independent experts or commentators appear. The following is an analysis of the cited sources.

#### Source 1: US Central Command (CENTCOM)

##### Timestamp

00:02:37–00:02:55

##### Statement

"Announced that two small US vessels successfully transited the Strait of Hormuz and are continuing to navigate safely"

Positioning: US government military body. A direct stakeholder.

Missing counter-argument: An independent maritime body, international maritime law experts, or confirmation from a neutral country.

Source Credibility Matrix (CENTCOM):

**(a) Funding:** US federal government (Department of Defense). As a direct stakeholder, it has a motive to report the success of the operation.

**(b) Mandate:** An organisation that executes military operations, making it structurally difficult to reconcile with neutral assessment.

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 — Has a direct motive to assert the legitimacy of the operation

D2 Personal Risk: -1 — Reputational risk as an institution exists but is limited

D3 Expert Competence: +2 — Highest authority regarding the conduct of military operations

D4 Consistency of Views: 0 — No comparative data

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +1 — Factual description ("2 vessels transited")

D6 Source Level: +2 — Primary source

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

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** Military body announcements are framed as neutral facts, and an annotation identifying them as stakeholder information is absent.

#### Source 2: Iranian state media

##### Timestamp

00:01:54–00:02:15

##### Statement

"Warning that any foreign aircraft used to approach and attempt to enter the Strait of Hormuz with aggressive US forces within Iran's military will come under attack"

Positioning: Iran's official state media. A direct stakeholder.

Missing counter-argument: Confirmation by independent international media, or assessment from a neutral country.

Source Credibility Matrix (Iranian state media):



**(a) Funding:** Iranian government. Has a structural motive to represent the government's position.

**(b) Mandate:** Has a government public relations function, making it difficult to reconcile with neutral reporting.

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 — Motive to represent the Iranian government's position

D2 Personal Risk: -1 — Institutional risk is limited

D3 Expert Competence: +1 — Has authority in conveying statements from its own government

D4 Consistency of Views: 0 — No comparative data

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -1 — Use of strong vocabulary such as "warning"

D6 Source Level: +1 — Primary transmission of government statement

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

Missing Expert Groups:

- International maritime law experts (assessment of the legal status of the Strait of Hormuz)
- Independent Middle East security analysts (assessment of escalation risk)
- Energy economists (assessment of impact on Japan)

### Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
US Central Command (CENTCOM)	-2	-1	+2	0	+1	+2	+2	Yellow
Iranian state media	-2	-1	+1	0	-1	+1	-2	Yellow

#### Summary (Matrix Results):

- CENTCOM: Yellow (+2) — Primary source but a direct stakeholder
- Iranian state media: Yellow (-2) — Government public relations function, structural limitations on neutrality
- Independent experts: Completely absent



## 2. Source Selection

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: US President Trump's social media post

**Timestamp** 00:00:42–00:00:56

**Statement** "Announced the commencement of Project Freedom from the morning of the 4th local time"

- (a) **Funding/operating entity:** US President (government). A direct stakeholder.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Has a direct motive to assert the legitimacy of the operation.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Assessment from an independent international body, a neutral country's government, or international law experts.

### Source 2: US news website "Axios"

**Timestamp** 00:01:32–00:01:49

**Statement** "Reporting that, according to officials, the US military would provide information to vessels such as indicating routes that are free of danger, while also stating that this does not necessarily include military escort of vessels"

- (a) **Funding:** Private investment (Cox Enterprises, etc.). Commercial media.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Reliance on anonymous sources described as "according to officials" limits verifiability.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Confirmation from European media, Asian media, or independent investigative journalism outlets.

### Source 3: UAE Foreign Ministry

**Timestamp** 00:03:33–00:03:51

**Statement** "Strongly condemning the UAE attack as being carried out by Iran"

- (a) **Funding:** UAE government.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** The UAE is in a geopolitical confrontational relationship with Iran and has a motive to claim Iran's attribution of responsibility.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** An independent maritime investigation body, a UN panel of experts, or Iran's rebuttal.

*Summary: All sources cited in this broadcast are direct stakeholders (US government, Iranian government, UAE government, South Korean government), and not a single independent expert, international organisation, or neutral media outlet is cited. This is problematic from the standpoint of multifaceted presentation of viewpoints as required by Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act.*



### 3. Airtime Allocation

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Estimated airtime:

- US position (President Trump's social media post, CENTCOM announcement, Axios reporting): Approximately 2 minutes 00 seconds (approximately 44%)
- Iranian position (state media, commander statement, Foreign Ministry spokesperson): Approximately 1 minute 10 seconds (approximately 26%)
- Third-party information (South Korean Foreign Ministry, UAE Foreign Ministry): Approximately 50 seconds (approximately 18%)
- Diplomatic negotiation context (14 points, Pakistan mediation): Approximately 30 seconds (approximately 11%)
- Japanese perspective: 0 seconds (0%)

*Summary: The US position accounts for approximately 44% of the total, far exceeding Iran's approximately 26%. The complete absence of reference to the Japanese perspective and national interests is a problem, as the context most relevant to viewers of a Japanese public broadcaster is completely absent. However, given that the US is the primary actor in this incident, a certain degree of temporal asymmetry is unavoidable in reporting.*



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

The specific content of Iran's 14-point proposal

Relevant timestamp: 00:03:55–00:04:17

Quotation: "The 14 points that Iran is said to have presented to the United States are being navigated"

###### Impact

By not reporting the content of the 14 points, viewers cannot assess the substance of Iran's diplomatic proposal and are more likely to perceive Iran purely as a military threat.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

The impact on Japan's energy security and the Japanese government's response

Relevant timestamp: Entire broadcast

###### Impact

Approximately 90% of Japan's oil imports pass through the Middle East, and tensions in the Strait of Hormuz are directly linked to Japan's national interests, yet this perspective is completely absent. The most important context for Japanese viewers is not provided.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

Independent verification of the attribution of responsibility for the South Korean vessel explosion and UAE vessel attack

Relevant timestamp: 00:02:58–00:03:51

Quotation: "Strongly condemning the UAE attack as being carried out by Iran"

###### Impact

Only the UAE's unilateral claim is reported, with no independent verification, no Iranian counter-argument, and no reservation such as "unconfirmed" presented. Viewers are likely to accept Iran's responsibility as an established fact.

*Summary: The greatest problems in this broadcast are the complete absence of perspectives directly linked to Japan's national interests (energy security, Japanese government response) and the omission of diplomatic context (the content of the 14 points). These omissions have the effect of presenting a complex diplomatic and security issue as a simple binary opposition between "US efforts vs. Iranian threat."*

#### Missing Voices

- International maritime law experts: Could have provided legal assessments of the right of transit passage through the Strait of Hormuz and Iran's sovereignty claims.
- Japanese Foreign Ministry and energy security officials: Could have provided specific impacts on Japan's energy imports and the government's response policy.
- Independent military analysts: Could have assessed the effectiveness of "Project Freedom" and the escalation risk.
- Iran researchers and Middle East specialists: Could have explained the content of Iran's 14-point proposal and the context of negotiations.

**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

- Independent sources from UAE and South Korea: Could have provided independent verification of the attribution of responsibility for the vessel attack incidents.
- Energy economists: Could have quantitatively assessed the impact of a Strait of Hormuz blockade on Japan and the global economy.
- UN and international organisation representatives: Could have presented the collective international response and the international legal framework.



<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>	00:01:20–00:01:28
	Figure: "It is said that missile destroyers, over 100 aircraft, and approximately 15,000 troops, among others, will be mobilised"
<b>Missing context</b>	There is no presentation of how this scale of forces compares to normal Middle East deployments, comparison with past similar operations, or relative assessment against Iran's military capability.
<b>Impact</b>	By presenting only the absolute values of figures, viewers cannot assess the relative meaning of the scale.

*Summary: Numerical manipulation is minor and primarily a problem stemming from lack of context. No evidence of intentional statistical manipulation is observed.*



## 6. Guilt by Association

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Association 1:

#### Timestamp

00:03:42–00:03:51

Quotation: "Strongly condemning the UAE attack as being carried out by Iran"

Technique: By reporting the UAE's condemnation statement without verification, Iran is indirectly positioned as the aggressor.

#### Impact

By associating Iran with an unverified act of aggression, there is a possibility of guiding viewers' perception.

Persons framed as "conspiracy theorists," etc.: None in this broadcast.

*Summary: Guilt by association in this broadcast is limitedly observed in the reporting treatment that associates Iran with unverified acts of aggression. However, this is more likely due to the structural constraints of a scheduled news bulletin prioritising timeliness than intentional manipulation.*



## 7. Timing

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:00:03–00:00:18 (opening)

Content: "US President Trump announced that efforts to guide vessels stranded inside the Persian Gulf and escort them through the Strait of Hormuz began on the 4th"

Timing effect: By presenting US actions as the "commencement of efforts" at the very start of the broadcast, viewers' cognitive framework is set with US actions as the reference point. Iran's position is more likely to be processed as subsequent information.

### Finding 2:

Position: 00:04:17–00:04:33 (end, incomplete)

Content: "The specifics of the response said to have been conveyed by the US side through Pakistan" (sentence incomplete)

Timing effect: The most important information regarding the possibility of a diplomatic resolution (the content of the US response) is placed at the end and the sentence is cut off. Viewers are more likely to retain an impression of military tension rather than the diplomatic context.

*Summary: The timing structure of presenting US actions at the opening and presenting the diplomatic context fragmentarily and incompletely at the end has the effect of foregrounding military tension and backgrounding the possibility of a diplomatic resolution.*



## 8. Selective Indignation

2/10

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 (v2.7): Always record the triggering event before assessment. A reaction is assessed as selective only if a comparable triggering event with another position did not produce a similar reaction.*

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

00:02:11–00:02:15

Triggering event: Reporting of Iran's military warning statement

Reaction: "Flatly denied the US side's efforts"

#### Comparison

For the US's suggestion of the use of military force (00:01:09–00:01:16 "emphasising that it would deal with [interference] by force and showing that it does not rule out the use of military force"), the neutral vocabulary "emphasising" is used.

Asymmetry: The US's military threat is processed as "emphasise," while Iran's counter-statement is processed as "flatly denied," revealing subtle vocabulary asymmetry. However, whether this difference constitutes intentional selective indignation is difficult to determine definitively from the transcript alone.

*Summary: Clear evidence of selective indignation is not observed, but subtle asymmetry exists in the vocabulary appended to the actions of the US and Iran. Considering the formal constraints of a scheduled news bulletin, this is difficult to assess as a serious manipulation technique.*



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

The Strait of Hormuz is a strategic chokepoint through which approximately 20–30% of the world's oil shipments pass, and an Iranian blockade or interference would directly affect the global economy. With US-Iran nuclear negotiations continuing intermittently, the Trump administration has resumed its "maximum pressure" policy, and military tensions are rising. Japan depends on the Middle East for approximately 90% of its energy imports, making the security of the Strait of Hormuz directly linked to Japan's national interests. This reporting contains multiple contentious issues: the legitimacy of unilateral US military action, the legal status of the Strait of Hormuz under international maritime law, and the risk of regional escalation.

*Share of covered perspectives*

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



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. Framing

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 00:00:03–00:00:18

Quotation: "US President Trump announced that efforts to guide vessels stranded inside the Persian Gulf and escort them through the Strait of Hormuz began on the 4th"

Manipulation technique: The US military operation is framed using the neutral, administrative vocabulary of "efforts," diluting its character as a military action.

Problem: Viewers are more likely to perceive US actions as humanitarian or technical assistance, and the essential aspect of military intervention recedes.

#### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 00:02:15

Quotation: "Flatly denied the US side's efforts"

Manipulation technique: Iran's military warning is framed with the word "denied," positioning Iran as "the opposing side."

Problem: This has the effect of diminishing Iran's position, treating it not as a sovereign defensive action but merely as a reaction against the US "efforts."

#### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 00:03:49–00:03:51

Quotation: "Strongly condemning the UAE attack as being carried out by Iran"

Manipulation technique: The UAE's unilateral claim is reported without verification, framing Iran as the aggressor.

Problem: By positioning Iran as the perpetrator before attribution of responsibility has been confirmed, this guides viewers' perception.

*Summary: As a whole, this broadcast frames US actions asymmetrically as "support/efforts" and Iranian actions as "warnings/denial/attacks," which presents a certain problem from the standpoint of neutral reporting. However, it should also be considered that, given the nature of a scheduled news bulletin, it is difficult to provide in-depth contextual presentation.*



## 12. Anchor Behaviour

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Methodological principle (v2.7): Always record the triggering event before assessment. An intervention is assessed as asymmetric only if a comparable triggering event with another guest/position did not produce a similar intervention.*

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

Entire broadcast

Triggering event: This broadcast is a one-directional news reading format by a studio anchor and is not an interview or discussion format.

Quotation (anchor): N/A (no interaction)

#### Comparison

Since no comparable other guests exist, the structural precondition for assessing asymmetry in anchor behaviour does not apply.

Asymmetry: Not verifiable (due to formal constraints)

*Summary: As this broadcast is in the format of a scheduled news reading, and no interaction between anchor and guests exists, this criterion is outside the scope of application. The score of 1 takes into account the possibility of subtle differences in the anchor's reading tone (tone in Iran-related reporting compared to US-related reporting), but a definitive assessment from the transcript alone is difficult.*



### 13. Question Asymmetry

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

This broadcast is not in interview format, and no question-and-answer structure exists.

#### Assessment

Outside the scope of this criterion. The score of 1 reflects the asymmetric processing whereby critical examination of the US side's claims (the purpose and legitimacy of "Project Freedom") is absent from the reporting, while reservational vocabulary such as "further emphasising" and "flatly denied" is appended to Iranian claims.

*Summary: As the format is not an interview, question asymmetry cannot be directly assessed, but subtle asymmetry is observed in the vocabulary appended to the claims of each position.*



<b>14. False Balance</b>									<b>2/10</b>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

#### Finding 1:

##### Timestamp

00:01:49–00:02:15

Structure: The US position (approximately 2 minutes) and Iran's position (approximately 1 minute 10 seconds) are presented in parallel, creating the form of a superficial "presentation of both sides."

##### Analysis

Despite asymmetries in time allocation, vocabulary treatment, and context provision, there is a possibility that balance is performed through the formal presentation of both sides. However, the false balance in this broadcast is minor, and the absence of balance (omission) is rather the main problem.

*Summary: The main problem in this broadcast is not false balance but the omission of important perspectives. Elements of false balance are only limitedly observed.*



## 15. Agenda Setting

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The Strait of Hormuz issue is treated as self-evidently a binary opposition of "US efforts vs. Iranian threat."

**Timestamp** 00:00:03–00:00:35

Evidence: "Efforts began on the 4th," "warning that [it] would come under attack," "whether the efforts will proceed is unclear"

Alternative agenda: The issue of the right of transit passage under international maritime law, the possibility of a diplomatic resolution, the impact on Japan's energy security.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: US military involvement is treated as a "natural premise" and its legitimacy and legality are not questioned.

**Timestamp** 00:01:20–00:01:28

Evidence: "It is said that missile destroyers, over 100 aircraft, and approximately 15,000 troops, among others, will be mobilised" (presentation of scale only, no reference to legitimacy)

Alternative agenda: The international legal basis for unilateral US military action, the role of the UN Security Council.

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The Japanese perspective and national interests are treated as self-evidently outside the scope of reporting.

**Timestamp** Entire broadcast

Evidence: No reference whatsoever to the Japanese government, Foreign Ministry, or energy policy.

Alternative agenda: Japan's energy security, the Japanese government's diplomatic response, impact on Japanese companies and vessels.

*Summary: The greatest problem in the agenda setting of this broadcast is that, despite being a Japanese public broadcaster, the Japanese national interests and perspective are completely excluded from the agenda. This is problematic from the standpoint of "serving the public's right to know" as required by Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act.*



## 52. Vocabulary and Terminology

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 00:00:50–00:00:56

Quotation: "Announced the commencement of Project Freedom from the morning of the 4th local time"

Manipulation technique: The name "Project Freedom," as designated by the US, is used as-is and broadcast without critical examination.

Problem: By uncritically adopting a term laden with the strong value connotation of "freedom," it lends an aura of legitimacy to US actions. A neutral alternative expression would be something like "Strait of Hormuz navigation support operation."

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 00:01:09–00:01:12

Quotation: "Emphasising that any interference with the efforts would be dealt with by force"

Manipulation technique: The word "interference" carries the connotation of positioning Iran's actions as an unjust obstacle.

Problem: From Iran's perspective, this is a defensive response to its own territorial waters and jurisdictional waters; the word "interference" contains a one-sided value judgement.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 00:02:21–00:02:23

Quotation: "Further emphasising that the Strait of Hormuz is under Iran's control"

Manipulation technique: The phrase "under control" conveys Iran's sovereignty claim as fact, but there is no annotation regarding its contradiction with the right of transit passage under international law.

Problem: By presenting a legally contested claim as fact, there is a risk of giving viewers an incorrect legal understanding.

*Summary: In the choice of vocabulary, US official terminology ("Project Freedom," "interference") is adopted uncritically, while Iran's claims are processed with reservational vocabulary such as "emphasise" and "deny," revealing subtle asymmetry.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

#### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

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

**3.8/10**

*Slight imbalance*

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

**3.0/10**

*Slight imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**3.4/10**

*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 of reporting (Paragraph 3), and multifaceted presentation of viewpoints (Paragraph 4).

Possible Violation 1:

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

Facts: The impact on Japan's energy security, the international maritime law context, independent expert assessment, and the Japanese government's response policy are completely absent.

Evidence: Entire broadcast timestamps — The complete absence of any reference to the Japanese perspective can be confirmed from the entire transcript.

Assessment: For a Japanese public broadcaster, completely omitting the Japanese perspective on an issue directly linked to Japan's national interests potentially violates the obligation of "multifaceted presentation of viewpoints" required by that paragraph. However, considering the time constraints of a scheduled news bulletin (approximately 4 minutes 30 seconds), it is physically difficult to cover all viewpoints, and caution should be exercised in determining a violation from a single broadcast alone.

Possible Violation 2:

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

Facts: The UAE vessel attack is reported with only the UAE's unilateral claim, and the reservation that attribution of responsibility is unconfirmed is absent.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:03:42–00:03:51 — "Strongly condemning the UAE attack as being carried out by Iran"

Assessment: The expression "strongly condemning" indicates that this is the UAE's claim, but the lack of independent verification and insufficient context contains the risk of causing viewers to accept unconfirmed information as fact.

No serious violations observed:

This broadcast, as a scheduled news bulletin, reports the official announcements of multiple parties (US, Iran, UAE, South Korea), and no broadcasting of clearly false information or blatant bias toward a particular political party is observed. Determination of a violation of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act requires not only analysis of a single broadcast but also cross-referencing with continuous monitoring data.

### Overall Assessment Under Broadcasting Act Article 4

This broadcast broadly meets the formal requirements of Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act (presentation of multiple positions, non-broadcasting of false information), but there are problems with the substantive fulfilment of the "multifaceted presentation of viewpoints" required by Paragraph 4. In particular, the complete absence of Japan's national interests and perspective despite this being a Japanese public broadcaster, the limitation of all sources to direct stakeholders, and the only fragmentary reporting of the possibility of a diplomatic resolution (the content of the 14 points) are issues requiring improvement in light of the purpose of that Article. However, since many of these problems stem from the structural constraints of a scheduled news bulletin, systematic accumulation of evidence through continuous monitoring is necessary before determining a legal violation.

### Detailed Source Check (Mandatory Verification for All Institutions, NGOs, and Specialist Bodies Cited)

#### US Central Command (CENTCOM)

- 1. Funding:** US federal government (Department of Defense). Annual budget in the hundreds of billions of dollars.
- 2. Mandate:** Command and execution of US military operations in the Middle East and Central Asia. Structurally difficult to reconcile with neutral assessment.



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

**3. Conflict of interest:** Has a direct motive to report the success of "Project Freedom." Self-assessment regarding the legitimacy and effectiveness of the operation has low credibility.

**4. Credibility Matrix (6 dimensions):** D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 / D2 Personal Risk: -1 / D3 Expert Competence: +2 / D4 Consistency of Views: 0 / D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +1 / D6 Source Level: +2 → Total: +2 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow

**5. Counter-sources:** Independent maritime bodies (IMO, etc.), confirmation from neutral country governments, and independent reporting by international media are absent.

### Iranian State Media (IRNA, etc.)

**1. Funding:** Iranian government.

**2. Mandate:** Public relations and transmission of the government's position. Structurally difficult to reconcile with neutral reporting.

**3. Conflict of interest:** Has a motive to justify the Iranian government's diplomatic and military position.

**4. Credibility Matrix (6 dimensions):** D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 / D2 Personal Risk: -1 / D3 Expert Competence: +1 / D4 Consistency of Views: 0 / D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -1 / D6 Source Level: +1 → Total: -2 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow

**5. Counter-sources:** Confirmation by independent international media and assessment from neutral countries are absent.

### UAE Foreign Ministry

**1. Funding:** UAE government.

**2. Mandate:** Expression of the UAE government's diplomatic position.

**3. Conflict of interest:** The UAE is in a geopolitical confrontational relationship with Iran and has a motive to claim Iran's attribution of responsibility.

**4. Credibility Matrix (6 dimensions):** D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 / D2 Personal Risk: -1 / D3 Expert Competence: +1 / D4 Consistency of Views: 0 / D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: 0 / D6 Source Level: +1 → Total: -1 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow

**5. Counter-sources:** An independent maritime investigation body, a UN panel of experts, and Iran's rebuttal are absent.

### US News Website "Axios"

**1. Funding:** Private investment (Cox Enterprises, etc.). Commercial media.

**2. Mandate:** News reporting. Political leaning is centre to centre-right.

**3. Conflict of interest:** Reliance on anonymous sources described as "according to officials" limits verifiability and contains the risk of deliberate government information manipulation (leaks).

**4. Credibility Matrix (6 dimensions):** D1 Conflict of Interest: -1 / D2 Personal Risk: 0 / D3 Expert Competence: +1 / D4 Consistency of Views: 0 / D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +1 / D6 Source Level: -1 (anonymous secondary information) → Total: 0 → Source Traffic Light: Yellow

**5. Counter-sources:** Independent reporting by European or Asian media, or confirmation via official documents, is absent.

Important note: "Recognised" and "credible" are social attributions that are themselves subject to verification. In this analysis, all sources are independently assessed based on the above matrix.

*This analysis was prepared based on the transcript of NHK News (estimated broadcast date: 4 June 2025) from the standpoint of compliance with Article 4 of the Broadcasting Act. Visual elements such as footage, audio, and graphics are not included in the assessment from the transcript alone. If the purpose is court submission, cross-referencing with actual broadcast footage and audio recordings is required.*

### 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.



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

**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)



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.**