



## SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2010-04-23 Radikale Muslime im Aufwind

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2010-04-23 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 15:12

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Massstab: Art. 4 RTVG

### OVERALL SCORE

**5.6/10**

*Considerable bias*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly one-sided/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to 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	Greens	SP	GLP	Centre	EVP	FDP	SVP
CHES	1.13	1.67	3.60	5.47	5.64	7.67	9.00
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

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

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**3.8 / 10**

*Left-favouring*

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 serves for political classification and does not feed into the overall score.



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Switzerland is a consensus democracy with a proportional representation principle. The Federal Council (7 seats) is filled according to the "magic formula": SVP 2, SP 2, FDP 2, Centre 1. There is no classic government/opposition dichotomy — all major parties are represented in the executive. Political conflicts run along substantive policy issues, not along a government/opposition axis.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NC	Government/Opposition	Core position (Islam/migration)
SVP	8.0	62	Government (2 FC)	Limit immigration, tighten asylum law, sovereignty
SP	2.5	41	Government (2 FC)	Open migration policy, promote integration
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Orderly immigration, skilled workers, combat abuse
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatic migration policy, integration and management
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Solidarity-based reception, promotion of integration
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Liberal migration policy, pragmatic integration
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Centre position, Christian-social

The broadcast falls in the aftermath of the minaret initiative (November 2009), which was accepted with 57.5% yes votes and triggered an intense societal debate about Islam, integration and freedom of religion. The main line of tension runs between the claim to freedom of religion (Art. 15 FC) and the principle of the rule of law, as well as between cultural integration and preservation of identity. A further line of conflict concerns the question of whether fundamentalist religious interpretation is per se compatible with the Swiss rule of law.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is the public broadcaster of Switzerland, financed through reception fees (today the Serafe levy). It is subject to Art. 4 RTVA, which prescribes accurate representation, diversity of opinion and balance on controversial topics. The Arena is SRF's main political discussion format and bears special responsibility for compliance with the diversity requirement.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	-1	00:35 Oscar Freisinger present as SVP representative. His core position (limiting immigration, criticism of Islam) is presented, but he is interrupted several times and framed as a provocateur (36:15 "To Valais? No, on a comedy stage"). Programme position (tighten asylum law, sovereignty) correctly represented, but portrayal slightly negatively framed.
SP	0	Not directly represented. Mr Kudluka describes himself as "thinking social-democratically" (61:48), which represents an indirect SP-leaning voice. Programme position (open migration policy) is represented by several guests, but no explicit SP portrayal.
FDP	0	Not represented. Topic not directly addressed.
Centre	+1	Gerhard Pfister (CVP/Centre) as guest. His position — rule of law above freedom of religion, but differentiated stance — is correctly and fully presented. Programme position (pragmatic integration, negotiated solution) largely correct.
Greens	0	Not represented. Mr Raff mentions European Greens resolution (68:48), but no direct party portrayal.
GLP	0	Not represented.
EVP	0	Not represented.

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: Centre (Pfister), score +1
- Strongest distortion: SVP (Freisinger), score -1
- Average deviation from 0: 0.3
- Conclusion: The party-political bias in this broadcast is minor, as the topic (Islam/fundamentalism) does not primarily run along classic party lines. Freisinger is slightly negatively framed through moderator comments, while Pfister appears as a factual counterpart. Most parties are not represented, which limits the assessment.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAME

### Broadcast data

- Title: Arena — "How dangerous are the radical Muslims in Switzerland?"
- Date: 23.04.2010
- Presenter: Not named in the transcript (Arena presenter)
- Persons interviewed:

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Nicolas Blanchot	President of the Islamic Central Council of Switzerland	Islamic Central Council	Religiously conservative
Oscar Freisinger	National Councillor	SVP, Canton of Valais	Right (8.0)
Erich Gisling	Publicist, former editor-in-chief SF	Independent/liberal	Centre-left
Gerhard Pfister	National Councillor	CVP/Centre	Centre (5.0)
Mr Kudluka	Muslim umbrella association	Muslim community	Centre-left
Mr Lieberherr	Organisation "Strategic Islamisation"	Critical of Islam	Right
Mr Afschar	Muslim umbrella association, Turkish roots	Muslim community	Centre
Hugo Stamm	Journalist, sect expert	Independent	Centre
Mr Maurer	Theologian, management consultant	Independent	Centre-right
Mr Raff	Islamic studies scholar/jurist	Independent	Centre-left
Mr Bergermin	Chief of staff Islamic Central Council, convert	Islamic Central Council	Religiously conservative
Ms Pegoraro	Cantonal councillor, head of security Baselland	Cantonal executive	Centre-right
Young woman (convert, Kurdish)	Muslim convert	Islamic Central Council milieu	Religiously conservative

### Main topic

The broadcast discusses whether the Islamic Central Council of Switzerland and its president Nicolas Blanchot represent a danger to the Swiss legal order and society, and whether fundamentalist interpretation of the Quran is compatible with the Swiss rule of law.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically robust

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Expert 1: Erich Gisling, publicist/former editor-in-chief SF

Timestamp	00:29
Statement	"I certainly do not see them as dangerous in a terrorist sense. The question is then how much they try to exert pressure inwardly, within their group."
Classification	Journalist with a Middle East focus, not an Islamic studies scholar or theologian. Is framed as an "expert" but is primarily an opinion journalist.
Missing counter-voice	Islamic studies scholar with academic training (e.g. University of Bern, University of Fribourg).

Source in-depth check Gisling:

(a) **FUNDING:** Freelance publicist, no recognisable institutional affiliation. No structural conflict of interest.

(b) **MANDATE:** Middle East expertise is relevant, but not a theologian or legal scholar.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No recognisable institutional conflict of interest

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Takes a differentiated position that criticises both sides

D3 Professional competence: 0 — Middle East journalist, not an Islamic studies scholar; statements about Quranic interpretation without theological training

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent mediating position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Largely factual, occasionally speculative

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source, no primary research

**TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Is framed as an "expert" but is an opinion journalist. The framing as a neutral expert voice is partly misleading.

#### Expert 2: Hugo Stamm, journalist/sect expert

Timestamp	41:22
Statement	"At 16 you cannot decide that Allah is, so to speak, the better God than the Christian God... it is mostly a protest, it is a rebellion, it is partly a hatred of society."
Classification	Well-known sect critic, primarily from a Christian-Protestant context. No academic Islamic studies.
Missing counter-voice	Conversion researcher with empirical data on motivations.

Source in-depth check Stamm:



- (a) **FUNDING:** Freelance journalist, long-standing work for the Reformed Church. Structural conflict of interest possible when assessing religious competitors.  
 (b) **MANDATE:** Sect expert — the Islamic Central Council is not a sect in the classical sense. Assessment outside mandate.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Long-standing connection to Reformed Church structures; structural conflict of interest when assessing Islamic groups  
 D2 Personal risk: 0 — No recognisable personal risks  
 D3 Professional competence: -1 — Sect expert, not an Islamic studies scholar; statements about conversion motivation without empirical basis  
 D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent critical stance towards religious fundamentalism  
 D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — "Hatred of society", "indoctrination" — appellative without data evidence  
 D6 Source level: -1 — Tertiary source, no primary research  
**TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW (borderline)**

- (c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Is framed as a neutral expert but has a structural conflict of interest and an assessment outside his mandate.

Expert 3: Mr Maurer, theologian/management consultant	
Timestamp	48:38
Statement	"I am of the opinion that a man like Mr Blanchot is fundamentalist. In its basic structures, Islam is a theocracy and not a democracy."
Classification	Theologian with a practical focus on management consulting. No specialisation in Islamic studies.
Missing counter-voice	Islamic studies scholar who differentiates the theocracy thesis.

Source in-depth check Maurer:

- (a) **FUNDING:** Active in the private sector. No recognisable institutional conflict of interest.  
 (b) **MANDATE:** Theologian with a focus on management consulting — statements about Islamic theology are outside his mandate.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No recognisable institutional conflict of interest  
 D2 Personal risk: 0 — No recognisable personal risks  
 D3 Professional competence: -1 — Christian theologian, not an Islamic studies scholar; statements about Islamic theology without specialist training  
 D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent position  
 D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — "Fundamentalist", "theocracy" without differentiated evidence  
 D6 Source level: -1 — Tertiary source  
**TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

*Missing expert groups:*

- Islamic studies scholar with academic training (University of Bern, University of Fribourg)
- Constitutional law expert on Art. 15 FC and ECHR Art. 9
- Integration researcher with empirical data

### Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Traffic light
Erich Gisling, publicist/former editor-in-chief SF	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+4	YELLOW
Hugo Stamm, journalist/sect expert	-1	0	-1	+1	-1	-1	-3	YELLOW



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

Mr Maurer, theologian/management consultant	+1	0	-1	+1	-1	-1	-1	<b>YELLOW</b>
---	----	---	----	----	----	----	----	---------------

*Summary:*

- Gisling: YELLOW (+4) — Journalist with Middle East expertise, not an Islamic studies scholar
- Stamm: YELLOW (-3) — Sect expert with structural conflict of interest, outside mandate
- Maurer: YELLOW (-1) — Christian theologian, outside mandate for Islamic theology

All three "experts" are journalists or practitioners without specialist training in Islamic studies. Not a single academic Islamic studies scholar is represented in the broadcast.



## 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: Weltwoche (implicit)

#### Timestamp

04:27 — Statement: "You are the inventor, according to the Weltwoche, and Le Matin, you are the inventor of a new pedagogy, which is the toothpick pedagogy."

- (a) **Funding:** Weltwoche is a private weekly magazine with a clearly right-conservative profile.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** The Weltwoche has an editorial line that is critical of Islam; reports about the Islamic Central Council are not neutral.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** No counter-statement from the Islamic Central Council regarding the Weltwoche allegations.

### Source 2: European Court of Human Rights (Refah ruling 2004)

#### Timestamp

52:38 — Statement: "the European Court of Justice, which clearly stated, in the Refah ruling 2004, that sharia is simply incompatible with the rule of law."

- (a) **Funding:** Public-law institution.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** None — ECHR is a neutral legal authority.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** The Refah ruling concerns a Turkish party, not individual religious practice. This nuance is missing.

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 57:30

Claim: "There are members of your organisation who have a picture of Osama Bin Laden on their computer."

Word markers: No explicit markers, but claim without primary source

Primary source available: NO — penalty point (+1)

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 58:42

Claim: "The father says, in the press, that he is in terrorist training."

Word markers: "in the press" — no primary source

Primary source available: NO — penalty point (+1)

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 60:00

Claim: "There are two further young men who are mentioned, who were also in Egypt, who were there for training."

Word markers: "are mentioned" — no primary source

Primary source available: NO — penalty point (+1)



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

*Summary: The source selection is one-sidedly critical of Islam (Weltwoche, Stamm, Maurer) without academic counter-voices. Three unsubstantiated claims about Blanchot's organisation are put forward without primary sources and not consistently challenged.*



### 3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Nicolas Blanchot (Islamic Central Council): (24%)
- Oscar Freisinger (SVP): (16%)
- Erich Gisling (publicist): (13%)
- Gerhard Pfister (CVP): (11%)
- Hugo Stamm (sect expert): (7%)
- Mr Kudluka (Muslim umbrella association): (7%)
- Mr Maurer (theologian): (5%)
- Mr Raff (Islamic studies scholar): (5%)
- Mr Afschar (Muslim umbrella association): (4%)
- Ms Pegoraro (cantonal councillor): (4%)
- Others (Lieberherr, Bergermin, convert): (5%)
- Presenter: (13%)

*Summary: Blanchot receives the most speaking time as the main person in the broadcast, which is thematically justified. Islam-critical voices (Freisinger, Stamm, Maurer, Lieberherr, Pegoraro) add up to approx. 37%, Islam-friendly/neutral voices (Blanchot, Kudluka, Afschar, Raff, Bergermin) to approx. 45%. The distribution is slightly in favour of the Islamic side, which creates a certain imbalance in a broadcast about the "dangerousness" of the Islamic Central Council.*



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

##### Omission 1:

**Context** No presentation of the actual membership numbers and reach of the Islamic Central Council.

Relevant at: 00:40 (introduction of Blanchot)

**Effect** The broadcast treats the Islamic Central Council as a significant force without clarifying how many members it has. Blanchot himself says (11:44): "I don't know how many" — this ambiguity is not resolved. Suggests an importance that may not correspond to reality.

##### Omission 2:

**Context** No presentation of the concrete activities of the Islamic Central Council beyond media reports.

Relevant at: 57:00 (allegations about Bin Laden picture, Egypt trip)

**Effect** Serious allegations (terrorist training, Bin Laden veneration) are made without primary sources and not substantiated by independent research. The omission of independent verification suggests that the allegations are substantiated.

##### Omission 3:

**Context** No presentation of the legal situation regarding religious practice in the workplace and in the military.

Relevant at: 27:50 (prayer dispute in the military) and 63:28 (factory example)

**Effect** The discussion about prayer times in the military and at the workplace is conducted without clarification of the actual legal situation. What the Federal Court or military law specifically prescribes remains unclear. Suggests that Muslim demands are per se unlawful.

*Summary: The broadcast systematically omits empirical foundations (membership numbers, legal bases, independent verification of allegations), which keeps the discussion at the level of opinions and anecdotes and prevents factual classification.*

#### Missing voices

- Constitutional law expert: Would have specified the exact limits of freedom of religion under Art. 15 FC and ECHR Art. 9.
- Integration researcher/sociologist: Would have contributed empirical data on the actual integration of Muslims in Switzerland.
- Intelligence service representative: Would have presented the concrete threat assessment of the intelligence service.
- Muslim women's rights activist: Would have illuminated the question of self-determination vs. indoctrination from a feminist-Muslim perspective.
- Islamic studies scholar (university): Would have provided specialist classification of the theological questions (Quranic interpretation, sharia, stoning).

**Präsident:** Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:kontakt@SVFAB.ch) - **Adresse:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

- Representative from other European countries: Would have contributed experiences from France, Germany or the UK with similar debates.
- Youth worker/de-radicalisation expert: Would have empirically classified the question of radicalisation of converts.
- Representative of liberal Muslims (organised): Would have presented the spectrum of Muslim positions beyond the Central Council and umbrella association.



## 5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 11:50

Figure: "We have over 400,000 Muslims in Switzerland."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value shown — (b) Share missing — (c) Trend missing

#### Missing context

How many of them are members of the Islamic Central Council? How many are considered "fundamentalist"? Without this relation, the figure of 400,000 is misleading.

#### Effect

Suggests a large homogeneous Muslim mass, although the Islamic Central Council represents only a small fraction.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 08:05

Figure: "More than 50% overall said yes, it is right [to beat a woman]. Then among university graduates over 40% said yes."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value indicated — (b) Share shown — (c) Trend missing; source missing

#### Missing context

Which study? When? How large was the sample? Egypt is not Switzerland — no transfer reference established.

#### Effect

Suggests that Muslim men generally condone violence against women, without source citation and without reference to Switzerland.

*Summary: Two figures are used without full contextualisation to support Islam-critical arguments. The Egypt study is particularly problematic, as it is deployed without source citation and without a transfer reference to Switzerland.*



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Association 1:

Timestamp

01:13

Quote

*"He has partly been labelled the Bin Laden of Biel, as the most dangerous Muslim in Switzerland."*

Technique: The presenter quotes the comparison with Bin Laden, even though he simultaneously describes it as "utter nonsense". The association is thus in the room, even if it is formally distanced.

Effect

Blanchot is associated from the outset with the world's most notorious terrorist. The formal distancing ("utter nonsense") does not fully neutralise the association — the comparison remains in the viewers' consciousness.

SOURCE CHECK Blanchot:

- Works with verifiable primary sources: YES (Quran, legal order)
- Core statements falsifiable: YES (adherence to rule of law is verifiable)
- Personal risk: High — public exposure, media attacks, "Bin Laden of Biel" label
- Gain: Attention for organisation, but with massive reputational costs
- Net: Risk > Gain → increased credibility
- Objectivity: Largely factual, acknowledges uncertainties
- RESULT CATEGORY: A — System-critical actor with methodology (evidence + risk + objectivity)

### Association 2:

Timestamp

57:30

Quote

*"There are members of your organisation who have a picture of Osama Bin Laden on their computer."*

Technique: Individual case is used as a characterisation of the entire organisation.

Effect

Suggests that the Islamic Central Council harbours Bin Laden sympathisers, without a primary source.

Chain of association: Blanchot → Islamic Central Council → Bin Laden picture → terrorist training Egypt → terrorism

### Association 3:

Timestamp

45:58

Quote

*"when you look at the foreign state media, BBC, media in France, media in Germany, Mr Freisinger and his SVP are regarded as far-right."*

Technique: Blanchot associates Freisinger with "far-right" by reference to foreign media.

Effect

Mutual delegitimisation through association — both sides engage in guilt by association.



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

*Summary: The broadcast begins with a serious guilt by association (Bin Laden of Biel) and continues this technique through unsubstantiated allegations (terrorist training, Bin Laden picture). Blanchot is Category A according to the source check — the framing as a dangerous fundamentalist is supported primarily by framing, not by substantiated facts.*



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

#### Finding 1:

Position: 00:00–01:20 (beginning)

Content: Presenter introduces Blanchot as "Bin Laden of Biel" before the discussion begins.

#### Timing effect

The most serious association (Bin Laden) is placed at the beginning, before Blanchot can speak. This sets the interpretive frame for the entire broadcast. All subsequent statements by Blanchot are filtered through this frame.

#### Finding 2:

Position: 36:15 (middle)

Content: Presenter to Freisinger: "Do you know where you belong? In Valais? No, on a comedy stage."

#### Timing effect

This comment comes after Freisinger's demand that Blanchot condemn stoning. The discrediting of Freisinger by the presenter occurs precisely when Freisinger makes a substantively legitimate demand, which delegitimises the demand itself.

#### Finding 3:

Position: 74:44 (end)

Content: Presenter: "Thank you for having taken part in the first discussion on television this evening."

#### Timing effect

The closing formulation frames Blanchot's participation as courageous and positive, which represents an implicit expression of sympathy at the end of the broadcast.

*Summary: The broadcast is characterised by strategic timing: the most serious association at the beginning, the discrediting of the Islam critic in the middle, and a positive framing of the Islamic Central Council at the end. This creates an arc that makes Blanchot appear positive despite serious allegations.*



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage reinforces the finding. Score = degree of outrage (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 36:15

Triggering event: Freisinger demands that Blanchot condemn the stoning of women ("Just say the sentence to me").  
Reaction: Presenter to Freisinger: "Do you know where you belong? In Valais? No, on a comedy stage. That would suit you better."

### Comparison

Blanchot says at 37:14: "That is part of it, it comes under freedom of belief. Stoning of women? Is that freedom of belief?" — Presenter reacts with: "Don't make my life so difficult, please." — no comparable discrediting.

Asymmetry: Freisinger is discredited with a joke for a legitimate demand (distancing from stoning). Blanchot's statement that stoning is "freedom of belief" is met with a mild comment. The asymmetry is clearly demonstrable.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 05:56

Triggering event: Freisinger quotes a Quranic verse about beating women.  
Reaction: Presenter interrupts: "Stop, stop." and gives Blanchot the floor to correct.

### Comparison

Blanchot makes the statement at 37:14 that stoning is freedom of belief — presenter does not interrupt, but says "Don't make my life so difficult".

Asymmetry: Freisinger's Quranic interpretation is immediately interrupted and corrected. Blanchot's more problematic statement (stoning as freedom of belief) is not challenged with the same energy.

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 2/5

*Summary: There is a demonstrable asymmetry in the moderation response: Freisinger's Islam-critical statements are interrupted and commented on more sharply than Blanchot's problematic statements (stoning as freedom of belief). The asymmetry is moderate but clearly documentable.*



## 9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 09:03

**Missing perspective/fact:** The intelligence service report on the Islamic Central Council is mentioned, but no intelligence service representative is present.

**Relevance:** The broadcast revolves around the question of dangerousness — the primary specialist authority (intelligence service/NDB) is absent.

**Impact:** The threat assessment remains at the level of opinions; the broadcast cannot provide a factual answer to the title question.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 50:00 (entire broadcast)

**Missing perspective/fact:** No academic Islamic studies represented. Mr Raff is introduced as an Islamic studies scholar/jurist, but his qualifications are not specified.

**Relevance:** Theological questions (Quranic interpretation, sharia, stoning) are discussed by non-specialists.

**Impact:** The discussion about Islamic theology lacks a specialist basis; errors and simplifications are not corrected.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 63:28

**Missing perspective/fact:** No integration research cited. The question of how well Muslims in Switzerland are actually integrated is treated only anecdotally.

**Relevance:** Empirical data would elevate the discussion from opinions to facts.

**Impact:** The broadcast remains at the level of individual cases and anecdotes, which does not permit factual classification.

*Summary: The broadcast systematically omits the most important specialist voices (intelligence service, Islamic studies, integration research) and replaces them with opinion journalists and practitioners. This prevents a factual answer to the title question.*

The broadcast takes place in the aftermath of the minaret initiative, which revealed a deep societal divide over Islam in Switzerland. The Islamic Central Council was founded as a reaction to the campaign for the initiative and is regarded as strictly Islamic. The debate touches on fundamental questions: freedom of religion vs. the rule of law, integration vs. preservation of identity, and the question of whether Islam is to be understood as a political ideology or as a private religion. Internationally, the debate stands in the context of 9/11, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and a growing European Islamophobia debate.

#### Share of perspectives covered

*Inverted: Original value measures coverage (higher = better). Displayed as deviation (higher = greater gaps).*

**[A] Legal perspective:** What does the Federal Constitution specifically say about freedom of religion and its limits?

**Präsident:** Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:kontakt@SVFAB.ch) - **Adresse:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



- [B] **Islamic studies perspective:** How diverse is Islam actually? What currents exist?
- [C] **Integration policy perspective:** What does research show about the integration of Muslims in Switzerland?
- [D] **Security perspective:** What does the intelligence service specifically say about the threat situation?
- [E] **Comparative perspective:** How were other religious communities (Catholics, Jews) treated historically?
- [F] **Women's perspective:** What do Muslim women themselves say about veiling and self-determination?
- [G] **Convert perspective:** What motivates conversions? What experiences do converts have?
- [H] **Economic perspective:** What concrete problems arise in businesses through religious practices?
- [I] **International perspective:** How do other European countries deal with similar questions?
- [J] **Victim perspective:** What discrimination do Muslims experience in Switzerland?

#### [A] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 23:34 — Quote: "Your religious freedom in this state is not unlimited, but reaches its limit where the rule of law intervenes." — Assessment: The legal perspective is discussed by Pfister and Blanchot, but without a constitutional law expert as a specialist voice.

#### [B] INDICATED

Timestamp: 51:28 — Quote: "There are many forms of Islam and there are many possible interpretations of the Quran." — Assessment: Gisling and Raff indicate diversity, but no systematic Islamic studies classification.

#### [C] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No integration research cited; the question of how well Muslims in Switzerland are actually integrated is treated only anecdotally.

#### [D] INDICATED

Timestamp: 09:03 — Quote: "where the intelligence service has now become attentive, and where there are statements from the director of the Federal Office for Migration that this is the breeding ground, also for terrorism" — Assessment: Intelligence service position is mentioned, but no representative is present.

#### [E] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 26:19 — Quote: "Catholics in the Swiss state had, for hundreds of years, more than a hundred years, fewer rights than the Reformed." — Assessment: Historical comparison is introduced by Pfister himself, which relativises the perspective.

#### [F] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 14:53 — Quote: "She has been veiled since she was 18, and voluntarily, she says" / 71:23 (convert): "I have been fighting for nine months to be allowed to go around like this" — Assessment: Women's perspective present, but limited to two individual cases; no research data.

#### [G] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 41:22 — Quote: "At 16 you cannot decide that Allah is, so to speak, the better God" — Assessment: Convert topic is discussed, but assessed primarily by non-converts; Bergermin as a convert speaks briefly.

#### [H] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 63:28 — Quote: "in a factory, in an industrial movement... five times praying a day as well. That is also a problem in industry." — Assessment: Maurer brings practical examples, but without systematic data.

#### [I] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No comparison with France, Germany, UK; how other European countries deal with similar questions is not addressed.



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

#### [J] INDICATED

Timestamp: 13:50 — Quote: "Muslims at the moment feel they are at the core under attack" — Assessment: Experiences of discrimination are mentioned, but not systematically addressed.

#### Completeness score: 5/10

---

Justification: The broadcast addresses the topic broadly, but without specialist voices from constitutional law, integration research and international comparison. The discussion remains largely at the level of opinions and individual cases, without an empirical basis. Central perspectives such as integration research and international comparison are entirely absent.



## Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:22
Quote	<i>"How dangerous are the radical Muslims in Switzerland?"</i>
Manipulation	The title question presupposes "radical" as a given. It does not ask "Are Muslims in Switzerland dangerous?" or "How integrated are Muslims in Switzerland?", but presupposes radicalism and asks only about the degree of dangerousness.
Why problematic	The presupposition "radical" is a pre-decision that keeps all subsequent discussions within a security and threat frame. Muslim guests must defend themselves against the suspicion of radicalism from the outset.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	01:01
Quote	<i>"Nicolas Blanchot founded his group as a reaction to the minaret ban. He is a strictly devout Muslim. He believes literally in the Quran."</i>
Manipulation	"Believing literally in the Quran" is framed as a problematic characteristic without explaining what this means. The formulation implies fundamentalism and dangerousness.
Why problematic	Many members of religions believe "literally" in their holy scriptures. The formulation is selective and suggestive without a factual basis.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	13:07
Quote	<i>"let's move away a little from the danger in connection with violence or such, and let's go to the concerns, to the unease that you trigger, as a person and with your organisation, with the cap, with the beard"</i>
Manipulation	The presenter frames Blanchot's external appearance (cap, beard) as causing "unease". Religious clothing is framed as a problem.
Why problematic	Framing a person's appearance as causing "unease" is a form of discrimination through framing. Orthodox Jews with sidelocks or nuns in habits are not confronted with this question.



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

*Summary: The broadcast is held from the outset in a threat frame that forces Muslims into a defensive position. The title, the introduction and the moderation questions set dangerousness and unease as the starting point, which structurally impedes a factual discussion.*



## 11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:40
Quote	"Nicolas Blanchot, president of the controversial Islamic Central Council"
Manipulation	"Controversial" is a value-laden term that sets a negative connotation before the discussion.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "President of the Islamic Central Council of Switzerland". "Controversial" is an editorial pre-decision that negatively frames the guest even before his first statement.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp	28:29
Quote	"strategic Islamisation"
Manipulation	The term "Islamisation" implies a targeted, threatening infiltration of society by Islam.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "increase in Muslim presence" or "growth of Muslim communities". "Islamisation" is a political battle term used by Islam-critical movements and carries a threat connotation.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp	41:22
Quote	"it is mostly a protest, it is a rebellion, it is partly a hatred of society" (Stamm on converts)
Manipulation	Conversion to Islam is associated with "hatred of society".
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Conversion can have various motivations, including spiritual seeking, social belonging or protest." The formulation "hatred of society" is a psychologising devaluation without empirical basis.

*Summary: The choice of words in the broadcast is systematically connoted as Islam-critical: "controversial", "Islamisation", "hatred of society". These terms set a negative frame that could be avoided through neutral formulations.*



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 36:15

Triggering event: Freisinger demands that Blanchot condemn the stoning of women ("Just say the sentence to me").

Quote (presenter) *"Do you know where you belong? In Valais? No, on a comedy stage. That would suit you better."*

Comparison Blanchot at 37:14: "Stoning of women? Is that freedom of belief?" — Presenter: "Don't make my life so difficult, please."

Asymmetry: Freisinger is discredited with a joke for a legitimate demand. Blanchot's more problematic statement is met with a mild comment. Asymmetry clearly demonstrable.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 05:56

Triggering event: Freisinger quotes a Quranic verse about beating women.

Quote (presenter) *"Stop, stop." — interrupts Freisinger and gives Blanchot the floor.*

Comparison Blanchot at 06:29: "You take a piece of the Quran out and interpret it exactly as you wish" — presenter lets Blanchot finish without interruption.

Asymmetry: Freisinger is interrupted, Blanchot is not. Triggering event for Freisinger: Quranic interpretation. Analogous event for Blanchot: counter-attack on Freisinger — no interruption.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp 74:44

Triggering event: End of broadcast.

Quote (presenter) *"Thank you for having taken part in the first discussion on television this evening."*

Comparison Freisinger receives no comparable positive closing formulation.

Asymmetry: The positive closing formulation for Blanchot is an implicit expression of sympathy that is not repeated for other guests.

*Summary: The moderation behaviour shows a demonstrable asymmetry: Freisinger is interrupted and commented on more sharply than Blanchot. The closing formulation favours Blanchot. This asymmetry is methodologically substantiated through the comparison of analogous triggering events.*



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

To Blanchot,  
20

11: "If your children, for example, were to decide tomorrow to convert to Catholicism or Protestantism, how would you react?" — neutral/soft

To Freisinger,  
35

07: "Are you not responsible for the radicalisation?" — hard, implies guilt

Comparison

Freisinger is held responsible for the radicalisation (leading question), while Blanchot receives an open question about family decisions.

#### Asymmetry 2:

To Blanchot,  
74

44: "Thank you for having taken part in the first discussion on television this evening." — positive, no critical closing question

To Freisinger

No comparable positive closing formulation; last interaction is the "comedy stage" comment.

Comparison

Blanchot receives a positive closing formulation, Freisinger a discrediting.

*Summary: The questions to Freisinger tend to be harder and more suggestive (responsibility for radicalisation) than the questions to Blanchot. The closing formulations are clearly asymmetric.*



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

50:00 (entire broadcast)

Construct: The broadcast juxtaposes "Islam" and the "Swiss rule of law" as two equally valid positions that must be discussed.

#### Analysis

The question of whether the Islamic Central Council accepts the legal order is not a question of balance — it is a legal question. Blanchot repeatedly says he accepts the legal order. The broadcast treats this statement as equally valid to the claim that he does not, without empirical verification. This is a false balance: two positions are treated as equally valid, although one (Blanchot's adherence to the rule of law) would be verifiable.

*Summary: The broadcast creates a false balance between Blanchot's adherence to the rule of law (which he repeatedly affirms) and doubts about it (which are expressed without evidence). An independent verification would have resolved the balance.*



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Muslim religious practice is per se suspect and must justify itself.

**Timestamp** 00:22 — Evidence: "How dangerous are the radical Muslims in Switzerland?"

Alternative agenda: "How can Switzerland reconcile religious diversity and the rule of law?" or "What does research show about the integration of Muslims in Switzerland?"

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The Islamic Central Council is the relevant voice for Muslims in Switzerland.

**Timestamp** 00:40 — Evidence: Blanchot as main guest, although he represents a small, controversial organisation.

Alternative agenda: Representative Muslim voices (large umbrella associations, liberal Muslims) would have completed the picture.

*Summary: The broadcast sets an agenda that frames Muslim religious practice as a security problem and treats the Islamic Central Council as a representative Muslim voice. Both agenda decisions distort the overall picture.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 5.4 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 5.8 / 10

### Dominant techniques

- 1. Guilt by Association (score 7):** The broadcast begins with the Bin Laden association and continues this through unsubstantiated allegations (terrorist training, Bin Laden picture). Blanchot must defend himself throughout the entire broadcast against associations that are not substantiated by primary sources.
- 2. Framing (score 7):** The threat frame ("How dangerous are the radical Muslims?") is maintained through the title question, introduction and moderation questions. Muslim religious practice is framed as a security problem requiring explanation, not as a normal right.
- 3. Agenda-Setting (score 7):** The broadcast sets the agenda that Muslim religious practice is per se suspect and must justify itself. The Islamic Central Council is treated as a representative Muslim voice, although it is a small, controversial organisation.

### Core messages of the broadcast

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "Fundamentalist Quranic interpretation is incompatible with the Swiss rule of law, and the Islamic Central Council is a potential breeding ground for radicalisation."

**Technique:** Framing, agenda-setting, guilt by association — evidence: 00:22, 01:13, 57:30

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "Nicolas Blanchot is a dangerous fundamentalist who does not truly accept the legal order, even though he claims to."

**Technique:** Guilt by association, moderation behaviour, timing — evidence: 01:13, 36:15, 57:30

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "Switzerland must be vigilant against a strategic Islamisation that undermines the legal order under the guise of freedom of religion."

**Technique:** Choice of words, framing, agenda-setting — evidence: 00:22, 28:29, 15:00

Justification: With an overall score of 5.6/10, the broadcast falls in the range of "clear one-sidedness". The one-sidedness manifests primarily in the framing (threat frame), in the expert selection (no Islamic studies scholars), in the guilt-by-association technique (Bin Laden association) and in the moderation behaviour (asymmetric treatment of Freisinger and Blanchot). At the same time, there are elements that show a certain balance: Blanchot receives a lot of speaking time, several guests defend the right to Muslim religious practice, and the presenter formally distances himself from the Bin Laden association. Art. 4 RTVA requires accurate representation and diversity of opinion — the missing specialist voices (Islamic studies, intelligence service, integration research) and the threat frame constitute a clear violation of the accuracy requirement.

### CONCLUSION

The Arena broadcast "How dangerous are the radical Muslims in Switzerland?" exhibits a clear one-sidedness that arises primarily through structural decisions (title question, expert selection, framing) and not through open partisanship. The threat frame, maintained from the title question to the closing formulation, forces Muslim guests into a permanent defensive position and prevents a factual discussion. The absence of academic Islamic studies scholars, constitutional law experts and integration research means that the title question ("How dangerous?") cannot be answered factually — the broadcast remains at the level of opinions and anecdotes. The moderation behaviour shows a demonstrable asymmetry: Freisinger is discredited for legitimate demands, while Blanchot's problematic statement (stoning as freedom of belief) is treated more mildly. According to Art. 4 RTVA, which requires accurate representation and diversity of opinion on controversial topics, the broadcast is deficient in several respects: the missing specialist voices violate the accuracy requirement, the threat frame violates the requirement of balanced presentation, and the unsubstantiated allegations (Bin Laden picture, terrorist training) without primary sources violate the requirement of factual accuracy.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	6	●●●
2	SOURCE SELECTION	5	●●●
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	4	●●
4	OMISSION (Selective Omission)	6	●●●
5	MANIPULATION OF FIGURES	3	●●
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	7	●●●●
7	TIMING	7	●●●●
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	5	●●●
9	COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)	6	●●●
10	FRAMING (Setting the frame)	7	●●●●
11	CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS	6	●●●
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	6	●●●
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	5	●●●
14	FALSE BALANCE	4	●●
15	AGENDA-SETTING	7	●●●●

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

**5.4/10**

*Considerable bias*

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

**5.8/10**

*Considerable bias*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**5.6/10**

*Considerable bias*

*Averaged from hard facts and soft facts*



## KEY — Meaning of scores

### Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

<b>0</b>	<b>No finding</b>	No relevant anomaly identified.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor anomaly without material impairment of balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Slight to moderate finding</b>	Recognisable tendency; impact relevance low to moderate.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with impact relevance</b>	Relevant bias that influences the opinion-forming potential of the audience.
<b>6</b>	<b>Considerable finding (threshold)</b>	Scores from 6 onwards are reported as "considerable findings".
<b>7</b>	<b>Considerable finding</b>	Clear, well-substantiated bias with marked impact relevance.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Serious finding</b>	Pronounced bias; several substantiable individual findings in this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum expression</b>	Systematic, pervasive bias in this criterion.

### Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Unremarkable</b>	No material patterns recognisable; broadcast meets the accuracy requirement.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Slight bias</b>	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
<b>4.1 – 6.0</b>	<b>Considerable bias</b>	Several considerable findings; relevant impairment of diversity of perspectives.
<b>6.1 – 8.0</b>	<b>Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation</b>	Pronounced, broadcast-wide patterns; high impact relevance.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias</b>	Maximum expression across almost all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

### Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	Party is clearly disadvantaged in portrayal, speaking time or framing.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Recognisable but weak disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No discernible preference or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favoured</b>	Recognisable but weak preference.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favoured</b>	Party is clearly favoured in portrayal, speaking time or framing.



## CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Art. 4 RTVA)

### Assessment under Art. 4 RTVA

---

#### Violation 1:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (accurate representation of facts and events)

Facts: Unsubstantiated claims about the Islamic Central Council are put forward without primary sources and not consistently challenged.

Evidence: Timestamp 57:30 — Quote: "There are members of your organisation who have a picture of Osama Bin Laden on their computer." / 58:42: "The father says, in the press, that he is in terrorist training."

Assessment: These claims are made without source citation. An accurate representation would either name the primary source or identify the claim as unsubstantiated. The broadcast does neither, which violates the accuracy requirement.

#### Violation 2:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA (diversity of opinion on controversial topics)

Facts: Not a single academic Islamic studies scholar is represented in the broadcast. All "experts" are journalists or practitioners without specialist training in Islamic studies.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:29 (Gisling as "expert"), 41:22 (Stamm as sect expert), 48:38 (Maurer as theologian)

Assessment: On a topic that touches on Islamic theology, Quranic interpretation and sharia, the absence of academic Islamic studies is a structural violation of the diversity requirement. Diversity of opinion is not guaranteed when all "experts" come from the same non-specialist milieu.

#### Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (accurate representation) in conjunction with Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA (balance)

Facts: The title question "How dangerous are the radical Muslims in Switzerland?" presupposes radicalism and dangerousness as given.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:22 — Quote: "How dangerous are the radical Muslims in Switzerland?"

Assessment: An accurate title question would pose the question to be examined openly, not presuppose it as given. The presupposition "radical" is an editorial pre-decision that violates the accuracy requirement and sets the threat frame for the entire broadcast.

### Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

---

The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in three dimensions: firstly through unsubstantiated claims without primary sources (accuracy requirement), secondly through the absence of academic specialist voices on a theological-legal topic (diversity requirement), and thirdly through the presupposing threat frame of the title question (balance requirement). The violations are structural in nature — they result from editorial decisions (title question, expert selection, framing) and not from individual moderation errors. A complaint to OFCOM or the IRAB would be justifiable on the basis of these findings, whereby the threshold for a formal objection (systematic, serious violation) is narrowly reached.



## CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

### 1. Hugo Stamm (sect expert)

- FUNDING:** Freelance journalist; long-standing connection to Reformed Church structures (Tages-Anzeiger, Reformed media). Structural conflict of interest possible when assessing religious competitors.
- MANDATE:** Sect expert — the Islamic Central Council is not a sect in the classical sense. Assessment outside mandate.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in maintaining relevance as a sect expert; Islam criticism increases demand for his expertise.
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -1
  - D2 Personal risk: 0
  - D3 Professional competence: -1
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: +1
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1
  - D6 Source level: -1**TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Conversion researcher with empirical data (e.g. Monika Wohlrab-Sahr, University of Leipzig) is missing.

### 2. Mr Maurer (theologian/management consultant)

- FUNDING:** Active in the private sector. No recognisable institutional conflict of interest.
- MANDATE:** Christian theologian with a focus on management consulting — statements about Islamic theology are outside his mandate.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** No recognisable institutional conflict of interest; possible personal interest in Islam-critical positioning as a differentiating feature.
  - D1 Conflict of interest: +1
  - D2 Personal risk: 0
  - D3 Professional competence: -1
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: +1
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1
  - D6 Source level: -1**TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Islamic studies scholar (e.g. Reinhard Schulze, University of Bern) is missing.

### 3. Mr Raff (Islamic studies scholar/jurist)

- FUNDING:** Not specified. Institutional affiliation unclear.
- MANDATE:** Introduced as Islamic studies scholar/jurist — qualifications not specified; statements appear more professionally grounded than those of other guests.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Not recognisable.
  - D1 Conflict of interest: +1
  - D2 Personal risk: +1
  - D3 Professional competence: +1
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: +1
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1
  - D6 Source level: 0**TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** None necessary — Raff takes a differentiated position.

### 4. Mr Lieberherr (organisation "Strategic Islamisation")

- FUNDING:** Not specified. Organisation with an Islam-critical mandate.
- MANDATE:** Islam-critical advocacy organisation — structurally partisan.



**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in portraying Islam as a threat (maintaining the organisation's relevance).

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2
- D2 Personal risk: 0
- D3 Professional competence: -1
- D4 Consistency of opinion: +1
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1
- D6 Source level: -2

**TOTAL: -5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED**

**5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Muslim umbrella associations (Kudluka, Afschar) are present, but Lieberherr's statements are not systematically challenged.

*IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. Lieberherr is introduced as a representative of an Islam-critical organisation without his structural conflict of interest being made explicit. Stamm is introduced as a "sect expert" without his assessment outside his mandate being addressed. Both are framed as neutral specialist voices, although they are structurally partisan.*

### Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Traffic light
Hugo Stamm (sect expert)	-1	0	-1	+1	-1	-1	-3	YELLOW
Mr Maurer (theologian/management consultant)	+1	0	-1	+1	-1	-1	-1	YELLOW
Mr Raff (Islamic studies scholar/jurist)	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+5	GREEN
Mr Lieberherr (organisation "Strategic Islamisation")	-2	0	-1	+1	-1	-2	-5	RED

### Legal and methodological classification

<b>No finding of fact</b>	The results presented do not constitute findings of fact about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a determination of individual responsibility.
<b>No legal ruling</b>	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of Art. 4 RTVA. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular the IRAB).
<b>No proof of causality</b>	Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intentions. Deviation values can be influenced by topic selection, news situation, political controversy or format logic.
<b>No judgement of intent</b>	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a considerable bias has been identified — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.



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

**Heuristic  
comparison  
instrument**

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



## APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

### Legal basis Switzerland — SRG SSR

---

#### Law

---

Federal Act on Radio and Television (RTVA, SR 784.40)

#### Relevant articles

---

- Art. 4 para. 1 RTVA: All broadcasts of a radio or television programme must respect fundamental rights. The broadcasts must in particular respect human dignity, must not be discriminatory, must not contribute to racial hatred, must not endanger public morality, and must not glorify or trivialise violence.
- Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA: Editorial broadcasts with informational content must present facts and events accurately, so that the public can form its own opinion. Views and comments must be recognisable as such.
- Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA: In the totality of editorial broadcasts, the diversity of events and opinions must be adequately expressed (diversity requirement).

#### Core obligations

---

1. **Accuracy:** Accurate representation of facts and events
2. **Diversity of opinion:** Diversity of views on controversial topics
3. **Balance:** Balanced selection of interlocutors

#### Supervisory authority

---

- IRAB (Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television): Reviews complaints against broadcast programmes for violation of Art. 4 RTVA
- OFCOM (Federal Office of Communications): Regulatory and supervisory authority
- SRG ombudsman offices: First point of contact for programme complaints

#### Complaints procedure

---

1. Ombudsman office of the respective business unit (SRF, RTS, RSI, RTR)
2. IRAB (if no agreement)
3. Federal Supreme Court (last instance)



## APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS

### Literature

---

- 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 – Research Centre Public Sphere and Society (2024). *Yearbook Quality of the Media 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). *Methods report v4.1: Countable criteria and multi-model cross-validation*.
- 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*

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | [www.svfab.ch](http://www.svfab.ch) | [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch) | *Methods report March 2026* | Converter 3.4 (2026-05-20)



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

## Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you not only receive further detailed evaluations, but can also have them produced for any broadcasts of your choice (we charge for this).

In order to make our work solid, we depend on membership and patron contributions.

### 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

**Recipient:** 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

## You can obtain the following books 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: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and source selection. Subsequently, 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with many examples. In addition, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques — this promotes not only insight 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 do not know this provide material. Good quotes that are cut incorrectly. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers that are framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox — for all those who have a microphone in front of their face and want to know what they can do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three basic principles of sovereignty — anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what counts after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers — for all those who are exposed and want to understand how the game works. So that they stop playing along — and start shaping it.

In A5. Direct. For preparation, for reference, for follow-up and in case of difficulties



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



**You think you see the world.** In reality you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It does not 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 participate. Daily. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You learn not only how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Listen to the news differently. Conduct conversations more confidently. And can no longer so easily have a frame imposed on them that someone else has chosen.

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

**Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.**



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year — compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can lodge a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the IRAB, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

Only: it is not independent. It has no sanctioning powers. And in 99.6% of all cases it decides: nothing.

This analysis lays the system bare — factually, precisely, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional law review that shows: the IRAB system meets none of the three fundamental criteria — it is not appropriate, not subject to separation of powers, not market-based. The authority that is supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it was supposed to control.

Essential reading for all those considering a complaint — and for all those who want to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still outstanding.