



SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2013-11-06 Rundschau vom 06.11.2013

Programme: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2013-11-06 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 14:54

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

OVERALL SCORE

7.1/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

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	Left	Left	Left	Centre	Right	Right	Right

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

3.2 / 10

Favouring left

0 1 2 **3** 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

This section serves the purpose of political classification and does not feed into the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Switzerland is a consensus democracy with a 7-member Federal Council based on the magic formula: SVP (2 seats), SP (2 seats), FDP (2 seats), Centre (1 seat). There is no classic government/opposition divide — all major parties are represented in government. The Greens, GLP and EVP are not in the Federal Council.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NC	Government/Opposition	Core position
SVP	8.0	62	Government (2 FC)	Restrict migration, sovereignty, reduction of state
SP	2.5	41	Government (2 FC)	Welfare state, redistribution, EU rapprochement
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Economic freedom, lean state, bilateral agreements
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatism, family relief, cost containment
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Climate protection, disarmament, solidarity
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Green economy, liberal migration, innovation
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Christian values, centrist course

The dominant lines of conflict in Switzerland are: (1) migration and asylum policy (SVP vs. SP/Greens), (2) relationship with the EU and Bilateral III (FDP/Centre/SP vs. SVP), (3) climate policy and energy transition (Greens/SP vs. SVP/FDP), (4) healthcare costs and health insurance premiums (single-payer SP/Greens vs. competitive model FDP/SVP). The broadcast does not touch on any of these lines of tension directly — it deals with a pharmaceutical liability topic and US foreign policy.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is the public broadcaster of Switzerland, financed through Serafe fees and committed to Art. 4 RTVA (accurate representation, diversity of opinion, impartiality). Rundschau is SRF's political magazine and has an explicit investigative mandate. As a public broadcaster, SRF is subject to the supervision of OFCOM and the IHRA (Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television).



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Preliminary remark: This broadcast deals with two topics — the Yasmin pill/pharmaceutical liability and Obama/NSA — which do not touch on direct Swiss party positions. Party-political bias is therefore structurally barely measurable. The assessment is based on indirect points of contact (regulation, pharmaceutical lobby, state supervision).

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	0	Not mentioned. The pharmaceutical regulation topic does not touch on the SVP position (personal responsibility, against over-regulation) — omitted
SP	0	Not mentioned. The SP position (stronger state control, consumer protection) would have been thematically relevant — omitted
FDP	0	Not mentioned. The FDP position (market solutions, competition in healthcare) would have been relevant — omitted
Centre	0	Not mentioned. The Centre position (cost containment, premium relief) is touched upon — omitted
Greens	0	Not mentioned. The Greens position (public healthcare provision) would have been relevant — omitted
GLP	0	Not mentioned — omitted
EVP	0	Not mentioned — omitted

Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: No party portrayed (all score 0)
- Strongest distortion: No direct distortion of party positions
- Average deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: The broadcast contains no measurable party-political bias in the strict sense, as no Swiss party is explicitly mentioned or positioned. Indirectly, however, it can be noted that the broadcast adopts a regulation-critical, state-sceptical stance towards pharmaceutical companies, which structurally corresponds more to left-progressive positions (SP, Greens) without explicitly naming them. The question about the pharmaceutical lobby (19:29) points to an implicit regulatory preference that is not party-politically neutral.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast data

- Title: SRF Rundschau
- Date: 06.11.2013
- Presenter/Reporter: Sandro Brotz (presenter); Marc Meschenmoser, Romana Kaiser, Karin Bauer (reporters)
- Persons interviewed:

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Stefan Kräböl	President of the Swissmedic Commission, Chief Physician at the University Hospital Basel	State/regulatory	Neutral (authority)
Claudia Pfleger	Selin's mother, plaintiff	Private individual	Victim side
Felix Rüeg	Selin's lawyer	Private law	Victim side
Filomena Collatrella	Secretary General of CSS	Health insurer	Institutional
Mike Papantonio	US lawyer, class actions against Bayer	Plaintiff side USA	Victim side/lawyer
David A. Kessler	Former FDA chief, expert witness for victim lawyers	Victim lawyers (paid)	Victim side
Thomas Drake	NSA whistleblower	Civil society/critic	Left-liberal
Morris Davis	Former Guantanamo prosecutor	Military/critic	Critical-institutional
Lynn (first name)	Former drone coordinator	US military	Critical-institutional
Nabila / Zubair	Drone victims Pakistan	Civil society	Victim side
Janine McMahon	Yasmin victim USA	Private individual	Victim side

Main topic

The broadcast examines in two segments: (1) the liability question regarding health damage caused by the contraceptive pill Yasmin by the Bayer corporation and the inadequacies of the Swiss legal system compared to the USA; (2) the discrepancy between Obama's civil rights promises and his actual security policy (NSA, drones, Guantanamo).



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts

Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically robust

1. EXPERT SELECTION

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: David A. Kessler, former FDA chief

Timestamp	07:55
Statement	"Bayer withheld information. [...] Bayer decided not to inform the authority about a side effect before Yasmin was approved."
Classification	Kessler is introduced as "formerly the highest chief of the American drug authority FDA" — a qualification that suggests neutrality. In fact, he produced his expert report on behalf of the victim lawyers (08:01: "examined on behalf of the victim lawyers"). He is therefore a paid partisan expert, not a neutral expert witness.
Missing counter-voice	A pharmacology expert commissioned by Bayer or an independent body would have provided the opposing perspective.

Source in-depth check Kessler:

(a) FUNDING: Paid by victim lawyers (Papantonio et al.) — explicitly stated in the transcript (08:01). Structural conflict of interest: the more strongly his report incriminates Bayer, the higher the settlement sums, the higher the lawyers' fees (contingency fees typically 30-40%).

(b) MANDATE: Not compatible with a neutral assessment. His mandate is to document Bayer's misconduct — not to assess the overall situation.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Paid partisan expert for the plaintiff side

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Former official, career not at risk, but reputation is at stake

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Former FDA chief, genuine expertise in drug approval

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No information about previous statements on Yasmin

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — References report and internal documents, but report itself not shown

D6 Source level: +1 — Secondary (expert report based on internal documents that are not shown)

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The broadcast frames Kessler as a neutral expert ("formerly the highest chief of the FDA"), even though he is structurally partisan. This is a classic technique no. 2 (source selection as pseudo-authority).

Expert 2: Mike Papantonio, US lawyer

Timestamp	07:21
Statement	"Bayer pays these compensations because this allows them to avoid having to testify in court."



Classification	Papantonio is a plaintiff lawyer with a direct financial interest in high settlement sums. He is introduced as "co-responsible for pill victims in the USA being compensated out of court" — a positive framing that conceals his conflict of interest.
Missing counter-voice	A corporate lawyer or pharmaceutical law specialist would have explained the logic of out-of-court settlements in a neutral manner.

Source in-depth check Papantonio:

(a) FUNDING: Contingency-fee lawyer — earns a percentage of settlement sums. Direct financial interest in maximum portrayal of damages.

(b) MANDATE: Completely incompatible with a neutral assessment. His profession is to harm Bayer.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct financial interest

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Gains from these statements (reputation, clients)

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Familiar with the US legal system, but not a medical expert

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No information

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Appellative ("the conduct of this company would become public")

D6 Source level: -1 — No primary sources shown

TOTAL: -4 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW (borderline)

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Papantonio is framed as a fighter for justice, not as an advocate with financial motives.

Expert 3: Stefan Kräböl, President of the Swissmedic Commission

Timestamp	15:21
Statement	"But it does not make sense to remove a single preparation or a single group of preparations from the market on merit."
Classification	Kräböl is the only expert who presents a differentiated position. However, he is placed under considerable pressure from the presenter and his factual arguments are repeatedly interrupted by emotional questions.

Source in-depth check Kräböl:

(a) FUNDING: State-funded (Swissmedic is a federal authority). No direct conflict of interest in pharmaceutical assessment, but institutional interest in defending its own approval decisions.

(b) MANDATE: Largely compatible with a neutral assessment, as Swissmedic is an independent regulatory authority.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — State-funded, no direct pharmaceutical conflict, but self-interest in defending own decisions

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Faces critical questions in the studio

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Chief Physician at the University Hospital Basel, expert in drug safety

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Represents a consistent regulatory position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Data-based, references studies

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary (own authority data)

TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Kräböl is the most credible expert in the broadcast, but is systematically put on the defensive by the presenter's conduct.

Missing expert groups:

- Independent pharmacologist (no connection to plaintiff or defendant side)
- Gynaecologist from practice
- Swiss professor of product liability law



Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
David A. Kessler, former FDA chief	-2	+1	+2	0	+1	+1	+3	YELLOW
Mike Papantonio, US lawyer	-2	-1	+1	0	-1	-1	-4	YELLOW
Stefan Kräböl, President of the Swissmedic Commission	0	+1	+2	+1	+2	+1	+7	GREEN

Summary:

- Kessler: **YELLOW (+3)** — paid partisan expert, framed as neutral
- Papantonio: **YELLOW (-4)** — advocate with financial motives, framed as fighter for justice
- Kräböl: **GREEN (+7)** — most credible expert, but under systematic presenter pressure



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: Bayer AG (written statements)

Timestamp

08:34 — Statement: "Bayer had continuously informed the approval authorities worldwide. Bayer has honestly informed about new scientific findings on the safety of its preparations."

- (a) **Funding and sponsorship:** Listed pharmaceutical corporation, self-interest in product protection
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Obvious — Bayer has a direct interest in avoiding liability
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** An independent scientific review of the Bayer studies is absent

Source 2: Kessler report (not shown)

Timestamp

08:10 — Statement: "This is the conclusion he reaches in this report."

- (a) **Funding:** Victim lawyers (Papantonio et al.)
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Partisan expert report
- (c) The report is not shown, not quoted, not made accessible — it exists only as a claim in the transcript

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 07:43

Claim: "If it came to a trial, the whole story would become public. The conduct of this company would become public."

Word marker: "would" (subjunctive, speculation)

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

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 08:05

Claim: "Before the drug was approved, Bayer had concealed the higher thrombosis risk."

Word marker: "had" (subjunctive, indirect speech without primary source in the report)

Primary source available: No (Kessler report is mentioned but not shown) — penalty point (+1)

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 26:06

Claim: "In Pakistan alone, Obama ordered six times more operations, which in total claimed up to 3,600 victims."

Word marker: "up to" (estimate without source citation)

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

Score with penalty points: Base 4 + 3 penalty points = 7/10

Summary: The source selection is structurally one-sided — all cited experts and sources stand on the plaintiff/victim side or are state regulators. Bayer is heard exclusively through written statements. Several central claims (Kessler report, drone figures) are presented without accessible primary sources.



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

Estimated speaking time (Yasmin segment):

- Victim side (Claudia Pfleger, Selin scenes, Janine McMahon): (24%)
- Plaintiff lawyers/experts victim side (Papantonio, Kessler, Rüeg): (16%)
- CSS (Collatrella): (8%)
- Bayer (written statements, read aloud): approx. 1.5 min. (6%)
- Kräböl (Swissmedic): (36%)
- Presenter/commentary: approx. 2.5 min. (10%)

Estimated speaking time (Obama segment):

- Critics of Obama (Drake, Davis, Lynn, victims): (77%)
- Obama (archive material, quotes): (15%)
- Presenter/commentary: (8%)

Summary: In the Yasmin segment, the victim/plaintiff side receives approximately 48% of speaking time combined, while Bayer receives only 6% (exclusively in writing). Kräböl receives 36% of the time, but is under constant presenter pressure. In the Obama segment, critics receive 77% of the time — Obama is heard only through archive material. The time distribution is strongly asymmetric in both segments.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Omission 1:

Context

The Swiss Product Liability Act (PrHG) and its rules on the burden of proof are never explained.

Relevant at: Timestamp 04:18 — "The claim is dismissed."

Effect

The ruling appears as a moral failure or corruption, even though it represents the correct application of existing law. Viewers cannot distinguish between "unjust law" and "incorrectly applied law."

Omission 2:

Context

The fact that millions of women take Yasmin without harm is never mentioned.

Relevant at: Timestamp 03:27 — "Annual turnover of over one billion francs."

Effect

The high turnover is framed as evidence of greed, not as evidence of broad acceptance and efficacy. The total population of users is completely absent.

Omission 3:

Context

The problems of the US class action system (contingency fees, potential for abuse, settlements without admission of guilt as risk avoidance) are not addressed.

Relevant at: Timestamp 07:03 — "Bayer has so far paid over 7,600 women the sum of 1.57 billion US dollars."

Effect

The US system is presented uncritically as a model; Kräböl's remark (16:31: "We cannot compare the two legal systems") is dismissed by the presenter as an excuse.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits all information that would complicate the picture of a clearly guilty corporation and a clearly failing legal system. Particularly serious is the absence of the legal explanation of the ruling and the perspective of the majority of users.

Missing voices

- Gynaecologist: Would have explained how doctors inform patients about risks and what role the package inserts play in practice
- Law professor/product liability expert: Would have explained the logic of the Swiss PrHG and why the ruling can be legally correct even if it appears morally unsatisfactory
- Pharmacologist: Would have placed the scientific controversy about the thrombosis risk of different pill types in a neutral context
- Woman without Yasmin-related harm: Would have represented the perspective of the majority of users
- Critical US legal expert: Would have presented the problems of the US class action system (contingency fees, potential for abuse)
- Bayer representative (live): Would have been able to represent the company's position directly; the refusal of the invitation is not further addressed



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

- Epidemiologist: Would have placed the absolute thrombosis risk in the population context
- IV/social insurance expert: Would have systematically placed the question of the social distribution of costs for drug-related harm in context



5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES						6/10			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	03:30
Figure: "Yasmin, like other modern pills, has a twice as high thrombosis risk compared to older pills from the 70s and early 80s."	
Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — not stated; (b) Proportion — "twice as high" (relative risk); (c) Trend — not stated	
Missing context	The absolute risk is absent. "Twice as high" sounds dramatic, but if the baseline risk is 4 in 10,000, "twice" means 8 in 10,000 — i.e. 0.08%. Kräböl mentions this later (19:00), but the presenter does not allow it to stand.
Effect	Viewers perceive "twice as high a risk" as threatening without knowing the absolute context.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	07:03
Figure: "Bayer has so far paid over 7,600 women the sum of 1.57 billion US dollars."	
Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — 1.57 bn USD; (b) Proportion — not stated (how many women take Yasmin worldwide?); (c) Trend — not stated	
Missing context	How many millions of women take Yasmin? 7,600 settlements with e.g. 10 million users would be 0.076%. Without the total population, the figure cannot be contextualised.
Effect	7,600 victims and 1.57 bn USD sound like a catastrophe; the proportion of the total user population is absent.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	26:03
Figure: "Obama did not arm any less. He inflated the budget of the controversial intelligence service NSA by half to 10.8 billion dollars."	
Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — 10.8 bn; (b) Proportion — not stated (proportion of total budget?); (c) Trend — "by half" (relative growth)	
Missing context	No comparison with other intelligence budgets, no context regarding inflation or the total defence budget.
Effect	Figure appears dramatic without contextualisation.

Summary: The broadcast consistently uses relative risk figures without absolute contextualisation and absolute damage figures without a total population. This systematically creates a distorted impression of the actual risk dimension.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp

19:29

Quote

"Are you intimidated because there is a relatively powerful pharmaceutical lobby in the background?"

Technique: Kräböl is implicitly associated with the "pharmaceutical lobby" through the question — as if his factual position were based not on data but on lobby influence.

Effect

Kräböl's scientific arguments are delegitimised through the association with lobby interests, without any concrete evidence of lobby influence being provided.

Association 2:

Timestamp

03:19

Quote

"Yasmin is one of Bayer's best-selling drugs, worldwide. Annual turnover of over one billion francs."

Technique: High turnover is placed immediately after the account of Selin's fate — implicit association: Bayer earns billions at the expense of victims like Selin.

Effect

Commercial success is framed as moral guilt.

Summary: Guilt by association is used moderately in this broadcast — most clearly in the lobby question directed at Kräböl, which delegitimises his factual position through association with interest politics.



7. TIMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:00-01:12 (beginning)

Content: "Battle against pharma giant" — title immediately sets the conflict frame

Timing effect

The term "pharma giant" in the title establishes the power imbalance (small victim vs. large corporation) before any information is provided and shapes the entire reception of the broadcast.

Finding 2:

Position: 01:13-03:00 (beginning)

Content: Emotional account of Selin's fate (cardiac arrest, need for care, mother weeping) before any factual information

Timing effect

The emotional conditioning takes place before figures, the legal situation or the scientific controversy are presented. Viewers are emotionally engaged before they can make a factual judgement.

Finding 3:

Position: 14:46 (shortly before studio interview)

Content: Mother tells Selin the verdict — Selin responds with "Yes" to "We must keep fighting"

Timing effect

This highly emotional scene is placed immediately before the studio interview with Kräböl. Every factual statement by Kräböl is received against the emotional backdrop of this scene.

Summary: The timing is strategically aimed at maximum emotional conditioning — emotional victim scenes frame all factual information and make a rational contextualisation of the regulatory arguments more difficult.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

7/10

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)

Methodological principle K11+K8: Before each assessment, the triggering event is documented.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 15:39-15:54

Triggering event: Presenter Brotz confronts Kräböl with the ruling (Selin must pay 120,000 CHF) and asks him explicitly "not as an expert, not as a jurist, not as a physician, but as a human being. What do you think of that?"
Reaction: Kräböl says "At first glance it is incredible. It is emotionally moving."

Comparison

No analogous event — a Bayer representative is not present; Papantonio and Kessler are never asked about their human reaction to the billion-franc profits of Bayer, which they themselves have helped to generate.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — The presenter demands from Kräböl (state regulator) an emotional statement that puts him in conflict with his factual function. No analogous emotional self-reflection is demanded from the plaintiff lawyers (e.g. "What do you think as a human being about receiving 30% of the settlement sums as your fee?").

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp 19:55-20:08

Triggering event: Kräböl explains factually that the risk is not large enough for a market withdrawal.
Reaction: Presenter: "But that means, to put it plainly, that human lives will have to be accepted as collateral damage in future."

Comparison

Papantonio says (07:34-07:47) that Bayer pays settlements to avoid court proceedings — a statement that implies Bayer accepts victims. No analogous outrage reaction from the presenter.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — Kräböl's factual regulatory logic is reformulated as "accepting human lives as collateral damage"; Papantonio's implicit statement that Bayer calculates victims is not reformulated analogously.

Degree of outrage: 4/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Summary: The selective outrage is directed exclusively against the state regulator (Kräböl) and implicitly against Bayer, never against the plaintiff lawyers or the US legal system. This is methodologically demonstrable, as comparable triggers in other positions do not produce an analogous reaction.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 04:18

Missing perspective/fact: The Swiss Product Liability Act (PrHG Art. 4) requires that the injured party prove the defect of the product, the damage and the causal connection. The court did not decide that Bayer is innocent, but that the proof was not provided.

Relevance: Without this information, the ruling appears as a failure of justice or corruption.

Impact: Viewers cannot distinguish between "the law is wrong" and "the law was applied incorrectly" — a fundamental distinction for a rule-of-law debate.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 11:44

Missing perspective/fact: Kräböl mentions that older pills have side effects such as weight gain. Not mentioned: older pills also have other risk profiles (e.g. higher risk of certain cancers with some formulations). The comparison "old pill = safer" is medically oversimplified.

Relevance: The decision between pill types is medically complex; the broadcast simplifies it to "new pill = more dangerous."

Impact: Women could be unnecessarily unsettled without having complete risk information.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 13:01

Missing perspective/fact: CSS is suing Bayer — but the broadcast does not mention that health insurers have an institutional interest in shifting costs to third parties, independent of the medical question.

Relevance: Collatrella is presented as a moral voice ("The Celine case must not become the rule") without addressing her institutional self-interest.

Impact: CSS appears as an altruistic actor, even though it is primarily seeking cost reimbursement.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits all information that would complicate the picture of a clearly guilty corporation, a clearly failing legal system and clearly altruistic plaintiffs. The overall picture is thereby structurally distorted.

Soft facts

The Yasmin topic is set in the context of an international debate about the increased thrombosis risk of newer contraceptive pills (containing drospirenone), which has been scientifically documented since approximately 2009. In the USA, over 7,600 settlements were concluded (1.57 bn USD), while the Swiss legal system structurally impedes product liability claims. The Obama topic is embedded in the Snowden revelations of 2013, which triggered a global debate about state surveillance, drone warfare and Guantanamo. Both topics touch on the question of who holds the powerful to account — courts, media or civil society.



Proportion of perspectives covered

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

- [A] Medical-epidemiological contextualisation:** Absolute vs. relative thrombosis risk compared to pregnancy and other contraceptive methods
- [B] Regulatory perspective:** How does Swiss product liability law work, why is the burden of proof so high?
- [C] Bayer perspective:** Full presentation of the company's position (not only written statements)
- [D] Gynaecological practice:** How do doctors inform patients about risks?
- [E] Comparison with other drugs:** What risks do other contraceptive methods carry?
- [F] Scientific controversy:** Are there studies that show no increased risk?
- [G] Legal system comparison:** Why is the US plaintiff lawyer system not without problems?
- [H] Patient perspective:** Women who take Yasmin and have no problems
- [I] Health economics:** Cost-benefit analysis of contraceptive methods
- [J] Swissmedic decision-making process:** How are approval decisions made?

[A] INDICATED

Timestamp: 19:00 — Quote: "The absolute risk, that is, the risk for a woman of actually developing a thrombosis, is still small" — Assessment: Kräböl briefly mentions the absolute risk, but the presenter does not allow this contextualisation to stand and immediately returns to the emotional framing.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The Swiss Product Liability Act (PrHG) and its rules on the burden of proof are never explained; the ruling is framed as a moral failure without presenting the legal logic.

[C] INDICATED

Timestamp: 08:34 — Quote: "Bayer firmly rejects the allegations of Papantonio and Kessler" — Assessment: Bayer's position is conveyed exclusively through written statements read aloud; a company representative was invited but declined (15:14). The refusal is not further contextualised.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No doctor, no gynaecologist is heard; the question of how doctors inform patients remains unanswered.

[E] INDICATED

Timestamp: 23:04 — Quote: "The risk of the pill is much smaller than that of an unwanted pregnancy" — Assessment: Kräböl mentions the comparison, but the presenter does not follow up on it.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The scientific controversy about the actual extent of the risk is not presented; only one side of the research landscape is presented.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: 07:03 — Quote: "Bayer has so far paid over 7,600 women the sum of 1.57 billion US dollars" — Assessment: The US plaintiff lawyer system (contingency fees, class actions) is presented uncritically as a model; its own problems (abuse, excessive legal fees) are not mentioned.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No woman who takes Yasmin and has no problems is heard; the millions of women who use the drug without harm are invisible.



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

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No health-economic contextualisation; the social costs of unwanted pregnancies are not addressed.

[J] INDICATED

Timestamp: 11:15 — Quote: "Is head Ruedi Stoller examining whether to withdraw the controversial pill from the market?" — Assessment: The approval process is indicated but not explained; Stoller appears only in the report, not in the studio.

Completeness score: 3/10

Rationale: Of 10 relevant perspectives, only 3 are indicated (A, C, E) and none is fully addressed. Seven perspectives are entirely absent. The broadcast presents exclusively the victim and plaintiff side as well as a state regulatory authority under considerable presenter pressure. The scientific controversy, the legal system logic and the perspective of the majority of users are entirely absent.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:00
Quote	<i>"Battle against pharma giant"</i>
Manipulation	The title sets the entire frame as a David-vs-Goliath conflict. "Pharma giant" is not a neutral description but a power metaphor.
Why problematic	Viewers are conditioned to a conflict logic in which Bayer is by definition the powerful party and therefore the guilty one, before any information is provided.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	04:07
Quote	<i>"A mother from Schaffhausen against an international pharmaceutical corporation."</i>
Manipulation	Explicit David-vs-Goliath framing. "Mother from Schaffhausen" (local, human, vulnerable) vs. "international pharmaceutical corporation" (global, impersonal, powerful).
Why problematic	This framing prejudices the moral assessment before the ruling is explained. A rule-of-law framing would read: "Plaintiff vs. defendant before the District Court of Zurich."

Finding 3:

Timestamp	26:30
Quote	<i>"From civil rights advocate to Big Brother."</i>
Manipulation	Obama is framed through the term "Big Brother" (Orwell reference, totalitarian surveillance) — an extreme metaphor that permits no differentiation.
Why problematic	"Big Brother" is a political battle metaphor, not a journalistic description. It precludes any differentiated assessment of security-freedom trade-offs.

Summary: The framing of the broadcast is consistently oriented towards conflict and attribution of blame. Both main topics are framed as moral narratives (good vs. evil), not as complex questions of weighing up competing interests.



11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:00
Quote	"Pharma giant"
Manipulation	"Giant" is a power metaphor with a negative connotation (menace, uncontrollability).
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "pharmaceutical company Bayer" or "Bayer AG."

Finding 2:

Timestamp	04:27
Quote	"the severely disabled person is to pay 120,000 francs in legal costs to the pharma giant Bayer"
Manipulation	"Severely disabled person" (maximum vulnerability) vs. "pharma giant" (maximum power) in one sentence — rhetorical contrast that compels moral outrage.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "The plaintiff is ordered to pay the defendant legal costs of 120,000 francs" — which is actually the text of the ruling (04:29).

Finding 3:

Timestamp	19:55
Quote	"that human lives will have to be accepted as collateral damage in future"
Manipulation	The presenter reformulates Kräböl's factual regulatory logic as "accepting human lives as collateral damage" — a morally charged reformulation that makes Kräböl's position appear cynical.
Why problematic	Every regulatory decision that approves a drug with a residual risk could be described in this way — including the approval of aspirin or penicillin. The formulation is rhetorical, not analytical. Neutral alternative: "This means that a residual risk is accepted."

Summary: The choice of words is consistently aimed at emotional impact. Particularly problematic is the presenter's reformulation of Kräböl's factual statements into morally charged formulations.



12. PRESENTER CONDUCT								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Methodological principle K11+K8: Before each assessment, the triggering event is documented.

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	15:48-15:54
Triggering event: Presenter presents Kräböl with the ruling (Selin must pay 120,000 CHF).	
Quote (presenter)	<i>"I am not asking you now as an expert, not as a jurist, which you are not, not as a physician, but as a human being. What do you think of that?"</i>
Comparison	Papantonio (07:21) is not asked what he thinks "as a human being" about receiving 30-40% of the settlement sums as his fee. Kessler (07:55) is not asked what he thinks "as a human being" about being paid by the plaintiff side.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — The question "as a human being" is directed exclusively at the state regulator in order to push him out of his factual role. Plaintiff lawyers are never questioned analogously.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	22:05-22:15
Triggering event: Kräböl says he cannot rule out that pharmaceutical companies withhold negative studies.	
Quote (presenter)	<i>"But that puts you on thin ice."</i>
Comparison	Papantonio makes the unsubstantiated claim that Bayer concealed information (07:34) — no analogous critical follow-up question from the presenter.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — Kräböl's cautious, epistemically correct statement ("I cannot rule it out") is framed as a weakness; Papantonio's unsubstantiated claims are not questioned.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	24:00-24:11
Triggering event: Presenter asks Kräböl a personal question as a father.	
Quote (presenter)	<i>"You yourself are the father of a daughter. Would you tell your daughter that Yasmin is a product that can be recommended with a clear conscience?"</i>
Comparison	Papantonio and Kessler are not asked whether they would inform their daughters about the risks of the US plaintiff lawyer system. No analogous personal question to the plaintiff side.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — The personal question aims to push Kräböl out of his expert role and elicit a statement that contradicts his official position. This succeeds (24:16: "I would say, a woman who tolerates an older pill should take the older pill").

Summary: The presenter's conduct is systematically asymmetric — Kräböl (state regulator) is put under pressure through emotional questions, personal appeals and rhetorical reformulations, while plaintiff lawyers and victim



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

representatives receive no critical follow-up questions. This is methodologically demonstrable, as comparable triggers in other guests produce no analogous intervention.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Asymmetry 1:	
To Kräböl, 15	48: "I am not asking you now as an expert, not as a jurist, not as a physician, but as a human being. What do you think of that?" — hard/emotional/role-breaking
To Papantonio, 07	21: [No critical question — his statements are adopted without comment] — no question
Comparison	Kräböl is pushed out of his expert role; Papantonio is never asked about his conflict of interest.

Asymmetry 2:	
To Kräböl, 19	29: "Are you intimidated because there is a relatively powerful pharmaceutical lobby in the background?" — hard/suggestive/delegitimising
To Collatrella (CSS), 13	08: [No critical question — her statements are adopted without comment] — no question
Comparison	Kräböl is asked about lobby influence; Collatrella is not asked about the institutional self-interest of CSS.

Asymmetry 3:	
To Kräböl, 22	05: "But that puts you on thin ice." — confrontational
To Kessler, 08	14: [No critical question — his statements are presented as facts] — no question
Comparison	Kräböl's epistemically correct caution is framed as a weakness; Kessler's partisan claims are not questioned.

Summary: The question asymmetry is particularly pronounced in this broadcast — the only studio guest (Kräböl) receives exclusively hard, emotional and suggestive questions, while all other actors (Papantonio, Kessler, Collatrella) receive no critical follow-up questions. This is the strongest measurable asymmetry in the broadcast.



14. FALSE BALANCE									4/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	08:34 — Construct: Bayer's written statements are read aloud after each plaintiff statement, creating the impression of balance.
Analysis	The false balance lies in the fact that Bayer's position is presented exclusively through written statements (read aloud by the reporter), while the plaintiff side is represented through personal appearances, emotional scenes and expert interviews. The formal equal treatment (both sides are heard) conceals the structural unequal treatment (one side is alive, the other is text).

Summary: The broadcast creates the formal impression of balance by reading out Bayer's statements, while the actual portrayal is strongly asymmetric. This is a moderate false-balance technique.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: It is taken for granted that the US plaintiff lawyer system is a model for Switzerland.

Timestamp

06:57 — Evidence: "In contrast to Switzerland, such victims are financially compensated in the USA."

Alternative agenda: The Swiss system could be discussed as protection against abuse by litigation industries; the question of whether the Swiss PrHG should be reformed is not posed as a political question.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: It is taken for granted that Yasmin should be withdrawn from the market.

Timestamp

18:49 — Evidence: "You could, for example, approve the old pills and ban the new ones."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether women should have the right to choose between pill types themselves (personal responsibility) is never posed. The agenda presupposes state bans as the solution.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: It is taken for granted that Bayer is guilty.

Timestamp

04:07 — Evidence: "A mother from Schaffhausen against an international pharmaceutical corporation."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether Bayer is actually legally or morally guilty is never openly posed — it is treated as settled. The ruling of the district court (which acquits Bayer) is treated as a failure of the system, not as a potentially correct decision.

Summary: The broadcast sets an agenda in which state regulation (market withdrawal), the US litigation industry as a model and Bayer's guilt are treated as self-evident premises. Alternative agenda items (personal responsibility, criticism of the legal system, presumption of innocence) do not appear.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 7.2 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 7.0 / 10

Dominant techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Question asymmetry (score 8):** The only studio guest (Kräböl) receives exclusively hard, emotional and suggestive questions, while all plaintiff representatives receive no critical follow-up questions. This is the most direct and measurable manipulation technique in the broadcast, as it is demonstrable through direct comparison.
- 2. Omission / Selective Omission (score 8):** The broadcast systematically omits all information that would complicate the picture of a clearly guilty corporation — in particular the legal logic of the ruling, the total population of users and the problems of the US plaintiff lawyer system. This fundamentally distorts the overall picture.
- 3. Framing (score 8):** The David-vs-Goliath frame ("battle against pharma giant", "mother from Schaffhausen against international pharmaceutical corporation") and the "Big Brother" metaphor for Obama prejudice the moral assessment before any factual information and make neutral reception structurally impossible.

Core messages of the broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "Bayer knowingly marketed a dangerous drug and victims are being let down by the Swiss legal system."

Technique: Framing + omission (legal logic of the ruling absent) — Evidence: 00:00, 04:07, 04:18

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "State regulators are either influenced by the pharmaceutical lobby or are on thin ice."

Technique: Presenter conduct + question asymmetry — Evidence: 19:29, 22:05, 22:15

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Powerful institutions (corporations, governments) systematically abuse their power at the expense of individuals."

Technique: Agenda-setting + timing — Evidence: 00:00, 26:30, 31:01

Rationale: With an overall score of 7.1/10, the broadcast exhibits a systematic imbalance that touches on several dimensions of Art. 4 RTVA. The one-sidedness is not attributable to individual errors but to a consistent pattern of asymmetric expert selection, selective omission, emotional framing and asymmetric presenter conduct. Particularly serious is the fact that the only guest who presents a differentiated position (Kräböl) is systematically put under pressure, while all representatives of the plaintiff side are treated uncritically. The requirement of accurate representation (Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA) and of diversity of opinion on contested topics (Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA) are violated.

CONCLUSION

The Rundschau broadcast on the Yasmin topic exhibits a systematic imbalance that goes beyond investigative journalism and crosses into advocacy journalism. The broadcast presents exclusively the victim and plaintiff side, leaves the legal logic of the ruling unexplained, subjects the only differentiated expert (Kräböl) to systematic emotional and rhetorical pressure and employs framing techniques ("pharma giant", "accepting human lives as collateral damage") that structurally prevent neutral reception. Pursuant to Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (accurate representation) and Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA (diversity of opinion on contested topics), the broadcast must be classified as not balanced. The Obama segment is less problematic, as it deals with a foreign topic, but exhibits the same structural patterns (exclusively critics, no defenders, emotional victim scenes). A legally robust complaint to the IHRA would need to be based on the criteria of expert selection (Kessler as paid partisan expert, framed as neutral), presenter conduct (demonstrable asymmetry with Kräböl vs. plaintiff side) and omission (legal logic of the ruling).



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

7.2/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

7.0/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

7.1/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

Averaged from hard facts and soft facts



KEY — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant irregularity identified.
1–2	Weak finding	Minor irregularity without material impairment of balance.
3–4	Slight to moderate finding	Discernible tendency; impact relevance low to moderate.
5	Moderate finding with impact relevance	Relevant imbalance that influences the opinion-forming potential of the audience.
6	Substantial finding (threshold)	Scores from 6 onwards are classified as "substantial findings."
7	Substantial finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with marked impact relevance.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum manifestation	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No material patterns discernible; broadcast meets the accuracy requirement.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated irregularities; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Substantial imbalance	Multiple substantial findings; relevant impairment of diversity of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, broadcast-wide patterns; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias	Maximum manifestation across almost all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is clearly disadvantaged in portrayal, speaking time or framing.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Discernible but weak disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No discernible favouring or disadvantaging.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Discernible but weak favouring.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	Party is clearly favoured in portrayal, speaking time or framing.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Art. 4 RTVA)

Assessment pursuant to Art. 4 RTVA

Violation 1:

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

Facts: The first-instance ruling of the District Court of Zurich is presented as a moral failure without explaining the legal logic (burden of proof rules of the PrHG).

Evidence: Timestamp 04:18 — Quote: "The claim is dismissed." / 04:52 — "It is unimaginable to me when you think about it. It is almost laughable."

Assessment: Accurate representation requires that a court ruling be explained in its legal context. The omission of the burden of proof rules of the PrHG leads viewers to perceive the ruling as a failure of justice or corruption, even though it may represent the correct application of existing law. This violates Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA.

Violation 2:

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

Facts: The scientific controversy about the actual extent of the thrombosis risk of drospirenone-containing pills is not presented; only one side of the research landscape is presented.

Evidence: Timestamp 21:06 — Quote: "But there are also studies by Bayer that say the risk of the new pills is not that much higher." — This statement by Kräböl is immediately delegitimised by the presenter with "Does that mean something is being glossed over?" without examining the studies.

Assessment: On a scientifically contested topic (thrombosis risk of different pill types), Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA requires the presentation of the various scientific positions. The broadcast presents exclusively the position that documents an increased risk and delegitimises the opposing position through presenter conduct.

Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA (balanced selection of interlocutors)

Facts: All experts and interlocutors in the Yasmin segment stand on the plaintiff/victim side or are state regulators under presenter pressure; no independent pharmacology expert, no law professor, no gynaecologist is heard.

Evidence: Timestamp 07:55 — David Kessler is introduced as a neutral expert, even though he is acting on behalf of the victim lawyers (08:01: "examined on behalf of the victim lawyers").

Assessment: The framing of a paid partisan expert as a neutral expert witness violates the requirement of a balanced selection of interlocutors pursuant to Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA. Viewers cannot recognise the partisanship of the source.

Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in three dimensions: (1) Accurate representation of the court ruling is not ensured, as the legal logic of the ruling is not explained (Art. 4 para. 2). (2) Diversity of opinion on a scientifically contested topic is not ensured, as only one side of the research landscape is presented (Art. 4 para. 4). (3) The selection of interlocutors is not balanced, as a paid partisan expert is framed as a neutral expert witness and no independent counter-voices are heard (Art. 4 para. 4). A complaint to the IHRA would have good prospects of success on the basis of these three violations, in particular regarding the framing of Kessler as a neutral expert and the omission of the legal logic of the ruling.



CHAPTER 6 — Source in-depth check

1. David A. Kessler (former FDA chief, expert witness)

1. FUNDING: Paid by victim lawyers (Papantonio et al.) — explicitly stated in the transcript (08:01). Contingency-fee system means: the higher the settlement sums, the higher the lawyers' fees, the higher Kessler's expert fee.

2. MANDATE: Not compatible with a neutral assessment. Mandate is to document Bayer's misconduct.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Direct financial conflict of interest. Not disclosed in the broadcast.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2

D2 Personal risk: +1

D3 Professional competence: +2

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1

D6 Source level: +1

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

5. COUNTER-VOICE: No independent pharmacology expert cited. Bayer's own studies are mentioned but not examined.

2. Mike Papantonio (US plaintiff lawyer)

1. FUNDING: Contingency-fee lawyer — earns a percentage of settlement sums (typically 30-40%).

2. MANDATE: Completely incompatible with a neutral assessment.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Direct financial conflict of interest. Not disclosed in the broadcast.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2

D2 Personal risk: -1

D3 Professional competence: +1

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1

D6 Source level: -1

TOTAL: -4 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW (borderline)

5. COUNTER-VOICE: No corporate lawyer or pharmaceutical law specialist cited.

3. CSS / Filomena Collatrella (Secretary General)

1. FUNDING: Health insurer CSS — private-law entity, financed through premiums.

2. MANDATE: Not compatible with a neutral assessment on cost questions — CSS has a direct interest in cost reimbursement from pharmaceutical companies.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Institutional interest in a precedent that holds pharmaceutical companies liable for consequential costs. Not addressed in the broadcast.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1

D2 Personal risk: 0

D3 Professional competence: +1

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0

D6 Source level: 0

TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

5. COUNTER-VOICE: No insurance lawyer or health economist cited who places the cost distribution question in a neutral context.

4. Swissmedic / Stefan Kräböl (President of the Swissmedic Commission)

1. FUNDING: State-funded (federal authority). No direct pharmaceutical funding.

2. MANDATE: Largely compatible with a neutral assessment. Institutional interest in defending own approval decisions.



3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Low — possible interest in defending own authority decisions, but no financial conflict of interest.

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

TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN

5. COUNTER-VOICE: Kräböl is himself the most differentiated voice in the broadcast; but is systematically delegitimised through presenter conduct.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. Kessler is framed as a recognised authority through his title ("formerly the highest chief of the FDA") — this is a social attribution that does not cancel out his structural conflict of interest as a paid partisan expert. The source indicator analysis shows: the most credible expert in the broadcast (Kräböl, GREEN) is treated most harshly; the least credible sources (Papantonio, YELLOW borderline) are treated most uncritically. This is the core problem of the broadcast from the perspective of Art. 4 RTVA.

Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
David A. Kessler (former FDA chief, expert witness)	-2	+1	+2	0	+1	+1	+3	YELLOW
Mike Papantonio (US plaintiff lawyer)	-2	-1	+1	0	-1	-1	-4	YELLOW
CSS / Filomena Collatrella (Secretary General)	-1	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	YELLOW
Swissmedic / Stefan Kräböl (President of the Swissmedic Commission)	0	+1	+2	+1	+2	+1	+7	GREEN

Legal and methodological classification

No finding of fact	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.
No legal ruling	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of Art. 4 RTVA. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular the IHRA).
No proof of causality	Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intentions. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news situation, political controversy or format logic.
No finding of intent	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a substantial imbalance 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 the purpose of comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not the precise metric measurement of individual reports. 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. 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 commentary 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 contested topics
- 3. Balance:** Balanced selection of interlocutors

Supervisory authority

- IHRA (Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television): Examines complaints against broadcast programmes for violations 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. IHRA (if no agreement is reached)
3. Federal Supreme Court (final 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 | 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 can not only obtain 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 donor contributions.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | 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

The following books are available from SVFAB

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



Unbalanced reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and source selection. 15 principles are then 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 toolkit — for everyone who has a microphone in front of their face and wants 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 everyone who is exposed and wants 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 difficult situations



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 go along with it. 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 with greater confidence. 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 IHRA, 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 bare the system — factually, precisely, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional law examination that shows: the IHRA 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 everyone considering a complaint — and for everyone who wants to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still outstanding.