



## SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2015-11-27 IS - Gefahr für die Schweiz

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2015-11-27 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 15:42

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**5.9/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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 displayed on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly favouring the left, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly favouring the 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)

**2.9 / 10**

*Left-leaning*

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 factor into the overall score.



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Switzerland is a consensus democracy with a 7-member Federal Council based on the magic formula. At the time of the broadcast (approx. November 2015, following the Paris attacks of 13 November 2015), the composition was: SVP 2 seats, SP 2 seats, FDP 2 seats, CVP 1 seat. There is no classic government/opposition divide — all major parties are represented in government. The SVP had achieved its best result at the 2015 National Council elections with approx. 29.4%.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NC	Government/Opposition	Core position (broadcast-relevant)
SVP	8.0	65 (2015)	Government (2 FC)	Limit migration, tighten asylum, strengthen security
SP	2.5	43	Government (2 FC)	Open migration policy, integration, welfare state
FDP	6.5	33	Government (2 FC)	Orderly immigration, economic freedom
CVP/Centre	5.0	27	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatic migration policy, integration
Greens	2.0	11	Opposition	Solidarity-based reception, prevention, deradicalisation
GLP	4.0	7	Opposition	Liberal migration policy, pragmatic

The broadcast falls in the immediate aftermath of the Paris terrorist attacks of 13 November 2015 (130 dead) and the Brussels lockdown situation. At the same time, Europe was in the midst of the largest refugee movement since the Second World War, with over one million arrivals in 2015. Switzerland had shortly before (October 2015) held National Council elections in which the SVP made strong gains, partly on the issue of migration and security. The central line of tension ran between tightening security/stopping migration (SVP) and deradicalisation/integration/humanitarian duty (SP, Greens, CVP).

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is Switzerland's public broadcaster, financed through reception fees (today the Serafe levy). It is subject to Art. 4 RTVA, which requires accurate representation, diversity of opinion and balanced selection of discussion partners. Arena is SRF's most important political discussion format and regularly achieves high viewing figures on politically relevant topics.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. programme position
SVP	-3	00:63 "no longer allow Muslim refugees from Syria into Switzerland" — Programme position: limit immigration, tighten asylum law — position correctly reproduced, but Wobmann is repeatedly interrupted, confronted with a sign reading "Stop Muslims" (54:16), described as "naive" (00:897), and his statements are systematically framed as discriminatory by the moderator and fellow discussants. Programme position substantively correct, but representational context distorted.
SP	0	Not directly represented. Glättli (Greens) represents similar positions. No SP representatives in the broadcast.
FDP	0	Not represented. Rickli (SVP-aligned, but CVP parliamentary group according to transcript) takes partially moderate positions.
CVP/Centre	+1	01:12:40 Rickli (CVP) — "he has shown very clearly where a modern Muslim stands today" — pragmatic, integration-oriented position correctly represented. Programme position: pragmatic migration policy, integration — largely correct.
Greens	+2	00:41 Glättli introduced as "parliamentary group leader of the Greens" — positions on deradicalisation, hotline, integration, criticism of arms exports correctly and extensively represented. Programme position: solidarity-based reception, prevention — correctly and favourably represented.
GLP	0	Not represented.
EVP	0	Not represented.

Score legend: +5 = correct/complete, 0 = not in broadcast, -5 = actively distorted

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate representation: Greens (score +2) — Glättli's positions are presented extensively and without systematic counter-questioning
- Strongest distortion: SVP (score -3) — Wobmann's positions are reproduced substantively correctly, but systematically delegitimised through moderation interventions, sign confrontation and framing
- Average deviation from 0: 0.8 (for represented parties)
- Conclusion: The SVP position is cast in a negative light through the moderation behaviour and broadcast design (sign "Stop Muslims", repeated interruptions, confrontation with extreme examples), while the Greens position (Glättli) is presented largely unchallenged. The substantive representation of the SVP's core position is correct, but the framing is systematically negative.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast data

- Title: Arena — Terror in Europe (Episode 2: Measures in Switzerland)
- Date: 27.11.2015
- Moderator: Jonas Projer (in the transcript "Jonas Preuer")
- Persons interviewed:

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Peter Regli	Former head of Swiss intelligence service	Non-partisan/security expert	Centre-right
Balthasar Glättli	National Councillor, parliamentary group leader	Greens	Left (2.0)
Walter Wobmann	National Councillor	SVP	Right (8.0)
Katharina Rickli	National Councillor	SVP (introduced as CVP in the transcript — error)	Right
Kurt Pelda	Journalist (investigations into Winterthur mosque)	Non-partisan/journalist	Centre
Montassar Ben-Mrad	President of the umbrella organisation of Islamic organisations in Switzerland (FIDS)	Islamic community	N/A

*Note: In the transcript, Rickli is introduced as "CVP" (00:72), which is an error — Katharina Rickli is an SVP National Councillor. This is an editorial error in the broadcast.*

### Main topic

What concrete measures should Switzerland take against Islamist terror, extremism and IS sympathisers, and how does this relate to the refugee question and the Muslim community in Switzerland?



## 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: Peter Regli, former head of intelligence service

Timestamp	00:107
Statement	"our security forces are only equipped for fair-weather situations"
Assessment	Former NDB chief, direct subject-matter expertise in intelligence matters. No obvious current conflict of interest, as no longer in office.
Missing counter-voice	The incumbent NDB chief or a representative of the FDJP would have provided a current official assessment.

Source in-depth check Regli:

**(a) FUNDING:** Retired federal official, no recognisable current institutional funding. Possible consultancy activity, not declared.

**(b) MANDATE:** Compatible with neutral assessment — no current institutional interest.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No current institutional conflict, but possible interest in maintaining relevance as an expert

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Retired, minimal career risk

D3 Subject-matter expertise: +2 — Direct expertise as former NDB chief

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — No contradictions apparent

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Largely factual, with concrete examples

D6 Source level: +1 — Secondary (experiential knowledge, no primary data)

**TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**

**(c) SUBJECT-MATTER EXPERTISE:** Yes, largely correct.

#### Expert 2: Kurt Pelda, journalist

Timestamp	00:903
Statement	"mosques play a central role in the recruitment and radicalisation of young people"
Assessment	Investigative journalist with research into the An-Nur mosque. Not a scientist, not a security expert — a journalist with a specific research focus.
Missing counter-voice	A scientific radicalisation researcher could have placed the statement about mosques as a site of radicalisation in an empirical context.

Source in-depth check Pelda:

**(a) FUNDING:** Freelance journalist / media house. Funded through media sales, no recognisable state or ecclesiastical conflict of interest.



**(b) MANDATE:** Journalist — mandate is research and reporting, not neutral scientific analysis.

- D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — No direct institutional conflict, but professional interest in the relevance of his research
- D2 Personal risk: +2 — Investigative journalism on Islamism carries personal risk
- D3 Subject-matter expertise: +1 — Expertise for the specific Winterthur case, but not a scientist
- D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent with his published articles
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Largely fact-based
- D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary (own research, no primary data)

**TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN (marginal)**

**(c) SUBJECT-MATTER EXPERTISE:** Is framed as a neutral expert, although he is a journalist with a specific research focus — slightly problematic.

**Expert 3: Montassar Ben-Mrad, President FIDS**

<b>Timestamp</b>	00:964
<b>Statement</b>	"1.5 persons per 100,000 Muslims per year" (jihadist rate)
<b>Assessment</b>	Association president of Islamic organisations — institutional interest representative, not a neutral expert.
<b>Missing counter-voice</b>	An independent sociologist or security researcher could have verified the statistic.

Source in-depth check Ben-Mrad:

**(a) FUNDING:** Islamic umbrella association, funded by member organisations. Structural conflict of interest in assessing radicalisation in Muslim communities.

**(b) MANDATE:** Representation of the interests of Muslim organisations — not compatible with a fully neutral assessment.

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Strong structural conflict of interest: association president has an institutional interest in downplaying the radicalisation problem
- D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public statements in a sensitive context
- D3 Subject-matter expertise: 0 — Association knowledge, no scientific expertise
- D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent with association position
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Provides figures, but without citing sources
- D6 Source level: -1 — Tertiary (association knowledge)

**TOTAL: 0 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**

**(c) SUBJECT-MATTER EXPERTISE:** Is implicitly framed as an expert on the Muslim community, but is primarily an interest representative — structurally partisan, not identified as such.

*Missing expert groups:*

- Islamic scholar/theologian for the discussion of Quranic passages
- Incumbent NDB representative for a current situational assessment
- Deradicalisation specialist unit (e.g. specialist unit for extremism and violence prevention)

**Source indicator for participants:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Peter Regli, former head of intelligence service	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+7	GREEN
Kurt Pelda, journalist	0	+2	+1	+1	+1	0	+5	GREEN
Montassar Ben-Mrad, President FIDS	-2	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	0	YELLOW



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

*Summary:*

- Regli: GREEN (+7) — competent, largely neutral
- Pelda: GREEN (+5) — competent for the specific case, but as a journalist not to be regarded as a scientist
- Ben-Mrad: YELLOW (0) — structural conflict of interest as association president not made transparent



## 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: Rundschau report on the An-Nur mosque

**Timestamp** 00:518 — Statement: "as Rundschau reported last June"

- (a) **Funding:** SRF's own programme — same parent organisation as Arena. No external conflict of interest, but self-referencing.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** SRF cites SRF — not an independent source.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Independent media reports or official statements on the mosque.

### Source 2: Unnamed "various media"

**Timestamp** 00:537 — Statement: "Various media report this. There is no evidence for it."

- (a) **Funding:** Unknown — no source cited.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Cannot be assessed.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** None.

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 00:531

Claim: "And an imam is said to allegedly maintain contacts with IS and recruit members for the terrorist organisation."

Word markers: "allegedly", "is said to"

Primary source available: NO — "Various media report this. There is no evidence for it." — +1 penalty point

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 02:500

Claim: "The facts are now accumulating, practically week by week [...] people being smuggled in via the Balkan route with forged passports"

Word markers: "seems to be the case", "facts are accumulating"

Primary source available: NO — Regli cites no concrete source — +1 penalty point

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 02:716

Claim: "Now we can see that in the Paris attacks there were two refugees among them"

Word markers: "one knows that it doesn't quite fit yet. That is not yet entirely clear."

Primary source available: NO — moderator immediately qualifies this himself — +1 penalty point

Score basis: 2/10 + 3 penalty points = 5/10

*Summary: The source selection is problematic due to self-referencing (SRF cites SRF), unnamed media and several unsubstantiated claims introduced with word markers such as "allegedly" and "is said to" but not verified.*



### 3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time (from transcript analysis):

- Walter Wobmann (SVP): (19%) — frequently interrupted
- Balthasar Glättli (Greens): (22%) — rarely interrupted
- Montassar Ben-Mrad (FIDS): (16%)
- Peter Regli (expert): (14%)
- Katharina Rickli (SVP/CVP): (11%)
- Kurt Pelda (journalist): (8%)
- Moderator Jonas Projer: (11%)

*Summary: Speaking time is nominally relatively balanced, but Wobmann's speaking time is effectively reduced by frequent interruptions and confrontations. Glättli receives more uninterrupted speaking time. The combination of Glättli + Ben-Mrad (both opposing Wobmann's position) creates a structural 2:1 asymmetry against the SVP position.*



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

No presentation of the actual security measures already taken by the federal government.

Relevant at: Timestamp 00:186 — Regli mentions foiled attacks in France

###### Effect

The absence of a stocktaking of existing measures leaves the debate vague and favours both alarmism and trivialisation.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

The question of whether and how the An-Nur mosque is actually monitored by the authorities is not answered. The city of Winterthur, the imam and the mosque leadership refused to participate.

Relevant at: Timestamp 00:543 — "All of them do not want to be part of this broadcast"

###### Effect

The broadcast discusses a specific case without giving the affected party a voice — one-sided representation without the possibility of a counter-statement.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

The question of the relationship between the expansion of surveillance and fundamental rights (data protection, proportionality) is not systematically addressed.

Relevant at: Timestamp 00:240 — Glättli briefly mentions "mass surveillance"

###### Effect

The legal dimension of the Intelligence Service Act (ISA), which was at the time subject to a popular vote, is not sufficiently examined.

*Summary: The most serious omission is the absence of the other side in the An-Nur mosque case — a broadcast that designates a specific location as a possible "hotbed of terror" without giving the affected institution speaking time violates elementary journalistic principles.*

#### Missing voices

- Islamic scholar/theologian: Could have placed the discussion of Quranic passages in a professional context, rather than conducting it as a layperson confrontation
- Legal expert (asylum/constitutional law): Could have precisely contextualised the legality of Wobmann's demands and the obligations under the Refugee Convention
- Deradicalisation expert (practice): Could have provided empirical evidence on effective measures (e.g. specialist unit for radicalisation)
- Terror victims or relatives: Could have brought in the human dimension beyond the political debate
- Police/public prosecutor's office: Could have presented the operational security situation from an enforcement perspective
- Sociologist/radicalisation researcher: Could have contributed scientific findings on radicalisation processes



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

- Representative of Winterthur city authorities: Could have contextualised the specific An-Nur mosque case from an official perspective
- Refugee organisation (UNHCR/SFH): Could have professionally represented the humanitarian and legal dimension of the refugee question



## 5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 01:034

Figure: "1.5 persons per 100,000 Muslims per year" (jihadist rate)

Dimensions: (b) proportion shown — (a) absolute value missing, (c) trend missing

**Missing context**

No source cited for this figure. No comparison with other forms of extremism. No trend (rising/falling?).

**Effect**

The figure appears reassuring, without its origin or validity being verifiable.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 00:581

Figure: "16,000 people travelled to Syria" / "50,000 members of his army"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value shown — (b) proportion missing (proportion of total population?), (c) trend missing

**Missing context**

No source cited (Glättli quotes Tilgner from the previous week). No breakdown of how many of these came from Europe/Switzerland.

**Effect**

Figures are used as an argument without contextualisation.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 03:692

Figure: "weapons worth over CHF 5 million sold" (to Saudi Arabia)

Dimensions: (a) absolute value shown — (b) proportion of total exports missing, (c) trend missing

**Missing context**

No comparison with Switzerland's total arms exports or those of other countries.

**Effect**

CHF 5 million sounds like a lot, but is marginal in the context of Swiss arms exports (approx. CHF 400 million/year) — Wobmann points this out (03:829), but without figures.

*Summary: Several figures are presented without citing sources, without trend contextualisation and without proportional data. Particularly problematic is Ben-Mrad's unsubstantiated statistic on the jihadist rate, which remains unchallenged as a fact.*



<b>6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION</b>							<b>7/10</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	8	9	10

<b>Association 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	00:720
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"He wanted to prevent that very law with a referendum together with the Group for a Switzerland without an Army and, believe it or not, with the support of the Islamic Central Council."</i>
Technique: Regli associates Glättli's referendum against the ISA with the GSoA and the Islamic Central Council — implying that Glättli is acting in the interests of Islamist groups.	
<b>Effect</b>	Delegitimation of a legitimate democratic position (referendum) through association with an organisation regarded as problematic.

<b>Association 2:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	00:543
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"The An-Nur mosque. A hotbed of terror in Switzerland?"</i>
Technique: Rhetorical question associates the entire mosque with terror, even though it is said in the same breath: "There is no evidence for it."	
<b>Effect</b>	The question hangs in the air; the negation ("there is no evidence") is relativised by the dramatic framing.

<b>Association 3:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	02:654
<b>Quote</b>	<i>Moderator shows sign "Stop Muslims" and asks Wobmann: "Is that what you have in mind?"</i>
Technique: Wobmann's demand for border controls is associated with a sign reading "Stop Muslims", which he never called for.	
<b>Effect</b>	Wobmann's position is equated with religious discrimination, even though he explicitly speaks of security checks.

For Wobmann (as actors implicitly framed as extremists):

**SOURCE CHECK:**

- Does Wobmann work with verifiable primary sources? YES (cites media reports, own political experience)
- Are his core statements falsifiable? YES (empirically verifiable security claims)

**RISK MATRIX:**

- What has he lost? Nothing directly, but political risk through accusation of extremism
- What does he gain? Political profiling among SVP voters
- Net: Balanced

**TONALITY:** Factual-political, not apocalyptic

**RESULT CATEGORY:** A/B — Political actor with a clear agenda, but no conspiracy ideology



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

*Summary: The strongest guilt-by-association technique is the sign "Stop Muslims" (02:654), which equates Wobmann's position with religious discrimination, even though he never called for this. The association Glättli/GSoA/Islamic Central Council by Regli is also problematic, but is not addressed by the moderator.*



## 7. TIMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:543 (early in the broadcast, after)

Content: Insert about the An-Nur mosque with the question "A hotbed of terror in Switzerland?"

#### Timing effect

The insert sets the emotional framework for the entire broadcast early on. The dramatic question without an answer ("there is no evidence") creates an atmosphere of threat that colours all subsequent discussions.

### Finding 2:

Position: 02:625 (middle of the broadcast, "test bench" segment)

Content: Confrontation of Wobmann with sign "Stop Muslims"

#### Timing effect

The sign appears in the "test bench" segment, which is structurally conceived as an interrogation format. Its placement in the middle of the broadcast maximises the impact on the overall picture.

### Finding 3:

Position: 01:442 (after)

Content: Insert with stoning image ("the worst left out") and Quranic passage interrogation

#### Timing effect

The insert with the stoning image appears immediately after the discussion about the An-Nur mosque and before the question to Ben-Mrad — maximum emotional impact through sequencing.

*Summary: The broadcast uses timing strategically: emotionalising inserts (mosque, stoning) are placed early and in the middle to set the interpretive framework. The "test bench" segment with Wobmann is structurally conceived as an interrogation.*



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

6/10

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 00:844

Triggering event: Wobmann says: "That is the fundamental ideology. That is what is dangerous, that is what is sick."  
Reaction: Moderator interrupts: "Mr Wobmann, now you're doing it again."

### Comparison

Glättli says at 03:001 "It seems somewhat strange to me when the SVP always talks about the values it wants to protect" and attacks the SVP historically (marriage law, rape within marriage) — moderator does not react with an interruption.

Asymmetry: Demonstrably present — Wobmann's statement about Islamist ideology is interrupted, Glättli's attack on SVP history is not.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 01:241

Triggering event: Wobmann says: "That is the blue public. That is simply unbelievable."  
Reaction: Moderator does not intervene, but Glättli responds with the accusation that Wobmann is endangering integration.

### Comparison

Glättli says at 01:286 "As such a naive Mr Glättli and uninformed, it simply cannot go on" (Regli about Glättli) — moderator does not intervene.

Asymmetry: Not clearly demonstrable — both sides make sharp statements, moderator intervenes selectively.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp 02:654

Triggering event: Wobmann calls for border controls for refugees from Syria/Iraq.  
Reaction: Moderator presents sign "Stop Muslims" and asks: "Is that what you have in mind?"

### Comparison

Glättli calls for a weapons export ban to Saudi Arabia (03:747) — moderator does not present a provocative sign, does not ask a comparably confrontational question.

Asymmetry: Clearly demonstrable — the sign confrontation is a unique instrument used exclusively against Wobmann.

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 3/5

*Summary: The selective outrage manifests itself most clearly in the sign confrontation (02:654), which is used exclusively against Wobmann, as well as in the asymmetric interruption practice. Glättli's political attacks on the SVP are not met with comparable moderation intervention.*



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

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:543

Missing perspective/fact: The An-Nur mosque and its representatives are not given a voice.

Relevance: A broadcast that designates a specific institution as a possible "hotbed of terror" violates elementary journalistic fairness if the affected institution is given no opportunity to make a statement.

Impact: The image of the mosque as a place of danger remains uncontested, even though "there is no evidence for it."

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 01:427

Missing perspective/fact: No Islamic scholar present during the Quranic passage discussion.

Relevance: The discussion about stoning, killing unbelievers and women's rights in the Quran is conducted between an association president and a moderator — without theological or Islamic studies expertise.

Impact: The discussion produces no valid insights, but serves primarily as confrontation and emotionalisation.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp Entire broadcast

Missing perspective/fact: No presentation of successful deradicalisation programmes with empirical evidence.

Relevance: The broadcast discusses deradicalisation as a solution without examining concrete programmes or their effectiveness.

Impact: The debate remains abstract and political, without action-oriented insights.

*Summary: The most serious completeness gap is the absence of the affected mosque and its representatives in a broadcast that explicitly addresses it as a place of danger. This violates the principle of the right to be heard and basic journalistic standards.*

The broadcast takes place immediately after the Paris attacks (13.11.2015, 130 dead), which plunged Europe into a state of emergency. Belgium had placed Brussels under a terror alert for weeks. At the same time, Europe was experiencing the largest refugee movement since 1945. The political debate was highly polarised between tightening security and humanitarian responsibility. In Switzerland, the SVP had shortly before made strong gains at the 2015 National Council elections, partly on the issue of migration/security. The An-Nur mosque in Winterthur had come into focus through media reports about IS recruitment.

#### Proportion of perspectives covered

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

**[A] Security policy perspective:** What concrete instruments does the intelligence service need?

**[B] Legal perspective:** What does Swiss law permit regarding surveillance, deportation, mosque monitoring?



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

- [C] **Integration policy perspective:** What demonstrably works in deradicalisation?  
[D] **Theological/Islamic studies perspective:** How do Islamic scholars interpret the cited Quranic passages?  
[E] **Refugee law perspective:** What does the Geneva Refugee Convention say about religious discrimination in admission?  
[F] **Security statistics perspective:** How high is the actual terrorist threat in Switzerland by comparison?  
[G] **Foreign policy perspective:** What role do arms exports and foreign policy play in terrorist financing?  
[H] **Muslim community perspective (grassroots):** How do ordinary Muslims experience the debate?  
[I] **Victims' perspective:** How do terror victims and their relatives experience the political instrumentalisation?  
[J] **Comparative perspective:** How are other European countries dealing with similar challenges?

**[A] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 00:107 — Quote: "our security forces are only equipped for fair-weather situations" — Regli discusses intelligence service capacities in detail. Assessment: Well covered by Regli.

**[B] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 00:698 — Quote: "I am also not the investigative authority that has the competence to, for example, tap phones" — Legal limits are briefly mentioned, but not systematically analysed. Assessment: Insufficiently explored.

**[C] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 00:608 — Quote: "pursue deradicalisation, pursue an integration policy that deserves the name" — Glättli and Ben-Mrad discuss deradicalisation. Assessment: Addressed, but without empirical evidence on effectiveness.

**[D] OMITTED**

Timestamp: N/A — No Islamic scholar or theologian present. Ben-Mrad is an association president, not a theologian. The Quranic passage discussion (01:26–01:35) is conducted without theological expertise. Assessment: Serious gap.

**[E] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 02:764 — Quote: "You are not only violating the Refugee Convention" — Glättli mentions the Refugee Convention, but no legal expert explains the concrete obligations. Assessment: Insufficient.

**[F] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 01:034 — Quote: "1.5 persons per 100,000 Muslims per year" — Ben-Mrad provides a statistic. Assessment: Addressed, but without independent verification.

**[G] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 03:635 — Quote: "How about a weapons boycott against Saudi Arabia?" — Extensive discussion about arms exports. Assessment: Well addressed, but one-sidedly initiated by the moderator.

**[H] OMITTED**

Timestamp: N/A — Ben-Mrad represents the institutional level, not the grassroots perspective of ordinary Muslims. Assessment: Missing voice.

**[I] OMITTED**

Timestamp: N/A — No terror victims or relatives given a voice. Assessment: Missing perspective.

**[J] INDICATED**



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

Timestamp: 02:068 — Quote: "In France it is quite different" — Comparison with France is briefly touched upon.  
Assessment: Superficial.

### **Completeness score: 5/10**

---

Rationale: The broadcast covers the security policy and integration policy dimensions well, but completely omits theological expertise, legal analysis, victims' perspectives and grassroots perspectives of Muslim communities. The Quranic passage discussion without an Islamic scholar is particularly problematic, as it questions lay persons on specialist matters.



## 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	00:543
Quote	<i>"The An-Nur mosque. A hotbed of terror in Switzerland?"</i>
Manipulation	The rhetorical question sets the frame "mosque = possible hotbed of terror", even though it is said immediately afterwards "there is no evidence for it." The question hangs in the air.
Why problematic	By formulating it as a question, the association is established without having to prove it. The viewer retains the association; the negation is relativised by the dramatic framing.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	01:967
Quote	<i>"I am now coming from a grouping that misuses the religion of Islam for a totalitarian ideology that is contemptuous of humanity and women"</i>
Manipulation	Regli frames IS as a "misuse" of Islam — this is a theological-political interpretation, not an established fact. The broadcast adopts this frame uncritically.
Why problematic	The question of whether IS "misuses" Islam or represents a legitimate (if extreme) interpretation is theologically contested. The broadcast sets a frame without questioning it.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	02:977
Quote	<i>"It seems somewhat strange to me when the SVP always talks about the values it wants to protect. The party that grew big in the 1980s, with Blocher and the fight against the new marriage law..."</i>
Manipulation	Glättli frames the SVP as a historically misogynistic party — this attack is not questioned or contextualised by the moderator.
Why problematic	The historical attack on the SVP is thematically out of place in a broadcast about terrorism and is not balanced by comparable historical attacks on other parties.

*Summary: The dominant framing of the broadcast is "Islam as a security problem that must be solved through integration" — a frame that enables both alarmism (mosque as hotbed of terror) and trivialisation (Wobmann's demands as discriminatory), depending on political preference.*



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



11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS									6/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

<b>Finding 1:</b>	
Timestamp	00:543
Quote	"A hotbed of terror in Switzerland?"
Manipulation	"Hotbed of terror" is an emotionally charged formulation — maximum emotional impact.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Are there radicalisation activities at the An-Nur mosque?"

<b>Finding 2:</b>	
Timestamp	01:203
Quote	Ben-Mrad: "For me, they are Islam punks."
Manipulation	The term "Islam punks" trivialises IS terrorists as youthful rebels without a political agenda.
Why problematic	The term is not questioned by the moderator, even though it equates IS terrorists with harmless young people. Neutral alternative: "radicalised young people with Islamist ideology."

<b>Finding 3:</b>	
Timestamp	02:654
Quote	Moderator: "The sign reads Stop Muslims. Is that what you have in mind?"
Manipulation	The sign "Stop Muslims" is attributed to Wobmann as his position, even though he never called for this. The wording "Stop Muslims" implies religious discrimination.
Why problematic	Wobmann's actual demand was "not to accept Islamic asylum seekers from Iraq and Syria" — a politically controversial, but legally different statement from "Stop Muslims." The equation is a falsification.

*Summary: The broadcast's choice of words is emotionally charged and tendentious at several points — "hotbed of terror", the sign "Stop Muslims" and the uncritical adoption of "Islam punks" demonstrate a language that prioritises emotionalisation over precision.*



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:844

Triggering event: Wobmann describes the Islamist fundamental ideology as "what is sick."

Quote (moderator) *"Mr Wobmann, now you're doing it again."*

Comparison Glättli attacks the SVP historically (03:001) with accusations about marriage law and rape within marriage — moderator: no interruption, no contextualisation.

Asymmetry: Clearly demonstrable — Wobmann's statement about Islamist ideology is commented on with "now you're doing it again" (implying a repeat offender), Glättli's attack on SVP history is not.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 02:654

Triggering event: Wobmann calls for border controls and no admission of Muslim asylum seekers from Syria/Iraq.

Quote (moderator) *"We have prepared a sign that you might perhaps like. The sign reads Stop Muslims. Is that what you have in mind?"*

Comparison Glättli calls for a weapons export ban to Saudi Arabia (03:747) — moderator does not ask a comparably confrontational question, does not present a provocative sign.

Asymmetry: Clearly demonstrable — the sign instrument is used exclusively against Wobmann.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp 01:286

Triggering event: Regli personally attacks Glättli: "As such a naive and uninformed Mr Glättli, it simply cannot go on."

Quote (moderator) *No intervention, no contextualisation.*

Comparison Wobmann's factual statements about Islamist ideology are interrupted.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — personal attack on Glättli by Regli is not commented on, Wobmann's factual statements are interrupted.

*Summary: The moderation behaviour shows a clear asymmetry: Wobmann is interrupted more frequently, confronted with provocative material and burdened with implicit accusations ("now you're doing it again"), while Glättli and other participants do not experience comparable interventions.*



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

<b>Asymmetry 1:</b>	
<b>To Wobmann, 02</b>	654: "The sign reads Stop Muslims. Is that what you have in mind?" — hard/confrontational/falsifying
<b>To Glättli, no comparable segment</b>	No confrontation with a sign or a falsifying reduction of his positions.
<b>Comparison</b>	Glättli effectively calls for a weapons export ban and criticises the SVP historically — no comparable confrontation with a provocatively designed sign.

<b>Asymmetry 2:</b>	
<b>To Ben-Mrad, 01</b>	427: "Does this instruction still apply today? Does this piece of text still apply?" (on the stoning passage) — hard/theologically confrontational
<b>To Wobmann, no comparable segment</b>	Wobmann is not confronted with comparably hard questions about his own contradictions (e.g. arms exports to Saudi Arabia vs. criticism of Islam).
<b>Comparison</b>	Ben-Mrad is questioned on theological details that he, as an association president, cannot answer with professional competence — a trap that is not set for other participants.

<b>Asymmetry 3:</b>	
<b>To Wobmann, 02</b>	821: "Mr Boban, you said earlier that victims become perpetrators. Is it not you who are turning Muslim victims into perpetrators?" — hard/accusatory
<b>To Glättli, no comparable segment</b>	Glättli's statement that the USA enabled IS through the Iraq War is not confronted with a comparably accusatory question.
<b>Comparison</b>	Wobmann is held personally accountable for his statements, Glättli is not.

*Summary: The question asymmetry is the most pronounced individual technique in the broadcast. Wobmann is confronted with falsifying signs, accusatory formulations and confrontations that are not applied to other participants. Ben-Mrad is lured into a theological trap that does not correspond to his function as an association president.*



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

01:427 — Construct: Moderator poses Quranic passage questions to Ben-Mrad as if they were equivalent to current security questions.

#### Analysis

The discussion about Quranic passages on stoning and killing unbelievers is treated as equivalent to the security debate, even though it is a specialist theological discussion that cannot be meaningfully conducted without professional expertise. At the same time, a false balance is created: Ben-Mrad must answer for all of Islam, while Wobmann does not have to answer for the entire SVP or the "West."

### Finding 2:

#### Timestamp

03:940

Construct: IS and Saudi Arabia are compared as equivalent ("same punishments").

#### Analysis

The IS/Saudi Arabia comparison is partly factually grounded (similar penal practices), but the equation of a terrorist state with a member of the United Nations is a simplifying false balance that ignores complex geopolitical realities.

*Summary: The false balance manifests itself primarily in the Quranic passage discussion, where an association president is treated as a theological expert, and in the IS/Saudi Arabia comparison, which levels complex differences.*



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Islam is Switzerland's central security problem.

#### Timestamp

00:000 — Evidence: "Terror in Europe" / "against terror, against extremists, against IS sympathisers" — from the outset, the broadcast sets the frame that Islamist terror is the relevant security threat.

Alternative agenda: Right-wing extremism, cybercrime, organised crime as security threats are not mentioned.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Muslims must collectively distance themselves.

#### Timestamp

02:112 — Evidence: "Why should only Muslims have to distance themselves?" — Glättli raises the question, but the broadcast structure (Ben-Mrad as representative of "the Muslims") implicitly presupposes that collective distancing is expected.

Alternative agenda: Individual responsibility instead of collective attribution.

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The refugee question and the terrorism question are linked.

#### Timestamp

02:480 — Evidence: "What role do the refugee movements play? Do we, yes or no, face an increased terrorist threat?" — the moderator presents the link as a legitimate question, even though the empirical evidence for this was weak in 2015.

Alternative agenda: Separation of the refugee question and the terrorism question as analytically necessary.

*Summary: The broadcast sets an agenda that frames Islamist terror as the primary security threat, Muslims as a group collectively required to explain themselves, and refugees as potential security risks — an agenda that is structurally closer to the SVP position than to the left-wing position, but is broken by the moderation asymmetry in favour of left-wing solutions (integration, deradicalisation).*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 5.6 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 6.2 / 10

### Dominant techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Question asymmetry (score 7):** The sign "Stop Muslims" is the most striking individual technique in the broadcast — Wobmann's position is delegitimised through a falsifying reduction that is not applied to other participants. The technique combines guilt by association with moderation asymmetry into an effective instrument.
- 2. Moderation behaviour (score 7):** The asymmetric interruption practice and the moderator's selective outrage ("now you're doing it again") towards Wobmann, combined with non-intervention in comparable statements by other participants, creates a structural disadvantage for the SVP position.
- 3. Framing/Guilt by Association (score 7/7):** The framing of the An-Nur mosque as a "hotbed of terror" without evidence and the association of Wobmann's border control demand with "Stop Muslims" set an interpretive framework that shapes the entire broadcast.

### Core messages of the broadcast

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "Islamist terror is a real threat that must be combated through deradicalisation and integration — not through discrimination against Muslims."

**Technique:** Framing through inserts + moderation asymmetry — evidence: 00:543, 02:654

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "Walter Wobmann (SVP) is engaging in discrimination and scaremongering that is counterproductive."

**Technique:** Guilt by association (sign), selective outrage, question asymmetry — evidence: 02:654, 00:844, 01:286

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "The Muslim community in Switzerland is part of the solution, not the problem — but it must distance itself and integrate."

**Technique:** Agenda-setting + time distribution (Ben-Mrad as main discussion partner) — evidence: 01:173, 03:537  
Rationale: With an overall score of 5.8/10, the broadcast exhibits a clear one-sidedness that manifests itself primarily in the treatment of the SVP position. The sign "Stop Muslims" (02:654) is an editorial decision that falsifies and delegitimises a political position — this violates Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA (accurate representation). The asymmetric moderation practice and the question asymmetry reinforce this finding. At the same time, the broadcast cannot be classified as a "systematic imbalance", since several perspectives are given a voice and the basic structure of a debate is maintained. The one-sidedness is primarily in the manner of presentation, not in the complete suppression of a position.

### CONCLUSION

The Arena broadcast of November 2015 on the topic of terror in Europe exhibits a clear one-sidedness that manifests itself primarily in the asymmetric treatment of the SVP position (Wobmann). The editorial decision to confront Wobmann's border control demand with a sign reading "Stop Muslims" (02:654) constitutes a factually inaccurate reduction that falsifies a political position and thereby violates Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA. The asymmetric moderation practice (more frequent interruptions of Wobmann, no comparable confrontation for Glättli) and the absence of the affected mosque as a discussion partner in a broadcast that describes it as a "hotbed of terror" reinforce the finding. The broadcast only partially fulfils the mandate of diversity of opinion under Art. 4 Para. 4 RTVA: while all relevant positions are given a voice, they are not treated with comparable care and fairness.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

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

**5.6/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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

**6.2/10**

*Serious deviation from the requirement of balance. High degree of deviation*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**5.9/10**

*Significant imbalance*

*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 irregularity identified.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor irregularity without material impairment of balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Slight to moderate finding</b>	Recognisable tendency; relevance of impact low to moderate.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with relevance of impact</b>	Relevant imbalance that influences the opinion-forming potential of the audience.
<b>6</b>	<b>Significant finding (threshold)</b>	Scores from 6 onwards are reported as "significant findings."
<b>7</b>	<b>Significant finding</b>	Clear, well-documented imbalance with marked relevance of impact.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Serious finding</b>	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum manifestation</b>	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

### Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Unremarkable</b>	No material patterns recognisable; broadcast complies with the requirement of accuracy.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Slight imbalance</b>	Isolated irregularities; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
<b>4.1 – 6.0</b>	<b>Significant imbalance</b>	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of diversity of perspectives.
<b>6.1 – 8.0</b>	<b>Serious deviation from the requirement of balance. High degree of deviation</b>	Pronounced, broadcast-wide patterns; high relevance of impact.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias</b>	Maximum manifestation 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 representation, 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 representation, 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: The sign "Stop Muslims" is presented to Wobmann as his position, even though he never called for this. His actual demand was: not to admit Islamic asylum seekers from Iraq and Syria.

Evidence: Timestamp 02:654 — Quote: "The sign reads Stop Muslims. Is that what you have in mind?" — Wobmann replies: "Yes, it doesn't have to say Muslims. It is a general check that I mean."

Assessment: The broadcast presents a falsified version of Wobmann's position as his own and confronts him with it. This violates the requirement of accurate representation, as a political position is falsified through editorial reduction.

#### Violation 2:

Norm: Art. 4 Para. 4 RTVA (balanced selection of discussion partners on controversial topics)

Facts: The An-Nur mosque is described as a possible "hotbed of terror" without its representatives being given a voice. The broadcast notes that all requests were declined, but makes no recognisable efforts to enable an alternative representation of the mosque.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:543 — Quote: "The An-Nur mosque. A hotbed of terror in Switzerland?" / "All of them do not want to be part of this broadcast."

Assessment: On a controversial topic where a specific institution is named as a place of danger, Art. 4 Para. 4 RTVA requires particular care in the selection of discussion partners. The absence of any counter-statement from the affected institution violates this requirement.

#### Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA (accurate representation)

Facts: The claim that an imam of the An-Nur mosque maintains contacts with IS and recruits members is presented as fact, even though it is said immediately afterwards: "There is no evidence for it."

Evidence: Timestamp 00:531 — Quote: "And an imam is said to allegedly maintain contacts with IS and recruit members for the terrorist organisation. Various media report this. There is no evidence for it."

Assessment: The formulation "is said to allegedly" in combination with "there is no evidence" formally satisfies the duty of care, but the dramatic framing ("hotbed of terror") and the absence of a counter-statement from those affected violates the requirement of accurate representation.

### Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

---

The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in three demonstrable respects: (1) The falsification of Wobmann's position through the sign "Stop Muslims" violates Art. 4 Para. 2 (accurate representation); (2) the absence of the affected mosque as a discussion partner violates Art. 4 Para. 4 (balanced selection of discussion partners); (3) the claim about the imam without evidence in a dramatic framing violates Art. 4 Para. 2. The violations are not of a severity that would establish a complaint to OFCOM/IHRA with a high probability of success, since the broadcast fundamentally allows several perspectives to be heard. However, the sign incident (02:654) is the strongest individual finding and would offer the greatest prospect of success in an IHRA complaint.



## CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

### Organisation 1: FIDS (Fédération d'organisations islamiques en Suisse) / Umbrella organisation of Islamic organisations in Switzerland

Represented by: Montassar Ben-Mrad

**1. FUNDING:** Member organisations (Islamic associations and mosques in Switzerland). No state core funding. Possible project contributions from cantons/federal government for integration projects.

**2. MANDATE:** Representation of the interests of Muslim organisations in Switzerland — explicitly not a neutral research or advisory mandate.

**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Strong structural conflict of interest: the association has an institutional interest in downplaying the radicalisation problem in Muslim communities and presenting the majority of Muslims as loyal and integrated. This is a legitimate form of interest representation, but not neutral expertise.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Strong structural conflict

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public statements in a sensitive context

D3 Subject-matter expertise: 0 — Association knowledge, no scientific expertise

D4 Consistency: +1 — Consistent with association position

D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 — Provides figures (without source)

D6 Source level: -1 — Tertiary

**TOTAL: 0 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**

**5. COUNTER-VOICE:** No independent sociologist or security researcher verifies Ben-Mrad's statistics. The figure "1.5 persons per 100,000 Muslims" remains without a source citation and verification.

**IMPORTANT:** Ben-Mrad is implicitly framed in the broadcast as an expert on "Islam" and "Muslims in Switzerland." However, he is primarily an interest representative. His theological statements (Quranic passages) are outside his area of expertise. Being "recognised" as a representative of the Muslim community is a social attribution, not a factual qualification for theological or security policy questions.

### Organisation 2: Group for a Switzerland without an Army (GSoA)

Mentioned by: Regli (00:733)

**1. FUNDING:** Membership fees, donations, left-wing political spectrum.

**2. MANDATE:** Political advocacy for the abolition of the army — explicitly partisan.

**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Strong structural conflict of interest on questions of security policy and intelligence services.

**4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** Not used as a source in the broadcast, but as an association partner for Glättli — guilt by association (see criterion 6).

**5. COUNTER-VOICE:** N/A — Organisation is not directly quoted.

**IMPORTANT:** The mention of the GSoA by Regli in the context of Glättli's ISA referendum is a guilt-by-association technique, not a factual source citation. The association implies that Glättli is acting in the interests of an organisation that endangers Switzerland's security interests — without this being substantiated.

#### Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
FIDS (Fédération d'organisations islamiques en Suisse) / Umbrella organisation of Islamic organisations in Switzerland	-2	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	0	YELLOW

#### Legal and methodological classification



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

**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 assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular 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 judgement of intent**

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a significant imbalance has been identified — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.

**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. In particular, broadcasts must respect human dignity, must not be discriminatory or 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 represent facts and events accurately, so that the public can form its own opinion. Opinions 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 (requirement of diversity).

#### 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 discussion partners

#### Supervisory authority

---

- IHRA (Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television): Reviews complaints against broadcast programmes for violations of Art. 4 RTVA
- OFCOM (Federal Office of Communications): Regulatory and supervisory authority
- Ombudsman offices of SRG: 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](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 toolkit — for everyone who has a microphone in front of them 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 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 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 CHF 1.56 billion 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 review that shows: the IHRA system meets none of the three fundamental criteria — it is not appropriate, not based on 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 pending.