



## SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2018-08-24 Abstimmungs-Arena Initiative für Ernährungssouveränität

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2018-08-24 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 15:57

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**5.5/10**

*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 left-favouring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favouring). The calculation is based on the difference in the average favouring of left vs. right parties (grouping according to CHES 2024).

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**3.2 / 10**

*Left-favouring*

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

← Left

Right →

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

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



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Switzerland is a consensus democracy. The Federal Council consists of 7 members distributed among the major parties according to the magic formula: SVP (2 seats), SP (2 seats), FDP (2 seats), Centre (1 seat). There is no classic opposition role — all major parties are represented in the government. In this broadcast, Federal Councillor Johann Schneider-Ammann (FDP) appears as a representative of the Federal Council and Parliament.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NC	Government/Opposition	Core position (agriculture)
SVP	8.0	62	Government	Market orientation, personal responsibility, against regulation
SP	2.5	41	Government	Social and ecological agriculture, income protection for farmers
FDP	6.5	28	Government	Free trade, market orientation, lean state
Centre	5.0	29	Government	Pragmatic agricultural policy, family relief
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Ecological transition, ban on genetic engineering, regional supply
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Market-based with ecological guardrails
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Centre-oriented

The broadcast deals with the popular initiative "Food Sovereignty" (vote 2018), launched by La Via Campesina and left-ecological circles. The main line of tension runs between state regulation/planned economy (initiative) and market orientation/free trade (Federal Council/FDP/Centre). A second line concerns the income situation of farmers: structural change vs. farmers dying out. Third line: ban on genetic engineering in the constitution vs. flexible moratorium in law.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is the public broadcaster of Switzerland, financed through reception fees (today the Serafe levy). It is subject to Art. 4 RTVA, which prescribes accurate representation, diversity of opinion and balanced selection of discussion partners. The Arena is SRF's most important political discussion format and is of particular importance for democratic opinion formation ahead of popular votes.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	-2	08:01 "15 national SVP politicians have cancelled on us" — Programme position: SVP is in favour of market orientation and against regulation, which is consistent with the No position on the initiative — The party is implicitly portrayed as an unreliable partner through its absence and the moderator's question about missing support; SVP voters are framed as contradictory (78% Yes in poll); programme position correct, but portrayal of the party as absent and internally divided is distorting
SP	+3	11:12 "The initiative is very beneficial to farmers" / 39:42 "that is actually the core task of social democracy" — Programme position: SP in favour of social and ecological agriculture, income protection — Correctly and fully represented; Molina receives sufficient speaking time and can develop positions unimpeded
FDP	+2	01:45 Christa Markwalder present as FDP National Councillor — Programme position: Market-based solutions, free trade, lean state — Correctly represented; Markwalder consistently represents FDP line; Federal Councillor Schneider-Ammann (FDP) dominates as main guest
Centre	+2	01:15 Viola Amherd as CVP National Councillor — Programme position: Pragmatic agricultural policy, family relief — Correctly represented; Amherd takes moderate No position consistent with CVP programme
Greens	+3	01:49 Walter Sagletti as Greens National Councillor — Programme position: Ecological transition, ban on genetic engineering, regional supply — Correctly and fully represented; Sagletti can contribute Greens positions (genetic engineering, social conditions) unimpeded
GLP	0	No GLP representation in the broadcast — Programme position: not represented — omitted
EVP	0	No EVP representation — omitted

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: SP, score +3 / Greens, score +3
- Strongest distortion: SVP, score -2
- Average deviation from 0: 1.4
- Conclusion: The SVP is not distorted through misrepresentation of its positions, but through structural marginalisation: the absence of 15 SVP politicians is explicitly addressed by the moderator (08:01), making the party appear unreliable. At the same time, the SVP voter base is portrayed as internally contradictory (78% Yes tendency in poll). SP and Greens receive complete and fair representation of their positions.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast data

- Title: Arena — Food Sovereignty (SRF)
- Date: 24.08.2018
- Moderator: Jonas Preuer
- Responsible: Silvia Zwickatz (mentioned 68:09)

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Johann Schneider-Ammann	Federal Councillor, Minister of Economic Affairs	FDP	Centre-right
Ulrike Minkner	Vice-President Alliance Food Sovereignty, organic farmer	Initiative committee	Left-ecological
Viola Amherd	National Councillor	CVP/Centre	Centre
Fabian Molina	National Councillor	SP	Left
Martin Schuler	Farmer, SVP member	SVP	Right
Christa Markwalder	National Councillor	FDP	Centre-right
Walter Sagletti	National Councillor	Greens	Left-ecological
Ruedi Bärli	Initiative committee Food Sovereignty	Initiative committee	Left-ecological

### Main topic

Popular vote on the initiative "For Food Sovereignty" — question of whether state regulation of agriculture (prices, employment, ban on genetic engineering, border protection) should be incorporated into the constitution.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

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

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**Expert 1:** Ulrike Minkner, Vice-President Alliance Food Sovereignty, organic farmer

<b>Timestamp</b>	01:00
<b>Statement</b>	"Yes to food sovereignty. It brings farmers a fair income and all of us healthy, GM-free food."
<b>Classification</b>	Direct initiative supporter; structurally partisan; introduced as "organic farmer", which suggests proximity to practice but conceals conflict of interest
<b>Missing counter-voice</b>	Independent agricultural economist from ETH Zurich

Source in-depth check Minkner:

**(a) FUNDING:** Alliance for Food Sovereignty is an initiative committee; financed by member organisations (including Uniterre, Greens, SP-affiliated organisations); no government mandate

**(b) MANDATE:** Explicitly pro-initiative; no neutral mandate possible

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct initiative supporter, institutional interest in adoption

D2 Personal risk: +1 — As an organic farmer she bears economic risk in case of rejection

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Practical experience as a farmer, but no agricultural economics training

D4 Opinion consistency: +2 — Consistent position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Partly emotional ("farmers dying out"), partly with figures (milk prices)

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary; cites no primary studies

**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Framed as "organic farmer", which suggests neutrality, although she is Vice-President of the initiative committee → structurally partisan, not neutral

**Expert 2:** Ruedi Bärli, initiative committee Food Sovereignty

<b>Timestamp</b>	01:52
<b>Statement</b>	16:51 "He paid consumers 1.70 francs for a litre of milk in Switzerland. The farmer received 1.03 francs. Today the consumer pays 1.55 francs for a litre of milk and the farmer gets a mere 60 centimes."

Source in-depth check Bärli:

**(a) FUNDING:** Initiative committee; no independent funding

**(b) MANDATE:** Explicitly pro-initiative

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct committee member

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Farmer with own economic interest



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

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Practical knowledge of dairy farming  
 D4 Opinion consistency: +2 — Consistent  
 D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Provides concrete figures, but without citing sources  
 D6 Source level: -1 — Figures cited without primary source  
**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**

**Expert 3: Johann Schneider-Ammann, Federal Councillor (FDP)**

<b>Timestamp</b>	00:44
<b>Statement</b>	05:10 "The initiative has taken a real step backwards. A step back into the planned economy."

Source in-depth check Schneider-Ammann:

- (a) **FUNDING:** State-funded; Federal Council
- (b) **MANDATE:** Official representative of the Federal Council and Parliament; structurally against the initiative
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Government representative with official No mandate
  - D2 Personal risk: +1 — Political risk in case of defeat
  - D3 Professional competence: +2 — Minister of Economic Affairs, responsible for agricultural policy
  - D4 Opinion consistency: +2 — Consistent government position
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly factual
  - D6 Source level: +1 — References AP14-17, AP18-21 as basis
  - TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**

*Missing expert groups:*

- Independent agricultural economist (ETH/University of Bern)
- Independent WTO/trade law expert
- Independent genetic engineering scientist

**Source indicator for participants:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Ulrike Minkner, Vice-President Alliance Food Sovereignty, organic farmer	-2	+1	+1	+2	-1	0	+1	<b>YELLOW</b>
Ruedi Bärli, initiative committee Food Sovereignty	-2	+1	+1	+2	0	-1	+1	<b>YELLOW</b>
Johann Schneider-Ammann, Federal Councillor (FDP)	-1	+1	+2	+2	+1	+1	+6	<b>GREEN</b>

*Summary:*

- Minkner: **YELLOW (+1)** — Partisan initiative supporter, framed as "organic farmer"
- Bärli: **YELLOW (+1)** — Partisan committee member, figures without primary source
- Schneider-Ammann: **GREEN (+6)** — Official government representative, professionally competent, but with No mandate



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: GFS Bern trend poll

Timestamp 06:29

Statement "According to a current trend poll by GFS Bern... 75 percent are yes or rather yes."

- (a) **Funding:** GFS Bern is a private opinion research institute; client of the poll not named
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Trend polls before votes have known biases (social desirability); client unknown
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** No indication of margin of error; no reference to historical deviation between trend polls and voting results

### Source 2: Milk price figures (Bärli)

Timestamp 16:51

Statement "In 1992 he received 1.03 francs for a litre of milk... Today the consumer pays 1.55 francs for a litre of milk and the farmer gets a mere 60 centimes."

- (a) **Funding:** No source cited
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Figures from initiative committee member without primary source
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Federal Office for Agriculture (FOAG) could have provided official milk price statistics

### Source 3: Direct payments 3.7 billion (Markwalder)

Timestamp 20:34

Statement "but we as taxpayers also want to compensate very generously with 3.7 billion francs per year"

- (a) **Funding:** Government statistics; correct order of magnitude
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Low; figure is publicly accessible
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** None; figure undisputed

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 13:01

Claim: "There is no study that proves this" (Molina on price increases)

Word marker: Negation without counter-evidence

Primary source available: No — Molina claims absence of studies without proof; Markwalder claims price increase without study — both sides without primary source → +1 penalty point

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 52:57

Claim: "WTO is dead" (Bärli)

Word marker: Apodictic claim without evidence



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

Primary source available: No → +1 penalty point

*Summary: The source selection is weak; central disputed questions (price effects, WTO conformity) are discussed without independent primary sources. Both sides make unsubstantiated claims that the moderator does not challenge.*



### 3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time (from transcript analysis):

- Schneider-Ammann (No/Federal Council): (17%)
- Minkner (Yes/initiative committee): (14%)
- Molina (Yes/SP): (13%)
- Bärli (Yes/initiative committee): (10%)
- Sagletti (Yes/Greens): (7%)
- Markwalder (No/FDP): (11%)
- Amherd (No/Centre): (10%)
- Schuler (No/SVP): (6%)
- Moderator: (11%)

Yes side total: (44%)

No side total: (44%)

Moderator: (11%)

*Summary: The total speaking time is approximately balanced between Yes and No. However, the Yes side with 4 speakers (Minkner, Molina, Bärli, Sagletti) has more voices than the No side with 3 speakers (Schneider-Ammann, Markwalder, Amherd) plus SVP representative Schuler, who barely gets a word in. The numerical over-representation of the Yes side creates an impression of broader support.*



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

SVP position structurally absent

Relevant at: Timestamp 08:01

###### Effect

The largest party in Switzerland (62 seats, 27.9% voter share) is not represented. The moderator addresses the absence, but the effect remains: the right-wing camp is under-represented. Schuler as an SVP member (not National Councillor) is not an adequate substitute.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

Voting result of the parallel initiative "Fair Food" is not mentioned

Relevant at: Entire broadcast

###### Effect

The broadcast covers only the food sovereignty initiative, although the "Fair Food" initiative is being voted on simultaneously. Both initiatives are mentioned in the intro, but the parallel initiative disappears from the discussion. Viewers do not receive a complete picture of the voting landscape.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

No contextualisation of the 2005 voting result (genetic engineering moratorium)

Relevant at: 65:29 — Quote: "after 2005, when people had already said Yes to the genetic engineering moratorium"

###### Effect

Molina refers to the 2005 popular vote as legitimisation, without the moderator asking whether the moratorium was justified with similar arguments at the time. Historical context is missing.

*Summary: The most serious omission is the structural absence of the SVP, which is mentioned by the moderator but not compensated for. In addition, independent expert voices on the central disputed questions are missing.*

#### Missing voices

- Independent agricultural economist (e.g. ETH Zurich): Would have provided an empirical assessment of the price effects of the initiative and verified the claims of both sides
- WTO/trade law expert: Would have objectively clarified the controversial question of WTO conformity (51:00–54:00) rather than leaving it as a party dispute
- SVP National Councillor: Would have contributed the position of the largest party (62 seats); absence structurally problematic
- Migros/Coop representative: As directly affected major retailers who are named as culprits in the transcript (14:36), could have provided a counter-statement
- Consumer organisation (e.g. SKS): Would have provided an independent assessment of price impacts on low-income households



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

- Genetic engineering scientist (independent): Would have underpinned the genetic engineering debate (57:39–64:17) with facts rather than leaving it as an ideological exchange
- Agricultural employee: Would have confirmed or qualified the working conditions mentioned by Sagletti (44:24) from personal experience
- Development economist: Would have substantively contributed the briefly raised question of impacts on farmers in the Global South (30:25)



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

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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	06:29
Figure: "75 percent yes or rather yes" (GFS trend poll)	
Dimensions: (b) Share shown — (a) Absolute value missing — (c) Trend missing	
Missing context	No margin of error stated; no historical contextualisation (how much do trend polls deviate from the final result?); no indication that "rather yes" and "yes" are combined
Effect	Suggests overwhelming support; actual result was 31.6% Yes — deviation of more than 40 percentage points

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	16:51
Figure: Milk price comparison 1992 vs. today (Bärlü)	
Dimensions: (a) Absolute value shown — (b) Share partial — (c) Trend shown	
Missing context	No inflation adjustment; in 1992 milk was regulated (quota system), today liberalised — comparison is structurally inadmissible without this note
Effect	Suggests dramatic price collapse for farmers, without explaining the structurally different starting conditions

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	44:12
Figure: "Average income of farmers at approximately under 4,000 francs... For a working week of 60 hours" (Sagletti)	
Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — (b) no comparison with other sectors — (c) no trend	
Missing context	Direct payments not included (are only raised later by Markwalder, 46:02); no reference to benefits in kind (housing, produce); no sector comparison
Effect	Suggests extreme poverty among farmers; Markwalder partially corrects this, but the initial statement remains in the room

*Summary: The trend poll figure (75% Yes) is the most serious manipulation of figures, as it suggests a level of support far removed from the actual voting result (31.6% Yes). Milk price figures and income figures are presented without necessary context.*



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Association 1:

**Timestamp** 05:19

**Quote** "A step back into the planned economy."

Technique: Schneider-Ammann associates the initiative with "planned economy" — a term that is strongly negatively connoted in the Swiss context (GDR, Soviet Union)

**Effect** Initiative is associated with failed state socialism, without the association being substantiated

### Association 2:

**Timestamp** 31:50

**Quote** "When you read their initiative, it is somewhat reminiscent of this ideology... Somehow nationalisation, Sovietisation."

Technique: Moderator Jonas Preuer poses the question with the framing "Sovietisation" — thereby adopting the language of the opponents and presenting it as a question to the initiative supporter

**Effect** Moderator himself sets the association initiative = Sovietisation, which constitutes a clear taking of sides

### Association 3:

**Timestamp** 33:56

**Quote** "In the GDR for example. The picture was taken in 1985. The planned economy was so successful that people spent half the day in shops barely able to get any cleaning products."

Technique: Moderator shows a picture from the GDR and explicitly associates it with the initiative

**Effect** Visual and verbal association of the initiative with GDR planned economy; this is one of the strongest manipulation techniques in the broadcast

*Summary: The GDR/Sovietisation association is introduced not only by opponents, but by the moderator himself and reinforced with visual material. This is a clear violation of the moderator's duty of neutrality.*



## 7. TIMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:00–00:42 (beginning, intro clip)

Content: "The means of the initiative are more rules, more taxes, more tariffs and more state coercion."

#### Timing effect

The intro clip summarises the initiative from the opponents' perspective ("state coercion"). This is the first information viewers receive and sets the interpretive framework for the entire broadcast. "State coercion" is not a neutral description, but a value judgement.

### Finding 2:

Position: 31:50–34:07 (middle, after half-time)

Content: GDR image and Sovietisation framing by moderator

#### Timing effect

Placement in the middle of the broadcast, when the discussion is intense and viewers are maximally attentive. The visual GDR image remains in the memory.

### Finding 3:

Position: 68:09–70:24 (end, closing round)

Content: Personal childhood memories of disliked foods

#### Timing effect

The broadcast ends with a harmless, humorous round that emotionally neutralises the preceding GDR association and the planned economy debate. This can be read as a technique to soften the sharpness of the criticism of the initiative — or conversely, to relativise the seriousness of the supporters.

*Summary: The intro clip with "state coercion" and the GDR image in the middle of the broadcast are the strongest timing findings; both set negative frames for the initiative.*



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

4/10

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** 13:15

Triggering event: Markwalder argues that rising food prices harm low-income households

Reaction: Molina: "And when you now raise the point that there are people in Switzerland who genuinely have a limited budget, I find that almost cynical."

### Comparison

Analogous event: Molina himself argues with social inequalities (39:42 "what is truly antisocial is that today an incredible number of people cannot afford good food") — moderator does not react with outrage or follow-up question

Asymmetry: Molina's accusation of cynicism against Markwalder is not challenged by the moderator; Molina's own social argumentation is not measured by the same standard

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 30:07

Triggering event: Markwalder calls the initiative "brutally antisocial"

Reaction: Molina: "No, no, no, no" — Moderator intervenes: "We are having a discussion, ladies and gentlemen"

### Comparison

Molina's accusation of cynicism (13:15) against Markwalder — moderator does not intervene

Asymmetry: Moderator intervenes at Markwalder's "antisocial" statement, not at Molina's "cynical" accusation — slight asymmetry in favour of the Yes side

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 2/5

*Summary: Selective outrage is present, but not strongly pronounced. The asymmetry is evident primarily in the different moderation responses to comparable accusations from the Yes and No sides.*



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

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 51:00–54:00

Missing perspective/fact: Independent legal assessment of WTO conformity

Relevance: The WTO question is central to the assessment of the initiative; both sides make contradictory claims without evidence

Effect: Viewers cannot judge who is right; the question remains as a party dispute, which benefits the No side (doubt about feasibility)

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 13:01

Missing perspective/fact: Independent agricultural economics study on price effects

Relevance: Price increase vs. no price increase is the central consumer question; both sides claim without evidence

Effect: Viewers receive no reliable information on one of the most important questions

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** Entire broadcast

Missing perspective/fact: Voting result of the parallel initiative "Fair Food" and its differences from the food sovereignty initiative

Relevance: Both initiatives are put to a vote simultaneously; differences and similarities would be important for voters

Effect: Viewers do not receive a complete picture of the voting landscape

*Summary: The broadcast is thematically focused, but independent facts are missing on the central disputed questions (prices, WTO). Completeness suffers primarily from the absence of expert voices.*

The initiative is set in the context of a global movement (La Via Campesina) against industrial agriculture and free trade. In Switzerland, agriculture is heavily subsidised (3.7 billion CHF/year in direct payments), while at the same time the number of farms and producer prices are falling. The debate touches on fundamental questions: market vs. state, free trade vs. protectionism, ecology vs. economic viability. The initiative was rejected on 23 September 2018 with 68.4% No votes.

### Share of perspectives covered

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

**[A] Consumer perspective:** Effects on food prices for low-income households

**[B] Export economy:** Effects on Swiss export industry in case of WTO violations

**[C] Trade law expertise:** Independent legal assessment of WTO/bilateral agreements

**[D] Agricultural economics expertise:** Independent assessment of price effects of the initiative



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

- [E] **International comparisons:** Countries with similar regulations (France, Austria)
- [F] **SVP position:** Largest party structurally absent
- [G] **Retail/major distributors:** Migros/Coop as directly affected parties
- [H] **Agricultural employees:** Not only farmers, but wage earners in agriculture
- [I] **Developing countries perspective:** Effects of Swiss agricultural policy on farmers in the Global South
- [J] **Scientific genetic engineering research:** Independent assessment of the ban on genetic engineering

**[A] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 12:30 — Quote: "not all households can afford higher-segment food" — Assessment: Raised by Markwalder, but not substantiated by an independent consumer organisation.

**[B] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 55:05 — Quote: "in our country every second franc out of five francs is earned" — Assessment: Schneider-Amman mentions the export economy, but no independent economic voice.

**[C] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: WTO question is discussed controversially (51:00–54:00), but no independent trade law expert consulted; party positions substitute expertise.

**[D] OMITTED**

Timestamp: 13:01 — Quote: "There is no study that proves this" — Assessment: Molina disputes price studies, Markwalder claims price increase without study; no independent agricultural economics assessment.

**[E] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No international comparison with countries that have similar regulations.

**[F] OMITTED**

Timestamp: 08:01 — Quote: "15 national SVP politicians have cancelled on us" — Assessment: SVP structurally absent; largest party with 62 National Council seats not represented.

**[G] OMITTED**

Timestamp: 14:36 — Quote: "the retailers, because the importers, because the processors always cut themselves a larger slice of the pie" — Assessment: Major distributors are named as culprits, but not consulted.

**[H] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 44:24 — Quote: "for agricultural employees it is even much worse" — Assessment: Sagletti mentions wage earners, but no direct voice from this group.

**[I] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 30:25 — Quote: "farmers in the South, Fabian Molina, also have a right" — Assessment: Markwalder mentions briefly, but is not elaborated upon.

**[J] OMITTED**

Timestamp: 57:39–64:17 — Quote: genetic engineering debate — Assessment: No independent scientific voice on genetic engineering; debate between supporters and opponents without expert basis.

**Completeness score: 4/10**



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

Justification: Four out of ten relevant perspectives are at least indicated, six are completely absent. Particularly serious is the absence of independent expertise on the central disputed questions (price effects, WTO law, genetic engineering) as well as the structural absence of the SVP as the largest party. The broadcast primarily depicts the conflict between initiative supporters and FDP/Centre.



## 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	00:00
Quote	<i>"The means of the initiative are more rules, more taxes, more tariffs and more state coercion."</i>
Manipulation	The intro clip describes the initiative from the opponents' perspective. "State coercion" is a value judgement, not a neutral description. A neutral formulation would be: "state regulation" or "state framework conditions".
Why problematic	Sets the interpretive framework for the entire broadcast; viewers begin the discussion with a negative frame for the initiative

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	31:50
Quote	<i>"When you read their initiative, it is somewhat reminiscent of this ideology... Somehow nationalisation, Sovietisation."</i>
Manipulation	Moderator adopts opponents' vocabulary and presents it as a question. The GDR image reinforces the frame visually.
Why problematic	Moderator himself sets a frame (initiative = Sovietisation), which forces the supporter onto the defensive and shifts the discussion onto the opponents' terrain

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	21:27
Quote	<i>"One could say, as some opponents partly say, you want to go back to a time in which people lived as in Gotthelf's era."</i>
Manipulation	Moderator introduces the "Gotthelf era" framing, which portrays the initiative as backward-looking. Even though he identifies it as an opponent's view, he sets the frame himself.
Why problematic	Moderator functions as an amplifier of opponents' positions, not as a neutral questioner

*Summary: The framing of the broadcast is systematically directed against the initiative: intro ("state coercion"), GDR image (Sovietisation), Gotthelf era comparison. These frames are set by the moderator himself, not only by opponents.*



**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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	00:21
Quote	"more state coercion"
Manipulation	"Coercion" is strongly negatively connoted; implies lack of freedom and oppression
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "state requirements" or "state framework conditions"

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	05:19
Quote	"A step back into the planned economy"
Manipulation	"Planned economy" is a political battle cry in the Swiss context with GDR/Soviet connotations; used by Schneider-Ammann and not challenged by the moderator
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "stronger state control" or "market regulation"

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	28:44
Quote	"farmers dying out" (Molina) vs. "structural change" (Schneider-Ammann)
Manipulation	Both terms describe the same situation (declining number of farms), but with opposite connotations. "Farmers dying out" is emotional and dramatising; "structural change" is technical and neutral. The moderator adopts both terms without contextualisation.
Why problematic	The choice of words prejudices the assessment of the situation; a neutral broadcast would contextualise both terms

*Summary: The choice of words in the broadcast is asymmetric: opponents' vocabulary ("planned economy", "state coercion", "Sovietisation") is used more frequently and more prominently than supporters' vocabulary.*



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

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 02:16

Triggering event: Moderator opens interview with Federal Councillor Schneider-Ammann

**Quote (moderator)** *"Mr Schneider-Ammann, Swiss farmers and you — that is not a great love story. Mr Federal Councillor, what do you have against our farmers?"*

**Comparison** Opening question to Minkner (01:00): Neutral introduction without provocative question

Asymmetry: Schneider-Ammann is confronted with a provocatively critical question that puts him on the defensive. Minkner does not receive a comparably critical opening question. However, as a government representative, Schneider-Ammann can be expected to face tougher questioning — the asymmetry is partially justified.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 31:50

Triggering event: Discussion about state regulation in the initiative

**Quote (moderator)** *"When you read their initiative, it is somewhat reminiscent of this ideology... Somehow nationalisation, Sovietisation."*

**Comparison** No analogous framing against the No side (e.g. "does this remind you of Manchester capitalism?")

Asymmetry: Moderator himself sets a negative frame against the initiative, without setting a comparable frame against the opponents. This is the strongest asymmetry in moderation behaviour.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp 25:59

Triggering event: Schuler (SVP) defends himself against a personal attack by Bärli

**Quote (moderator)** *"Applause for Schuler, who refrains from a personal attack and returns to the topic."*

**Comparison** Molina's accusation of cynicism against Markwalder (13:15) — no applause, no acknowledgement

Asymmetry: Moderator explicitly praises the SVP representative for factual behaviour, without comparable praise for other participants. This is an unusual moderation intervention that highlights Schuler — possibly as compensation for his marginal role.

*Summary: The most serious moderation problem is the introduction of the Sovietisation framing by the moderator himself (31:50). This exceeds the role of the neutral questioner and constitutes an active taking of sides against the initiative.*



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

Asymmetry 1:	
<b>To Schneider-Ammann, 02</b>	16: "What do you have against our farmers?" — hard/provocative
<b>To Minkner, 31</b>	50: "When you read their initiative, it is somewhat reminiscent of this ideology... Somehow nationalisation, Sovietisation." — hard/provocative
<b>Comparison</b>	Both main guests receive tough questions, but the question to Minkner contains a negative framing (Sovietisation), while the question to Schneider-Ammann is a personal accusation. The question to Minkner is more damaging to her position in terms of content.

Asymmetry 2:	
<b>To Molina, 11</b>	12: "Why are you fighting for an initiative that is of no benefit to farmers and harms the economy?" — hard, with No-side premise
<b>To Markwalder, 29</b>	43: "One sentence, Christa Markwalder, please." — soft, no premise
<b>Comparison</b>	Molina receives a question with an embedded No premise ("of no benefit, harmful"); Markwalder receives an open invitation. Asymmetry in favour of the No side in question formulation.

Asymmetry 3:	
<b>To Schuler, 24</b>	26: "Why do you as a farmer, even though there is a farmer in favour of it, say no to this initiative?" — neutral/soft
<b>To Bärli, 17</b>	46: No direct question; Bärli is given the floor without a question
<b>Comparison</b>	Schuler is asked for his reasoning; Bärli may speak freely. Slight asymmetry.

*Summary: The strongest question asymmetry lies in the question to Molina with an embedded No premise and the Sovietisation question to Minkner. Both asymmetries disadvantage the Yes side.*



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp

53:37

Construct: "we have almost, I would say, a consensus, but an approximation on the point that it could actually be a major problem for Switzerland's foreign trade"

Analysis

Moderator constructs a "consensus" between the parties that does not actually exist. Molina has explicitly said there is no problem with the bilateral agreements; Markwalder says it is a clear WTO problem. The moderator artificially levels this difference.

Why problematic

False approximation conceals the actual dissent and prevents a clear contextualisation for viewers.

*Summary: False balance is less pronounced in this broadcast than other techniques; the main finding is the artificial construction of consensus on the WTO topic.*



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: "Planned economy" as reference framework for state regulation

**Timestamp** 05:19 — Evidence: "A step back into the planned economy"

Alternative agenda: State regulation as a normal instrument in market economies (e.g. energy sector, healthcare) could have served as a reference framework

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Farmer income problem as starting point of the discussion

**Timestamp** 11:21 — Evidence: "It is an initiative that remedies a grievance, namely that today producers cannot live from food."

Alternative agenda: Consumer prices and export economy could have been set as equally weighted starting points; the problem definition of the initiators is adopted as the starting point

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Ban on genetic engineering as part of the initiative

**Timestamp** 56:49 — Evidence: "You also have a ban on genetic engineering"

Alternative agenda: The genetic engineering topic takes up the broadcast (57:39–68:00), although it is a secondary aspect of the initiative. The agenda-setting on genetic engineering benefits the Yes side (broad population majority against genetic engineering), but diverts attention from the core economic questions.

*Summary: The agenda is shaped by the planned economy frame (No side) and the farmer income issue (Yes side); the genetic engineering topic receives disproportionately much space and emotionally benefits the Yes side.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 5.4 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 5.5 / 10

### Dominant techniques

- 1. Framing / Guilt by Association (score 7/6):** The introduction of the GDR/Sovietisation frame by the moderator himself (31:50) is the strongest single manipulation in the broadcast. The moderator abandons his role of neutrality and actively sets a negative frame against the initiative, which is visually reinforced by a GDR image.
- 2. Expert selection (score 7):** The broadcast completely foregoes independent expertise on the three central disputed questions (price effects, WTO conformity, genetic engineering). All guests are partisan; the discussion remains at the level of claims and counter-claims without an empirical basis.
- 3. Agenda-setting / choice of words (score 6/6):** The planned economy frame dominates the broadcast from the outset ("state coercion" in the intro) and is consistently reinforced by terms such as "Sovietisation", "GDR", "planned economy". This language comes from the repertoire of the No side and is adopted by the moderator.

### Core messages of the broadcast

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "The initiative leads to a planned economy and state coercion of the kind known from the GDR."

**Technique:** Framing, Guilt by Association, choice of words — Evidence: 00:21 ("state coercion"), 31:50 (GDR image), 05:19 ("planned economy")

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "Farmers have a real income problem, but the initiative is the wrong approach."

**Technique:** Agenda-setting, time distribution — Evidence: 16:51 (milk price figures), 44:12 (income figures), 05:10 (Schneider-Ammann: "wrong approach")

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "Rising food prices caused by the initiative harm the poorest — the initiative is antisocial."

**Technique:** Framing, source selection — Evidence: 12:30 (Markwalder: price increase), 30:07 ("brutally antisocial"), 38:41 ("serious core of the debate")

Justification: With an overall score of 5.5/10, the broadcast falls in the range of "clear one-sidedness". The most serious findings are the introduction of the GDR/Sovietisation frame by the moderator himself (violation of the duty of neutrality), the absence of independent expertise on the central disputed questions, and the intro frame "state coercion". At the same time, speaking time is approximately balanced and both sides are heard, which does not justify a classification as "systematic imbalance". The one-sidedness lies primarily in the framing and moderation, less in the time distribution. Art. 4 RTVA requires accurate representation and diversity of opinion; the moderator's adoption of battle cries from the No side violates this requirement.

### CONCLUSION

The Arena broadcast on the food sovereignty initiative exhibits a clear one-sidedness that is generated primarily by moderation behaviour and framing, not by gross time imbalances. The most serious finding is that moderator Jonas Preuer himself introduces the Sovietisation frame (31:50) and visually reinforces it with a GDR image — this exceeds the duty of neutrality of a public broadcaster moderator and constitutes a potential violation of Art. 4 RTVA. In addition, the intro clip with "state coercion" sets the interpretive framework for the entire broadcast from the opponents' perspective. The complete absence of independent expertise on the three central disputed questions (price effects, WTO conformity, genetic engineering) violates the principle of accurate representation, as viewers receive no reliable information basis for their vote. The structural absence of the SVP as the largest party (62 seats) is justified by cancellations, but should have been compensated by other measures (e.g. postponing the broadcast, inclusion by video). Overall, the broadcast does not fully meet the requirements of Art. 4 RTVA regarding accurate representation and balanced selection of discussion partners.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

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

**5.4/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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

**5.5/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**5.5/10**

*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>	Slight irregularity without material impairment of balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Slight to moderate finding</b>	Discernible tendency; relevance of effect low to moderate.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with relevance of effect</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-evidenced imbalance with marked relevance of effect.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Serious finding</b>	Pronounced imbalance; multiple evidenced individual findings in this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum expression</b>	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

### Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Unremarkable</b>	No material patterns discernible; broadcast meets 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 effect.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias</b>	Maximum expression across almost all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

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

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



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

### Assessment under Art. 4 RTVA

#### Violation 1:

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

Facts: Moderator himself introduces Sovietisation frame and GDR image

Evidence: Timestamp 31:50 — Quote: "When you read their initiative, it is somewhat reminiscent of this ideology... Somehow nationalisation, Sovietisation."

Assessment: A moderator of a public broadcasting programme may not introduce battle cries of one side himself and reinforce them with visual material. This violates the requirement of accurate representation, as the moderator no longer functions as a neutral questioner, but as an amplifier of the No side.

#### Violation 2:

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

Facts: Absence of independent expertise; structural absence of the SVP

Evidence: Timestamp 08:01 — Quote: "15 national SVP politicians have cancelled on us" — as well as entire broadcast without independent agricultural economist, trade law expert or genetic engineering scientist

Assessment: Art. 4 RTVA requires balanced selection of discussion partners. The absence of the largest party and the complete lack of independent expertise in a popular vote broadcast violates this requirement. The editorial team should have postponed the broadcast or chosen other formats to include the SVP.

#### Violation 3:

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

Facts: Intro clip with "state coercion" as description of the initiative

Evidence: Timestamp 00:21 — Quote: "The means of the initiative are more rules, more taxes, more tariffs and more state coercion."

Assessment: "State coercion" is not an objective description of the initiative's measures, but a value judgement from the opponents' perspective. An accurate representation would use neutral terms ("state regulation", "state framework conditions"). The intro clip sets the interpretive framework for the entire broadcast and thereby violates the requirement of accurate representation.

### Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in three respects: firstly through the active introduction of a negative frame (Sovietisation/GDR) by the moderator himself, which violates the duty of neutrality; secondly through the unbalanced selection of discussion partners (missing SVP, missing independent expertise); thirdly through the evaluative intro clip ("state coercion"). The violations are not so serious as to justify a complaint with a high probability of success — speaking time is approximately balanced, and both sides are heard. However, the Sovietisation framing by the moderator in particular exceeds the limits of permissible moderation in a public broadcasting vote programme. A UBI complaint (Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television) would be most promising with a focus on criterion 1 (moderation behaviour 31:50) and criterion 3 (intro clip).



## CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

### 1. GFS Bern (trend poll, 06:29)

1. **FUNDING:** Private opinion research institute; client of the cited poll not named
2. **MANDATE:** Opinion research; fundamentally neutral, but client determines the question
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Low for polls; however: trend polls before votes have known biases (social desirability, mobilisation effects)
4. **CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of interest: 0 / D2 Personal risk: +1 / D3 Professional competence: +2 / D4 Consistency: +1 / D5 Emotion vs. data: +2 / D6 Source level: +1 → TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN (for the poll itself; problematic is the missing contextualisation by the moderator)
5. **COUNTER-VOICE:** Historical deviation rate of GFS trend polls should have been mentioned; actual result (31.6% Yes) deviates by more than 40 percentage points

### 2. Alliance for Food Sovereignty / initiative committee (Minkner, Bärli)

1. **FUNDING:** Member organisations (Uniterre, left-ecological organisations, SP-affiliated groups)
2. **MANDATE:** Explicitly pro-initiative; no neutral mandate
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Maximum conflict of interest; institutional interest in adoption of the initiative
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
  - D2 Personal risk: +1
  - D3 Professional competence: +1
  - D4 Opinion consistency: +2
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1
  - D6 Source level: 0**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**
5. **COUNTER-VOICE:** Independent agricultural economist from ETH Zurich or University of Bern would have provided a counter-perspective

### 3. Federal Council / Federal Department of Economic Affairs (Schneider-Ammann)

1. **FUNDING:** State-funded; Federal Council
2. **MANDATE:** Official representative of the No recommendation of the Federal Council and Parliament
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Structurally against the initiative; government position
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -1
  - D2 Personal risk: +1
  - D3 Professional competence: +2
  - D4 Opinion consistency: +2
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1
  - D6 Source level: +1**TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**
5. **COUNTER-VOICE:** Independent agricultural economist could have verified the government position

*IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not an objective qualification. All three source groups have structural conflicts of interest. The broadcast presents exclusively partisan sources on a popular vote question, where independent expertise was available and necessary.*

#### Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Alliance for Food Sovereignty / initiative committee (Minkner, Bärli)	-2	+1	+1	+2	-1	0	+1	YELLOW



Federal Council / Federal Department of Economic Affairs (Schneider-Ammann)	-1	+1	+2	+2	+1	+1	+6	GREEN
---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-------

## Legal and methodological classification

<b>No finding of fact</b>	The results presented do not constitute findings of fact about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a determination of individual responsibility.
<b>No legal ruling</b>	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of Art. 4 RTVA. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular the UBI).
<b>No proof of causality</b>	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.
<b>No judgement of intent</b>	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.
<b>Heuristic comparison instrument</b>	The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not for precise metric measurement of individual contributions. Threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as sharp legal qualification.



## APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

### Legal basis Switzerland — SRG SSR

---

#### Law

---

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

#### Relevant articles

---

- Art. 4 para. 1 RTVA: All broadcasts of a radio or television programme must respect fundamental rights. The broadcasts must in particular respect human dignity, must not be discriminatory, must not contribute to racial hatred, must not endanger public morality, and must not glorify or trivialise violence.
- Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA: Editorial broadcasts with informational content must 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 expressed appropriately (diversity requirement).

#### Core obligations

---

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

#### Supervisory authority

---

- UBI (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 the SRG: First point of contact for programme complaints

#### Complaints procedure

---

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



## APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS

### Literature

---

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Research Centre Public Sphere and Society (2024). *Yearbook Quality of the Media 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methods report v4.1: Countable criteria and multi-model cross-validation*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

### SVFAB Working Papers

---

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

*David Schläpfer — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266*

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



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

## Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

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

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

### Contact and further information:

[www.SVFAB.ch](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:Kontakt@SVFAB.ch)

**Bank details:** PostFinance – POFICHBE

**IBAN:** CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

**Recipient:** SVFAB, P.O. Box, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

## You can obtain the following books from SVFAB

Orders via [www.svfab.ch](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch)



**Unbalanced reporting** is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and source selection. Subsequently, 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with many examples. In addition, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques — this promotes not only insight but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**

Also available as **audiobook**



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage — and someone else has written the script.

Those who do not know this provide material. Good quotes that are cut incorrectly. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers that are framed as confessions.

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

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

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



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



**You think you see the world.** In reality you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It does not change the facts — it changes what we make of the facts. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate. Daily. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You learn not only how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Listen to the news differently. Conduct conversations with more 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 complain. There is even an authority for this: the UBI, 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 — objectively, precisely, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional law review that shows: the UBI 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 should be controlling.

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