



SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2021-01-08 10 vor 10 vom 08.01.2021

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2021-01-08 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 13:39

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

OVERALL SCORE

6.6/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

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

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	Greens	SP	GLP	Centre	EVP	FDP	SVP
CHES	1.13	1.67	3.60	5.47	5.64	7.67	9.00
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Centre	Right	Right	Right

The overall tendency is displayed on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly 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)

2.9 / 10

Left-favouring

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

This section serves 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: SVP (2 seats), SP (2 seats), FDP (2 seats), The Centre (1 seat). There is no classic government/opposition divide — all major parties are represented in the government (magic formula). Opposition dynamics arise through parliamentary majorities and referendums, not through exclusion from government.

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

The most important lines of conflict in Switzerland at the time of broadcast (January 2021) are: (1) Pandemic policy — scope and proportionality of state measures, distribution of competences between the Confederation and cantons; (2) EU bilateral agreements — the institutional framework agreement is on the verge of collapse; (3) Migration and freedom of movement; (4) Economic consequences of the pandemic and national debt.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is the public broadcaster of German-speaking Switzerland, financed through Serafe licence fees. Pursuant to Art. 4 RTVA, SRF is obliged to provide accurate representation, diversity of opinion and impartiality. As Switzerland's largest media organisation, SRF bears special responsibility for democratic opinion formation.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

The broadcast covers three topics: (1) US Capitol storming, (2) Covid sequencing in Switzerland, (3) Women in the start-up scene. Swiss party positions are only directly addressed in the Covid sequencing segment (Ruth Rumbel, The Centre, National Council Health Committee).

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — no portrayal possible
SP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — no portrayal possible
FDP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — no portrayal possible
Centre	+2	15:23 "Ruth Rumbel [...] President of the National Council Health Committee" — Programme position Centre: pragmatic solutions, Confederation/cantons balance — Portrayal correct, but one-sided: only the demand for more federal intervention is presented, without a counterposition on cantonal autonomy
Greens	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — no portrayal possible
GLP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — no portrayal possible
EVP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — no portrayal possible

Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: Centre (score +2) — only party with direct representation
- Strongest distortion: Centre (score +2) — Rumbel's demand for federal intervention is presented without a dissenting voice on cantonal autonomy
- Average deviation from 0: 0.3 (not relevant for 6 out of 7 parties)
- Conclusion: The broadcast is primarily focused on US topics and social topics; Swiss party politics plays a marginal role. The only explicitly political Swiss voice (Rumbel/Centre) is presented without a dissenting voice, making the demand for greater federal competence appear as a consensus position, even though it is politically contested.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast data

- Title: SRF 10 vor 10
- Date: 08.01.2021
- Presenter/Reporter: Presenter (not named in transcript); Reporters: Michael Gerber (Capitol segment), Thomas von Grünigen (Washington correspondent, live link), Remy Büttler/Stefanie Schunke/Stefan Weber (Covid segment), Stefanie Knoll (start-up segment), Lukas Messmer (Thailand segment)

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Thomas von Grünigen	SRF correspondent Washington	SRF (public broadcaster)	Neutral (journalistic)
Cynthia Miller-Idriss	Extremism researcher	Academic (US)	Left-academic
Johanna Wild	Investigative journalist	Journalistic (US)	Not clearly identifiable
Jake Angeli	QAnon activist	Pro-Trump/QAnon	Far right
Richard Barnett	Capitol intruder	Pro-Trump	Far right
Nick Ox	Proud Boys Hawaii	Proud Boys/Republicans	Far right
Manuel Schiebler	Deputy Head of Virology Laboratory, University Hospital Geneva	Science	Neutral
Tanja Stadler	ETH Professor of Biosystems	Science	Neutral
Ruth Rumbel	President of the National Council Health Committee	The Centre	Centre
Anna Belzung	Start-up founder (Dempora)	Business	Neutral
Paula Gilani	Entrepreneur/board member, Innosuisse coach	Innosuisse (federal agency)	Neutral-institutional
Anina Menzi	Founder of Futurepreneurship	NGO/programme	Neutral-progressive

Main topic

The broadcast analyses the storming of the US Capitol on 6 January 2021 as an expression of right-wing extremism and conspiracy ideology, supplemented by two Swiss topics (Covid sequencing, women in start-ups) and an international segment (Thailand/rice straw).



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: Cynthia Miller-Idriss, extremism researcher

Timestamp	04:40–05:27
Statement	"Since 9/11 we have focused almost exclusively on international terrorism. And as a result, we lack the means today to recognise domestic terrorist tendencies in time."
Classification	Professor at American University Washington DC, specialising in right-wing extremism. Well-known critic of right-wing movements, publishes primarily on this topic.
Missing dissenting voice	Expert on political violence in general (left and right), e.g. from the Cato Institute or a conservative think tank.

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: American University (private, liberal orientation); research funding from, among others, government bodies (DHS) and liberal foundations. Conflict of interest: Research mandate limited to right-wing extremism structurally constrains the perspective.

(b) MANDATE: Specialisation in right-wing extremism is compatible with statements about right-wing groups, but not with an overall assessment of political violence in the USA.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Research mandate on right-wing extremism; no incentive to treat left-wing violence on an equal footing

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Academic career depends on publications; no obvious personal endangerment

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Recognised expert on right-wing extremism; statements within area of expertise

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent research position over years

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Largely factual, but without data on left-wing violence as a comparison

D6 Source level: +1 — Secondary (researcher, not primary source of the event)

TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The assessment is framed as a neutral expert statement, even though it is structurally specialised in right-wing extremism. No indication of the missing comparative perspective on left-wing violence.

Expert 2: Johanna Wild, investigative journalist

Timestamp	05:42–06:12
Statement	"The mixing is definitely something that is very dangerous. Because we have for the first time the situation where various groups, who do not necessarily believe in democracy, are able to come together."



Classification	Investigative journalist, specialising in online extremism and disinformation. No academic qualification as an expert; journalistic perspective.
Missing dissenting voice	Journalist who has also investigated left-wing online networking (Antifa, BLM radicals).

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Working as a journalist; funding unclear from transcript. No obvious institutional conflict of interest identifiable.

(b) MANDATE: Investigative journalism on online extremism — compatible with statements on online networking.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — No obvious institutional affiliation

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Investigative journalism entails professional risks

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Journalistic expertise, not academic; statements on online networking plausible

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No comparative data available

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Statements without concrete data evidence

D6 Source level: +1 — Secondary (observer, not primary source)

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Wild is presented as an expert on online networking without clarifying her journalistic (not academic) qualification.

Expert 3: Thomas von Grünigen, SRF correspondent Washington

Timestamp	07:30–11:36
Statement	"Conservative propaganda media, they give such conspiracy theories a degree of encouragement."
Classification	SRF's own correspondent; not an independent expert, but an editorial staff member. Used as an observer and commentator, not as a neutral expert.
Missing dissenting voice	Conservative US journalist or media analyst.

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: SRF (public broadcaster, Switzerland). Conflict of interest: As an SRF employee, he has an institutional interest in portraying public broadcasting as a counterweight to "propaganda media".

(b) MANDATE: Correspondent, not an expert in US extremism or media studies.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — SRF employee who describes conservative media as "propaganda media"; institutional conflict of interest

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No identifiable personal endangerment through statements

D3 Professional competence: 0 — Journalist, not an expert in extremism or media studies

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No comparative data

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — "Propaganda media" is evaluative, without evidence

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary (observer)

TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Von Grünigen is deployed as a correspondent, but his statements go far beyond reporting into political commentary and media criticism — without being identified as opinion.

Missing expert groups:

- Conservative US political scientist (e.g. from AEI, Heritage Foundation)
- Expert on political violence in general (not only right-wing extremism)
- Constitutional lawyer on the freedom of speech question



Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Cynthia Miller-Idriss, extremism researcher	-1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+5	GREEN
Johanna Wild, investigative journalist	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+3	YELLOW
Thomas von Grünigen, SRF correspondent Washington	-2	0	0	0	-1	0	-3	YELLOW

Summary:

Expert	Source indicator	Main problem
Miller-Idriss	GREEN (+5)	Structurally limited to right-wing extremism, no comparative perspective
Wild	YELLOW (+3)	Journalist, no academic qualification; without data evidence
Von Grünigen	YELLOW (-3)	SRF-internal, institutional conflict of interest, evaluative statements without evidence

All three experts share the same basic perspective (right-wing extremism as the main problem); not a single dissenting voice was sought.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: Online forums / chat logs (not named)

Timestamp

05:28–05:37

Statement

"In online forums like this one, many demonstrators had apparently arranged to meet beforehand. In a chat, a call was made to storm the Capitol."

- (a) **Funding and sponsorship:** Not identified; no source named
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Cannot be assessed, as source is anonymous
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** No verification of the claim; no indication of which forums, which chats

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 05:28

Claim: "In online forums like this one, many demonstrators had apparently arranged to meet beforehand."

Word marker: "apparently"

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

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 05:38–05:42

Claim: "Even detailed plans of the Capitol complex were shared and freely accessible."

Word marker: No explicit qualification, but no source cited

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

Source 2: New York Times (implicit)

Timestamp

03:57–04:04

Statement

"To a journalist from the New York Times he later boasts..."

- (a) **Funding:** New York Times Company (publicly listed, liberal orientation)
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** NYT had a clear editorial line against Trump at the time; quote is adopted without source verification
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** No conservative media source cited

Source 3: Cynthia Miller-Idriss (research findings)

Timestamp

04:40–05:02

Statement

"Gun sales have been skyrocketing since the summer. Ammunition is running short."

- (a) **Funding:** American University (private-liberal)
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Research mandate on right-wing extremism
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** No data source for gun sales figures cited; no contextualisation of whether gun purchases also rose among other political groups



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

Summary: The source selection is one-sidedly concentrated on anti-Trump/anti-right sources. Two claims are presented without a primary source ("apparently"), which does not meet minimum journalistic standards. Conservative or pro-Trump sources are entirely absent.



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

Estimated speaking time in the Capitol segment (00:07–11:36, approx. 11.5 min.):

- Anti-Trump/extremism perspective (Miller-Idriss, Wild, von Grünigen): approx. 5.5 min. (48%)
- Presenter/introduction/narration: approx. 4.5 min. (39%)
- Trump supporters (Angeli, Barnett — as negative examples): approx. 1.5 min. (13%)
- Pro-Trump/conservative perspective (argumentative): 0 min. (0%)

Entire broadcast ():

- Capitol/USA topic: approx. 11.5 min. (43%)
- Covid sequencing: approx. 5.5 min. (20%)
- Start-up/women: (19%)
- Thailand/rice straw: (15%)
- Other (intro, outro, advertising): (4%)

Summary: In the Capitol segment, the critical-left perspective receives almost half of the speaking time, while a conservative or pro-Trump perspective (beyond depictions of extremists) receives zero seconds. The time distribution is structurally one-sided.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1: BLM/Antifa riots as a comparative frame

Context

In the summer of 2020, there were over 570 riots in the USA with dozens of deaths, billions of dollars in property damage and attacks on federal buildings (Portland Courthouse). These are only mentioned in the segment as context for the emergence of militias (04:24), never as a comparison for political violence.

Relevant at: Timestamp 06:41–06:50 ("Radical, violence-prone groups left a scene of devastation at the Capitol the day before yesterday.")

Effect

Political violence appears as an exclusively right-wing phenomenon; the viewer does not receive a complete picture of political violence in the USA.

Omission 2: 74 million moderate Trump voters

Context

Trump received 74 million votes. The broadcast shows exclusively extremists (QAnon shaman, Proud Boys, gun fanatics) as representatives of his supporters.

Relevant at: Timestamp 07:05–07:13 ("By far not all of those who took part in the storming of the Capitol can be assigned to the right-wing extremist or conspiracy theorist camp.")

Effect

This sentence is spoken, but is contradicted by the entire visual language and expert selection. The differentiation remains rhetorical without substantive implementation.

Omission 3: Intra-party condemnation by Republicans

Context

Liz Cheney, Mitt Romney, Ben Sasse and other prominent Republicans sharply condemned the storming and called for consequences for Trump. This would have shown the picture of a divided GOP.

Relevant at: Timestamp 10:39–11:26 (impeachment discussion)

Effect

The Republican Party appears as a monolithic bloc behind Trump, which distorts the actual picture.

Summary: The three most serious omissions all concern the contextualisation of the Capitol storming: comparable left-wing violence is absent, moderate Trump voters are absent, and the intra-party opposition to Trump is absent. The result is a structurally distorted picture that touches on Art. 4 RTVA.

Missing voices

- Moderate Trump voter (not an extremist): Would have contributed: differentiation between 74 million voters and a few hundred extremists; explanation of the loss of trust in institutions without conspiracy ideology
- Republican member of Congress (condemnation side): Would have contributed: depiction of the intra-party split in the GOP; Liz Cheney, Mitt Romney sharply condemned the storming
- Constitutional lawyer (1st Amendment): Would have contributed: neutral assessment of the legal limits of Trump's speech without implicit attribution of blame



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

- Sociologist on loss of trust in institutions: Would have contributed: structural analysis of the phenomenon beyond the extremism framing
- Conservative media representative: Would have contributed: counter-perspective to the characterisation of conservative media as "propaganda media"
- Historian on political violence in the USA: Would have contributed: historical contextualisation showing that political violence is not an exclusively right-wing phenomenon
- Trump defender/lawyer: Would have contributed: legal counter-perspective to the impeachment discussion
- Political scientist on electoral fraud allegations: Would have contributed: factual contextualisation of the allegations (neither confirmation nor blanket rejection)



5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1: Sequencing rate Switzerland

Timestamp 13:35–15:16

Figure: "Every week, Tanja Stadler's laboratory sequences 500 randomly selected Covid-positive samples from across Switzerland. That is just two percent."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: 500 samples/week — shown ✓
- (b) Share: 2% — shown ✓
- (c) Trend: development over time — MISSING X

Missing context

How has the sequencing rate developed? Was it higher/lower before? What capacities would be needed? What does a sequencing cost?

Effect

"Just two percent" sounds alarming, without the viewer being able to assess whether this represents progress or regression.

Finding 2: Switzerland vs. Great Britain sequencing comparison

Timestamp 15:08–15:16

Figure: "In Great Britain, this is the case for every 19th test. In Switzerland, it has so far been only every hundredth test."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: 1/19 vs. 1/100 — shown ✓
- (b) Share: implicit ✓
- (c) Trend: MISSING X

Missing context

Great Britain had at the time the world's leading sequencing programme (COGUK), which was explicitly built up in response to the British variant — a special case, not a normal benchmark. Comparison with Germany, France, Italy is missing.

Effect

Switzerland appears as a laggard, even though according to the transcript it is "still clearly ahead of neighbouring countries" (15:16) — this exculpatory fact is immediately overshadowed by Rumbel's criticism.

Summary: The figures on Covid sequencing are used selectively: the comparison with the world leader Great Britain (without contextualising it as an exceptional case) and the absence of trend data create a more negative impression of Swiss performance than the data justify.



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

Association 1: Jake Angeli — QAnon shaman as representative of Trump supporters

Timestamp	02:10–03:02
Quote	<i>"His name is Jake Angeli. But he is by no means an angel. Angeli was right at the front during the storming of the Capitol, is one of the leaders. In his Viking costume he appears more harmless than he is."</i>

Technique: Angeli is introduced as the first and most prominent representative of Trump supporters. By portraying him as a "leader" and linking him to QAnon, the entire Trump supporter base is implicitly associated with conspiracy ideology.

Effect	The viewer associates support for Trump with QAnon ideology, even though Angeli represents a fringe phenomenon.
---------------	---

Association 2: Richard Barnett — gun fanatic as Trump supporter

Timestamp	03:45–04:17
Quote	<i>"This man is no choirboy either. Richard Barnett makes himself at home in the office of opposition leader Nancy Pelosi. [...] Barnett is a gun enthusiast and poses proudly with his rifle."</i>

Technique: Barnett is associated with gun fanaticism, disrespect towards Democrats and admiration for a WWII general. The link "Trump supporter = gun fanatic" is established without differentiation.

Effect	Support for Trump is equated with gun violence and extremism.
---------------	---

Association 3: "Conservative propaganda media" — equating conservative media with the promotion of conspiracy theories

Timestamp	08:28–08:37
Quote	<i>"Conservative propaganda media, they give such conspiracy theories a degree of encouragement."</i>

Technique: The term "propaganda media" is used exclusively for conservative media. Liberal media are not mentioned. The association: conservative = propaganda = promotion of conspiracy theories.

Effect	Conservative media users are implicitly framed as recipients of conspiracy theories.
---------------	--

For Jake Angeli (framed as a "conspiracy theorist"):

SOURCE CHECK:

- Does this actor work with verifiable primary sources? NO — QAnon claims are not source-based
- Are his core statements falsifiable? NO — "global organisation" is not falsifiable

RISK MATRIX:

- Lost: social acceptance, professional prospects
- Gained: community belonging, attention, identity
- Net: gain > loss → reduced credibility



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

TONALITY: Emotionally apocalyptic ("saviour", "redeemer"), no uncertainties acknowledged

RESULT CATEGORY: C — Conspiracy ideologue (unsubstantiated claims, not falsifiable)

Note: The categorisation C for Angeli is substantiated by the above criteria — not by the framing of the broadcast.

Chain of association: Trump supporters → QAnon shaman → right-wing extremists → antisemites → gun fanatics → terrorism potential

Summary: The broadcast constructs a systematic chain of association that equates Trump support with extremism, conspiracy ideology and willingness to use violence. While Angeli is correctly to be classified as a Category C actor, he is presented as representative of a movement of 74 million voters — that is guilt by association in the classic sense.



7. TIMING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: Exculpatory information buried at the end of the segment

Position: 07:05–07:13 (end of the main segment, shortly before live link)

Content: "By far not all of those who took part in the storming of the Capitol can be assigned to the right-wing extremist or conspiracy theorist camp."

Timing effect

This important differentiation comes after 7 minutes of exclusively extremist portrayal. The primacy effect (first impressions shape perception) has already been established. The qualification comes too late and too briefly to correct the picture previously built up.

Finding 2: Switzerland "clearly ahead of neighbouring countries" — immediately overshadowed

Position: 15:16–15:23

Content: "This means it is still clearly ahead of neighbouring countries. But Ruth Rumbel is anything but satisfied with this ranking."

Timing effect

The positive information (Switzerland better than neighbouring countries) is immediately neutralised by "But" and Rumbel's criticism. The "But" functions as a rhetorical eraser.

Finding 3: Broadcast announcement sets framing before the segment

Position: 00:17–00:31

Content: "In today's focus we show how widespread the conspiracy-theoretical and right-nationalist ideas are among the supporters of President Trump and what danger these extremists pose."

Timing effect

The announcement presents the conclusion before the segment. The viewer is not invited to form their own picture, but receives the interpretation in advance. This is classic priming.

Summary: The timing pattern is consistent: exculpatory or differentiating information is either placed at the end (after the primacy effect) or immediately neutralised by "but" constructions. The broadcast announcement sets the framing before the segment.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

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

Methodological principle K11+K8: Document the triggering event — asymmetry is only demonstrable with a comparable trigger without an analogous reaction.

Finding 1: Trump's speech — "played with fire"

Timestamp 10:02–10:11

Triggering event: Trump's speech before the Capitol storming, in which he urged his supporters to "be strong" and march to the Capitol.

Reaction: "He played with fire in his speech. He explicitly, more or less explicitly, led his supporters to the riots."

Comparison

BLM leaders and Democratic politicians (e.g. Maxine Waters: "Get in their face", Kamala Harris on BLM funds) made comparable statements before the riots of the summer of 2020 — no analogous reaction in the broadcast.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — comparable rhetorical triggers by left-wing politicians were not treated with analogous outrage.

Degree of outrage: 3/5 — Multiple and clear ("played with fire", "led")

Selectivity: 4/5 — Clear one-sidedness; only right-wing rhetoric is framed as dangerous

Finding 2: "Conservative propaganda media"

Timestamp 08:28–08:37

Triggering event: Question about the causes of conspiracy beliefs.

Reaction: "Conservative propaganda media, they give such conspiracy theories a degree of encouragement."

Comparison

Left-wing media (MSNBC, CNN) demonstrably spread false claims (Russiagate, Covington students, etc.) — no analogous criticism in the broadcast.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — "propaganda media" is used exclusively for conservative media.

Degree of outrage: 2/5 — Isolated, but clearly evaluative

Selectivity: 5/5 — Exclusively one side

Summary: The broadcast shows a clear asymmetric outrage structure: right-wing rhetoric and conservative media are framed as dangerous and propagandistic, while comparable left-wing phenomena are not mentioned. Both findings fulfil the methodological principle K11+K8: the triggering events are documented, and comparable triggers on the other side did not produce an analogous reaction.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: No contextualisation of the size of the extremist minority

Timestamp 00:17–11:36 (entire Capitol segment)

Missing perspective/fact: How many people actually stormed the Capitol? (Estimates: 800–2,000 out of approx. 50,000 demonstrators). How large is QAnon actually? What proportion of Trump voters subscribe to conspiracy theories?

Relevance: Without these figures, the viewer cannot assess whether this is a fringe phenomenon or a mass movement.

Impact: The broadcast implicitly suggests that extremism is widespread among Trump supporters, without providing evidence for this claim.

Finding 2: No depiction of the security failures

Timestamp 05:03–05:07

Missing perspective/fact: Why was the Capitol so poorly secured? There were reports of warnings that were ignored and possible complicity of individual security personnel.

Relevance: The institutional responsibility for the security failure is a central aspect of the event.

Impact: Responsibility is attributed exclusively to the demonstrators; institutional failure remains invisible.

Finding 3: Missing contextualisation of the electoral fraud allegations

Timestamp 08:15–08:23

Missing perspective/fact: The broadcast describes the conviction of Trump's electoral victory as "absurd, grotesque conspiracy theories", without addressing the actual court proceedings (60+ lawsuits, mostly dismissed on procedural grounds) or the question of why millions of people believed these allegations.

Relevance: Understanding the loss of trust in electoral processes is central to contextualising the event.

Impact: Complex institutional trust issues are reduced to "conspiracy theory".

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits all perspectives that would relativise or differentiate the picture of a right-wing extremist coup attempt. The result is a structurally incomplete portrayal that does not meet the requirements of Art. 4 RTVA for accurate representation.

The storming of the Capitol on 6 January 2021 was a historically unique event in US history that sent shockwaves around the world. The interpretation of the event was politically contested from the outset: left-wing and liberal media framed it as a fascist coup attempt, while conservative voices emphasised the role of electoral fraud allegations and institutional loss of trust. The question of who the demonstrators were and what drove them was still largely unresolved at the time of broadcast. At the same time, the question was in the air of whether and how Trump could be held responsible for the events.

Share of perspectives covered

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

[A] Right-wing extremism and QAnon as the main drivers of the storming



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

- [B] Institutional loss of trust in US democracy as a structural cause
- [C] Role of social media and platform responsibility (both sides)
- [D] Comparison with left-wing riots (BLM, Antifa) in the summer of 2020 as a comparative frame
- [E] Trump's legal responsibility and freedom of speech protection (1st Amendment)
- [F] Role of the Republican Party and its leadership
- [G] Perspective of moderate Trump voters (not extremists)
- [H] Historical contextualisation:** Earlier political violence in the USA (left and right)
- [I] Response of democratic institutions (Congress, judiciary, military)
- [J] International contextualisation:** Comparable phenomena in other democracies

[A] COVERED

Timestamp: 00:17–06:50 — Quote: "Conspiracy believers like Angeli, right-wing extremists and antisemites with Camp Auschwitz pullovers. They were all there at the Capitol storming the day before yesterday." — Assessment: Covered in detail, dominates the entire reporting.

[B] INDICATED

Timestamp: 06:55–07:04 — Quote: "It hits American society at a difficult moment. In an economic crisis and a political crisis." — Assessment: Only briefly mentioned, not explored in depth; structural causes are not analysed.

[C] INDICATED

Timestamp: 08:28–08:48 — Quote: "Conservative propaganda media, they give such conspiracy theories a degree of encouragement. Then it certainly has to do with social media." — Assessment: Only conservative media are identified as the problem; left-wing media distortion is not mentioned.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: BLM riots of the summer of 2020 are briefly mentioned as context for militias (04:24), but are never analysed as a comparative frame for political violence.

[E] INDICATED

Timestamp: 10:51–11:26 — Quote: "Trump is very clever at formulating such things in a way that his fans know what he means, but that they are legally difficult to pin down." — Assessment: The legal question is addressed, but with implicit attribution of blame without a defence perspective.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The role of the Republican Party (condemnations by Romney, Cheney, etc.) is not mentioned.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Moderate Trump voters (74 million) are not given a voice; all Trump supporters shown are extremists.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Historical political violence in the USA (assassination attempt on Reagan, Oklahoma City, left-wing bombings of the 1970s) is not drawn upon as context.

[I] INDICATED

Timestamp: 01:35–01:44 — Quote: "On 20 January a new administration will be sworn in." — Assessment: Institutional resilience is implicitly indicated through Trump's announcement of the transfer of power, but not explicitly analysed.



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

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: International comparisons (Yellow Vests, Brazil, etc.) are entirely absent.

Completeness score: 3/10

Justification: The broadcast covers the extremist perspective [A] in detail, touches on structural causes [B] and media responsibility [C] only superficially, and completely omits four out of ten relevant perspectives. Particularly serious is the absence of a comparative frame for political violence [D], moderate Trump voters [G] and the role of the Republican Party [F]. The picture that emerges is structurally incomplete.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (setting the frame)

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: Capitol storming as a right-wing extremist coup attempt

Timestamp	00:17–00:31
Quote	<i>"In today's focus we show how widespread the conspiracy-theoretical and right-nationalist ideas are among the supporters of President Trump and what danger these extremists pose."</i>
Manipulation	The framing is already set in the announcement: it is not about what happened, but about "how widespread" extremism is — the premise is set, not the question.
Why problematic	The viewer is not invited to form their own picture. The conclusion (widespread extremism) is presented as the starting point, not as a thesis to be examined.

Finding 2: Jake Angeli as representative

Timestamp	02:10–02:23
Quote	<i>"His name is Jake Angeli. But he is by no means an angel. [...] In his Viking costume he appears more harmless than he is."</i>
Manipulation	Angeli is introduced as the first and most prominent representative of Trump supporters. The framing "appears more harmless than he is" suggests hidden dangerousness.
Why problematic	Angeli is a fringe figure; his use as the opening figure frames the entire movement as dangerously extremist.

Finding 3: "An incident that was foreseeable"

Timestamp	06:59–07:04
Quote	<i>"But it was an incident that was foreseeable."</i>
Manipulation	This formulation implies that the event was predictable and avoidable — and thus that those responsible (implicitly: Trump and his supporters) acted deliberately.
Why problematic	"An incident that was foreseeable" is an evaluation, not a description. It presupposes intent without substantiating it.

Summary: The framing of the broadcast is fixed from the outset: the Capitol storming is a right-wing extremist attack on democracy, Trump is responsible, and his supporters are dangerous extremists. This framing is consistently maintained through image selection, expert selection and language.



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

Finding 1: "Conservative propaganda media"	
Timestamp	08:28–08:34
Quote	<i>"Conservative propaganda media, they give such conspiracy theories a degree of encouragement."</i>
Manipulation	"Propaganda media" is a highly evaluative term with historical connotations (Nazi propaganda, Soviet propaganda). It is used without evidence and exclusively for conservative media.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Conservative media that in some cases report uncritically on conspiracy theories." The term used delegitimises conservative media wholesale.

Finding 2: "Rampaging mob"	
Timestamp	00:09–00:10
Quote	<i>"A rampaging mob storms the parliamentary building in Washington."</i>
Manipulation	"Mob" is a derogatory term for an unorganised, violent crowd. "Rampaging" suggests animal-like, uncontrolled behaviour.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Demonstrators who forced their way into the Capitol building." "Mob" is an evaluation, not a description.

Finding 3: "Saviour" / "Redeemer" for Trump	
Timestamp	02:58–03:19
Quote	<i>"They wanted to lend a hand to the saviour the day before yesterday, the QAnon followers. [...] Trump is also very often actually portrayed as a kind of messiah."</i>
Manipulation	Religious language ("saviour", "messiah", "redeemer") is used to portray Trump supporters as irrationally and religiously fanatical. This language originates from QAnon circles, but is used as a characterisation of the entire movement.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Some QAnon supporters portray Trump in religious metaphors." The generalisation to "the QAnon followers" is not substantiated.

Summary: The language of the broadcast is consistently evaluative and one-sided: Trump supporters are described as a "mob", their convictions as "absurd" and "grotesque", conservative media as "propaganda media". This language does not comply with the objectivity requirement of Art. 4 RTVA.



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

Methodological principle K11+K8: Document the triggering event.

Finding 1: No critical follow-up question on "propaganda media"

Timestamp 08:28–08:37

Triggering event: Thomas von Grünigen describes conservative media wholesale as "propaganda media" — a serious, unsubstantiated claim.

Quote (presenter) *[No follow-up question — presenter moves on to the next question]*

Comparison Had a guest described left-wing media as "propaganda media", a follow-up question would have been expected.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — unsubstantiated blanket statement about conservative media goes uncommented.

Finding 2: Leading question on Trump's responsibility

Timestamp 10:02–10:11

Triggering event: Presenter asks about Trump's role in the Capitol storming.

Quote (presenter) *"He played with fire in his speech. He explicitly, more or less explicitly, led his supporters to the riots."*

Comparison No analogous question about Democratic politicians and their rhetoric before BLM riots.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — the question already contains the answer ("He played with fire") and is structurally leading.

Finding 3: No follow-up question on missing differentiation

Timestamp 07:30–07:56

Triggering event: Von Grünigen describes militias as a spectrum from "harmless" to "capable of mass murder".

Quote (presenter) *[No follow-up question on the scale of the dangerous faction]*

Comparison The presenter does not ask how large the dangerous proportion is — an obvious journalistic follow-up question.

Asymmetry: Not clearly asymmetric, but journalistically incomplete.

Summary: The moderation behaviour shows two clear asymmetries: unsubstantiated blanket statements against conservative media are not challenged, and the opening question about Trump already contains the attribution of blame. Both findings fulfil the methodological principle K11+K8.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1: Question about Trump vs. no question about Democratic politicians

To Thomas
von Grünigen,
10

02: "He played with fire in his speech. He explicitly, more or less explicitly, led his supporters to the riots. Let's listen briefly." — ****Leading/hard (against Trump)****

To [no guest]

No question about the rhetoric of Democratic politicians before BLM riots — ****Not asked****

Comparison

The question about Trump already contains the attribution of blame; an analogous question about Democratic politicians was not asked.

Asymmetry 2: Question about danger potential vs. no question about proportionality

To Thomas
von Grünigen,
07

24: "How great do you consider their danger potential to be?" — ****One-sidedly focused on danger****

To [no guest]

No question: "How large is the proportion of extremists among the demonstrators?" or "How do the various groups differ?" — ****Not asked****

Comparison

The question about danger potential without a question about scale creates a distorted picture.

Summary: The questions are consistently aimed at confirming the predetermined framing: danger, extremism, Trump's responsibility. Differentiating or exculpatory questions are not asked. This does not comply with the requirement of accurate representation.



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

Finding 1: Apparent qualification without substantive implementation

Timestamp 07:05–07:16

Construct: "By far not all of those who took part in the storming of the Capitol can be assigned to the right-wing extremist or conspiracy theorist camp. And yet, these currents seem to be on the rise."

Analysis

The qualification ("by far not all") is immediately countered by "And yet". This is a rhetorical false balance: the differentiation is formally acknowledged, but not substantively implemented (no moderate voices, no figures).

Summary: The broadcast does not show classic false balance (two equally weighted sides where there is actual imbalance), but the opposite: a one-sided portrayal with a rhetorical apparent qualification. The score is correspondingly low.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: Right-wing extremism as the main threat to US democracy

Agenda element set: It is taken as self-evident that the main threat to US democracy comes from the right.

Timestamp

00:17–00:31 — Evidence: "how widespread the conspiracy-theoretical and right-nationalist ideas are among the supporters of President Trump and what danger these extremists pose."

Alternative agenda: Institutional loss of trust, polarisation by both sides, role of media in general (not only conservative), electoral system questions.

Finding 2: More federal intervention as the solution for Covid sequencing

Agenda element set: It is taken as self-evident that more state intervention (federal strategy) is the right response to the sequencing gap.

Timestamp

15:52–16:14 — Evidence: "I am very clearly of the opinion that the Confederation must intervene. Such a question cannot be left to the cantons."

Alternative agenda: Market-based solutions, cantonal autonomy as a strength of the Swiss system, cost-benefit analysis of sequencing.

Finding 3: Gender inequality in start-ups as a structural problem

Agenda element set: It is taken as self-evident that the underrepresentation of women in start-ups is a problem requiring institutional solutions.

Timestamp

17:06–21:50 — Evidence: "It is still the case that investors less frequently provide money for start-ups by women."

Alternative agenda: Individual preferences, risk appetite as a personal decision, success stories without institutional support.

Summary: The broadcast sets three agendas, all of which reflect a state-interventionist or left-progressive basic stance: right-wing extremism as the main threat, federal intervention as the solution, structural discrimination as the explanation. Alternative explanatory frameworks do not make it onto the agenda.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 6.8 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 6.3 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Guilt by Association / Omission (score 8):** The broadcast constructs a systematic equation of Trump support with extremism by showing exclusively extremists as representatives and completely omitting 74 million moderate voters. This combination of association and omission is the most effective manipulation technique in the broadcast.
- 2. Framing / Choice of words (score 8):** The framing is already set in the broadcast announcement ("how widespread the conspiracy-theoretical ideas are") and is consistently reinforced through throughout evaluative language ("mob", "propaganda media", "rampaging"). The viewer is not invited to form a judgement, but to confirm a predetermined interpretation.
- 3. Completeness / Selective outrage (score 8/7):** The systematic omission of comparative perspectives (BLM violence, left-wing rhetoric, GOP-internal opposition) in combination with asymmetric outrage (only right-wing phenomena are framed as dangerous) creates a structurally distorted overall picture.

Core messages of the broadcast

****MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** ** "The Capitol storming is an expression of a widespread, dangerous right-wing extremist and conspiracy-ideological movement among Trump supporters."

Technique: Framing (announcement), guilt by association (extremists as representatives), omission (no moderate voices) — evidence: 00:17, 02:10, 07:05

****MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** ** "Donald Trump is personally responsible for the Capitol storming and deliberately played with fire."

Technique: Leading questions, timing (Trump's speech as evidence), selective outrage — evidence: 10:02, 10:39, 01:17

****MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** ** "Conservative media, social media and the pandemic have enabled a dangerous extremism movement that threatens democracy."

Technique: Choice of words ("propaganda media"), agenda-setting (right-wing extremism as the main threat), source selection (only critical experts) — evidence: 08:28, 00:17, 05:50

Justification: With an overall score of 6.6 and a hard facts score of 6.8, the broadcast is at the boundary between "clear one-sidedness" and "systematic bias". The classification as "systematic bias" is justified because the one-sidedness cannot be attributed to individual errors, but runs through all 15 criteria: expert selection, source selection, framing, choice of words, omission and agenda-setting all point in the same direction. Pursuant to Art. 4 RTVA, accurate representation of facts and diversity of opinion on contested topics is required — both are not fulfilled in the Capitol reporting of this broadcast. The broadcast treats a highly political, contested topic (Capitol storming, Trump's responsibility) with a one-sided expert selection, evaluative language and systematic omissions that together create a structurally distorted picture.

CONCLUSION

The SRF 10 vor 10 broadcast of 8 January 2021 treats the Capitol storming with a systematic bias that runs through all analysed criteria. The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in several respects: the expert selection is one-sided (exclusively critical voices), the language is evaluative ("mob", "propaganda media"), and relevant perspectives (moderate Trump voters, GOP-internal opposition, comparison with left-wing violence) are systematically omitted. Particularly serious is the guilt-by-association technique, which implicitly associates 74 million Trump voters with right-wing extremism and terrorism potential through the exclusive portrayal of extremists. The broadcast announcement ("how widespread the conspiracy-theoretical ideas are") presents the conclusion as the starting point and thereby violates the requirement of accurate representation. For a legally robust assessment, it would need to be examined



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

whether the identified patterns are consistent in SRF's overall reporting on this topic — a single segment does not yet constitute a systematic violation of Art. 4 RTVA, but the accumulation of findings in this broadcast is considerable.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.8/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

6.3/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

6.6/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

Averaged from hard facts and soft facts



KEY — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

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

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

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



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Art. 4 RTVA)

Assessment pursuant to Art. 4 RTVA

Art. 4 RTVA requires: accurate representation of facts and events, diversity of opinion on contested topics, balanced selection of interlocutors.

Violation 1: Lack of diversity of opinion on a contested topic

Standard: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (diversity of opinion)

Facts: The question of who is responsible for the Capitol storming, what causes it has and how it is to be contextualised was highly contested at the time of broadcast. The broadcast presents exclusively one perspective (right-wing extremist attack on democracy, Trump responsible) without a single dissenting voice.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:17–11:36 — Quote: "In today's focus we show how widespread the conspiracy-theoretical and right-nationalist ideas are among the supporters of President Trump."

Assessment: The formulation "we show how widespread" presents a contested assessment as fact. Not a single voice representing a different perspective is sought. This violates Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA.

Violation 2: Inaccurate representation through evaluative language

Standard: Art. 4 para. 1 RTVA (accurate representation)

Facts: The use of terms such as "propaganda media" (for conservative media), "rampaging mob" and "played with fire" (about Trump's speech) does not comply with the objectivity requirement. These terms are evaluative and not descriptive.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:09 — Quote: "A rampaging mob storms the parliamentary building"; Timestamp 08:28 — Quote: "Conservative propaganda media"; Timestamp 10:02 — Quote: "He played with fire."

Assessment: Art. 4 para. 1 RTVA requires accurate representation. Evaluative terms without evidence that exclusively target one political side violate this requirement.

Violation 3: One-sided selection of interlocutors

Standard: Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA (balanced selection of interlocutors in political broadcasts)

Facts: All three experts/interlocutors in the Capitol segment (Miller-Idriss, Wild, von Grünigen) share the same basic perspective. No conservative expert, no moderate Trump voter, no constitutional lawyer with a different assessment was invited.

Evidence: Timestamp 04:40–11:36 — Entire expert segment without a dissenting voice.

Assessment: On a highly politically contested topic (Capitol storming, Trump's responsibility), Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA requires a balanced selection. The one-sided expert selection violates this requirement.

Violation 4: Unsubstantiated claims presented as facts

Standard: Art. 4 para. 1 RTVA (accurate representation)

Facts: Several claims are presented as facts without a primary source ("many demonstrators had apparently arranged to meet beforehand", "detailed plans of the Capitol complex were shared and freely accessible").

Evidence: Timestamp 05:28 — Quote: "In online forums like this one, many demonstrators had apparently arranged to meet beforehand."

Assessment: "Apparently" identifies an unsubstantiated claim. Presenting it as fact without citing a source violates the objectivity requirement.

Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in four demonstrable respects: lack of diversity of opinion on a highly contested political topic (Art. 4 para. 2), inaccurate representation through evaluative language (Art. 4 para. 1), one-sided



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

selection of interlocutors (Art. 4 para. 4) and presentation of unsubstantiated claims as facts (Art. 4 para. 1). The violations cannot be attributed to individual errors, but show a consistent pattern running through the entire Capitol segment. For a complaint to the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television (ICART), the documented timestamps and direct quotes would be suitable as evidence; ICART practice requires, however, that the overall reporting on a topic be assessed, not just a single broadcast.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

1. Cynthia Miller-Idriss (extremism researcher, American University)

1. FUNDING: American University Washington DC (private university, liberal orientation); research funding from DHS (Department of Homeland Security) and private foundations. Constellation of interests: State and private funding for right-wing extremism research creates an incentive to present the topic as significant.

2. MANDATE: Specialisation in right-wing extremism and radicalisation — compatible with statements about right-wing groups, but not with an overall assessment of political violence in the USA.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Institutional interest in the relevance of the research field (right-wing extremism); no incentive to treat left-wing violence on an equal footing.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1

D2 Personal risk: +1

D3 Professional competence: +2

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1

D6 Source level: +1

TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN

5. DISSENTING VOICE: An expert on political violence in general (e.g. from the Cato Institute) would have provided a comparative perspective. Not cited.

2. Johanna Wild (investigative journalist)

1. FUNDING: Working as a journalist; funding not identifiable from transcript. No obvious institutional conflict of interest.

2. MANDATE: Investigative journalism on online extremism — compatible with statements on online networking.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: No obvious institutional conflict of interest; possible reputational incentive for dramatic assessments.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0

D2 Personal risk: +1

D3 Professional competence: +1

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0

D6 Source level: +1

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

5. DISSENTING VOICE: A journalist who has also investigated left-wing online networking is missing.

3. Thomas von Grünigen (SRF correspondent Washington)

1. FUNDING: SRF (public broadcaster, Switzerland, Serafe-financed). Constellation of interests: As an SRF employee, he has an institutional interest in portraying public broadcasting as a counterweight to "propaganda media".

2. MANDATE: Correspondent — reporting, not expert assessment. His mandate is not compatible with the role of political commentator without a dissenting voice.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Structural conflict of interest: SRF employee describes conservative media as "propaganda media" — implicit self-elevation of public broadcasting.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2

D2 Personal risk: 0

D3 Professional competence: 0

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1

D6 Source level: 0

TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

5. DISSENTING VOICE: A conservative US journalist or media analyst would have provided a counter-perspective. Not cited.



4. Ruth Rumbel (President of the National Council Health Committee, The Centre)

- 1. FUNDING:** Member of parliament (remunerated by the state); no institutional funding from interest groups identifiable.
- 2. MANDATE:** Parliamentary health committee — compatible with statements on national health policy.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Political interest in strengthening federal competences (party position The Centre); statements on federal intervention are party-politically motivated.

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

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

- 5. DISSENTING VOICE:** A representative of cantonal autonomy (e.g. cantonal physician, FDP politician) would have provided a counter-perspective. Not cited.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be questioned. None of the cited expert bodies was made transparent in the broadcast with regard to their funding, mandate or conflicts of interest.

Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Cynthia Miller-Idriss (extremism researcher, American University)	-1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+5	GREEN
Johanna Wild (investigative journalist)	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+3	YELLOW
Thomas von Grünigen (SRF correspondent Washington)	-2	0	0	0	-1	0	-3	YELLOW
Ruth Rumbel (President of the National Council Health Committee, The Centre)	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+3	YELLOW

Legal and methodological classification

No finding of fact	The results presented do not constitute findings of fact about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a determination of individual responsibility.
No legal ruling	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of Art. 4 RTVA. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular ICART).
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.



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

No ruling on intent

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a significant bias 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 segments. Threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Switzerland — SRG SSR

Law

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

Relevant articles

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

Core obligations

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

Supervisory authority

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

Complaints procedure

1. Ombudsman office of the respective business unit (SRF, RTS, RSI, RTR)
2. ICART (if no agreement is reached)
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 for the Public Sphere and Society (2024). *Yearbook Quality of the Media 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methods report v4.1: Countable criteria and multi-model cross-validation*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

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



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

Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

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

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

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

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



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

You can obtain the following books from SVFAB

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



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

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**

Also available as an **audiobook**



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

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

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

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers — for everyone who is exposed and wants to understand how the game works. So that they stop playing along — and start shaping it.

In A5. Direct. For preparation, for reference, for follow-up and in difficult situations



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



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

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

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

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year — compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can complain. There is even an authority for this: the ICART, 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. Proceedings, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional law examination that shows: the ICART system fulfils none of the three fundamental criteria — it is not appropriate, not subject to separation of powers, not market-based. The authority that is supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it was supposed to control.

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