



SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2022-04-07 10 vor 10 vom 07.04.2022

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2022-04-07 | Analyzed on: 2026-05-19 13:57

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

OVERALL SCORE

4.5/10

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

4.2 / 10

Balanced

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 factor into the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Switzerland is a consensus democracy. The Federal Council consists of 7 members distributed among the largest parties according to the so-called magic formula: SVP (2 seats), SP (2 seats), FDP (2 seats), The Centre (1 seat). There is no classic government-opposition dichotomy — all major parties are represented in the executive. Opposition manifests itself in the National Council and Council of States through parties without a Federal Council seat (Greens, GLP, EVP) as well as through intra-coalition tensions.

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

The dominant line of conflict runs between migration advocates (SP, Greens, GLP) and migration critics (SVP, partly FDP). A second line concerns EU relations: the Bilateral Agreements Package III is under negotiation, with SVP fundamentally opposed and SP/FDP/Centre/GLP supporting it to varying degrees. Third line: climate policy — Greens/SP call for state-directed measures, SVP/FDP rely on technological openness and the market. Fourth line: healthcare costs — SP/Greens favour a single health insurer, bourgeois parties oppose it.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is Switzerland's public broadcaster, financed through Serafe fees (formerly Billag) and a state concession. Pursuant to Art. 4 RTVA, SRF is obligated to provide accurate representation, diversity of opinion and a balanced selection of interlocutors. As Switzerland's largest media provider with a monopoly character in the public broadcasting sector, SRF bears special responsibility for democratic opinion formation.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Preliminary remark: The broadcast deals primarily with international topics (Ukraine war crimes, Croatian emigration, Macron's record, Swiss band). Swiss domestic politics appears only marginally — the Croatia report mentions freedom of movement as a fact, without party-political classification. No Swiss party is mentioned by name or quoted.

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	0	Not mentioned. Freedom of movement (09:03) is presented as a fact without mentioning SVP's critical position — programme position (terminating freedom of movement) omitted, but no active attack. Score 0 = not addressed.
SP	0	Not mentioned. No portrayal of SP-relevant positions (open migration, welfare state). Score 0 = not addressed.
FDP	0	Not mentioned. FDP's position on freedom of movement (pro bilateral path) would have been relevant, is absent. Score 0 = not addressed.
Centre	0	Not mentioned. Score 0 = not addressed.
Greens	0	Not mentioned. Score 0 = not addressed.
GLP	0	Not mentioned. Score 0 = not addressed.
EVP	0	Not mentioned. Score 0 = not addressed.

Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: No party portrayed (all score 0)
- Strongest distortion: No active distortion demonstrable
- Average deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: The broadcast deals exclusively with international topics and a piece of Swiss cultural history. Swiss party positions are not portrayed, neither correctly nor in a distorted manner. The Croatia report touches on freedom of movement as a fact (09:03: "Since the beginning of the year, full freedom of movement between the two countries has been in effect"), without depicting the domestic political debate on the matter — this is an omission, but not an active distortion of a party position.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast data

- Title: SRF 10vor10
- Date: 07.04.2022
- Presenter / Reporter: Presenter (not named in the transcript); Reporters: Peter Balzli (Croatia), Jessica Kobler (Macron), Michael Steiner (Black Zidahu); Correspondent: Lucia Tschirki (Ukraine/Kyiv)

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Lucia Tschirki	SRF correspondent Kyiv	SRF	Neutral (journalist)
Fred Abrams	Representative of Human Rights Watch	NGO (HRW)	Left-liberal (human rights NGO)
Alexander Markushin	Mayor of Irpin	Ukrainian municipal politics	Pro-Ukrainian
Olga (restaurant owner)	Civilian/survivor	None	Civil society
Stjepan Sterc	Demography professor Zagreb	Academic	Neutral (academia)
Andrei Plenkovic	Croatian Prime Minister	HDZ (conservative)	Centre-right
Sandra Bencic	Croatian opposition politician	Možemo! (left-green)	Left-green
Janine Gattrain	Singer Black Zidahu	Cultural sector	Non-political

Main topic

The broadcast documents alleged Russian war crimes in Ukraine (main focus), supplemented by reports on Croatian emigration to Switzerland, Macron's record ahead of the runoff election, and a Swiss indie band.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically robust

1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Fred Abrams, Human Rights Watch

Timestamp	02:57
Statement	"One should photograph the switches to show how they died. One should collect the names of the victims. One should collect names of witnesses."
Classification	HRW is an internationally recognised human rights organisation with a clear advocacy orientation. In the Ukraine conflict, HRW has adopted a decidedly pro-Ukrainian, anti-Russian stance. Abrams is presented as a neutral forensic expert, but is in fact a representative of an advocacy NGO.
Missing countervoice	An independent forensic scientist without an NGO mandate (e.g. ICMP — International Commission on Missing Persons) or OSCE observer.

Source in-depth check Fred Abrams / HRW:

(a) FUNDING: HRW is financed primarily through private donations, including large US foundations (Open Society Foundations by George Soros, Ford Foundation, and others). Structural conflict of interest: HRW is ideologically committed to the Western-liberal human rights discourse; in conflicts involving Russian participation, HRW has historically taken a clear stance against Russia.

(b) MANDATE: HRW's mandate is human rights advocacy, not neutral forensic evidence gathering. The mandate is not compatible with a neutral assessment — HRW is a party to the discourse, not an arbiter.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — HRW has an institutional interest in proving war crimes (maintaining relevance, fundraising)

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Working in war zones entails personal risk

D3 Professional competence: +1 — HRW has experience in war crimes documentation, but Abrams is not a forensic scientist

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — HRW positions on Russia are consistent

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Statements are methodical, but without concrete data

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (reports on observations, no primary data presented)

TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: 47), although he is a representative of an advocacy NGO. This is a technique of false attribution of neutrality.

Expert 2: Stjepan Sterc, Demography Professor Zagreb

Timestamp	10:26
Statement	"The main reasons are the poor state of politics, society and the rule of law here in Croatia."
Classification	Academic demographer, professionally competent in population matters. No obvious conflicts of interest. Forecast of 40,000–60,000 emigrants to Switzerland (13:17) is presented as scientific without citing confidence intervals or model assumptions.



**Missing
countervoice**

Swiss demographer or State Secretariat for Migration with an assessment of absorption capacity.

Source in-depth check Stjepan Sterc:

(a) FUNDING: State University of Zagreb — no obvious private conflicts of interest.

(b) MANDATE: Academic research mandate, compatible with a neutral assessment.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No obvious conflict of interest

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Academic statements, moderate risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Demography is his field of expertise

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — No contradictory earlier statements known

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Uses mathematical model, but without transparency about assumptions

D6 Source level: +1 — Own research, but model not verifiable

TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Forecast is presented without uncertainty margins — methodologically problematic, but no structural bias.

Missing expert groups:

- Independent forensic scientist (without NGO mandate) for the Ukraine report
- Swiss State Secretariat for Migration or demographer for the Croatia report
- International law expert for legal classification of the war crimes question

Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Fred Abrams, Human Rights Watch	-1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+2	YELLOW
Stjepan Sterc, Demography Professor Zagreb	+1	0	+2	+1	+1	+1	+6	GREEN

Summary:

- Fred Abrams (HRW): SOURCE INDICATOR YELLOW — Advocacy NGO framed as forensic expert, structural conflict of interest not disclosed
- Stjepan Sterc (University of Zagreb): SOURCE INDICATOR GREEN — professionally competent, but forecast without uncertainty margins



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: Human Rights Watch (HRW)

Timestamp 02:57 — Statement: "One should photograph the switches to show how they died."

(a) Funding: Private US foundations (Open Society, Ford Foundation), donations. No state funding, but close ideological alignment with the Western-liberal human rights discourse.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: HRW has an institutional interest in proving war crimes — this secures relevance, donation income and political influence. In the Russia-Ukraine conflict, HRW is not a neutral authority.

(c) Missing counter-source: OSCE Special Observer Mission, UN Human Rights Council, ICMP (International Commission on Missing Persons) as institutionally more independent alternatives.

Source 2: Amnesty International

Timestamp 04:20 — Statement: "Since the beginning of March, the human rights organisation claims to have documented at least five extrajudicial executions and killings."

(a) Funding: Membership fees, private donations, no state funding. Similar structure to HRW.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Identical to HRW — advocacy organisation with an interest in proving human rights violations. Amnesty also criticised Ukrainian conduct of warfare in residential areas in the Ukraine conflict (later, August 2022), which shows that the organisation is not one-sided — this context is absent from the broadcast.

(c) Missing counter-source: Russian rebuttal regarding the cited cases (Takachowa, Prilipko) is completely absent.

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 02:15

Claim: "The dead are said to have been deliberately run over by tanks."

Word marker: "are said to" — classic rumour marker

Primary source available: No — Mayor Markushin as source, no forensic confirmation at the time of broadcast. +1 penalty point.

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 02:19

Claim: "There were said to be witnesses."

Word marker: "were said to be" (subjunctive) — rumour marker

Primary source available: No — no witnesses are presented or quoted. +1 penalty point.

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 05:45

Claim: "Apparently, however, Bucha is not an isolated case."

Word marker: "apparently" — rumour marker



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

Primary source available: Partially — Amnesty reports are cited, but "apparently" suggests more than is substantiated.
+0.5 penalty point.

Total penalty points: +2.5 → Score raised to 6/10 (base 4 + 2 penalty points rounded)

Summary: The source selection is one-sidedly concentrated on Western advocacy NGOs (HRW, Amnesty), which are framed as neutral forensic authorities without disclosing their structural conflicts of interest. Russian rebuttals are completely absent, and several claims are presented with rumour markers without a primary source.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Ukraine block (war crimes): (32%) — exclusively pro-Ukrainian/Western voices
- Croatia block: (20%) — government (Plenkovic), opposition (Bencic) approx. 1.5 min., demographer approx. 1.5 min., street survey
- Macron block: (20%) — archive material, no countervoices
- Black Zidahu block: (16%) — exclusively the band
- Presenter/transitions: (12%)

Within the Ukraine block:

- Fred Abrams (HRW): approx. 1.5 min.
- Mayor Markushin: approx. 0.5 min.
- Correspondent Tschirki:
- Olga (survivor): approx. 0.5 min.
- Russian voice: 0 min. (0%)

Summary: The time distribution in the Ukraine block is structurally one-sided — Russian voices receive zero seconds of speaking time. In the Croatia block, the distribution between government and opposition is relatively balanced, with the opposition (Bencic) receiving slightly more speaking time and the more incisive statement ("They stole the glass", 11:47).



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1: Russian rebuttal regarding Bucha

Context

Russia denied responsibility for the Bucha massacre and spoke of a Ukrainian staging. This position was publicly known at the time of broadcast.

Relevant at: Entire Ukraine block (01:05–08:05)

Effect

The omission of the Russian position creates a one-sided picture. Even if the Russian account is implausible, it belongs in balanced reporting — at least as a thesis to be refuted. Its absence prevents viewers from being able to assess the evidence themselves.

Omission 2: Swiss domestic politics on freedom of movement

Context

Freedom of movement with Croatia is domestically controversial in Switzerland. The SVP fundamentally rejects it. This debate is completely blanked out.

Relevant at: 09:03 — "Since the beginning of the year, full freedom of movement between the two countries has been in effect."

Effect

Freedom of movement is presented as an uncontested fact, even though it is politically controversial in Switzerland. This structurally favours the pro-freedom-of-movement position.

Omission 3: Standards of proof and uncertainties in war crimes documentation

Context

The securing of evidence for war crimes tribunals is methodologically complex. At the time of broadcast, the forensic investigation was still in its early stages. The broadcast presents allegations as largely established.

Relevant at: 01:11 — "The Russian army is under urgent suspicion of having committed war crimes."

Effect

The formulation "urgent suspicion" is effectively elevated to a certainty by the overall presentation, without the legal standards of proof being explained.

Summary: The most serious omission is the complete absence of the Russian rebuttal in the Ukraine report. Combined with the omission of the Swiss domestic political debate on freedom of movement, a pattern of selective information selection emerges that structurally favours a particular worldview.

Missing voices

- Russian Foreign Ministry / Russian government: Would have introduced the official Russian rebuttal regarding Bucha (denial, claim of Ukrainian staging) — essential for balanced war reporting, even if the account would be classified as implausible.
- International law expert (e.g. University of Zurich/Geneva): Would have explained what standards of proof apply to war crimes tribunals and how likely a conviction is.
- OSCE observer or UN Special Rapporteur: Would have provided a neutral, institutionally independent assessment of the state of evidence.



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

- SVP representative or migration-critical Swiss voice: Would have depicted the domestic political debate on freedom of movement with Croatia.
- Swiss Employers' Association / Trade Association: Would have introduced the economic perspective on Croatian immigration to Switzerland.
- Croatian returnee: Would have assessed the effectiveness of return incentives from an experiential perspective.
- Independent French political scientist: Would have contextualised Macron's record without journalistic evaluation.
- Gilets-jaunes representative: Would have introduced the perspective of the protest movement beyond the government's portrayal.



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

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

Finding 1: Population decline Vukovar

Timestamp 09:28

Figure: "In the last ten years, the population here fell by almost 20 percent."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: Missing — how many people in absolute terms?
- (b) Proportion: Present (20%)
- (c) Trend: Partial — "last ten years", but no comparison with other Croatian regions or EU average

Missing context	Is 20% in 10 years exceptional for an Eastern European region after EU accession? Comparative figures for other EU accession countries (Bulgaria, Romania) are absent.
Effect	The figure appears more dramatic without comparative context.

Finding 2: Annual emigration Croatia

Timestamp 10:17

Figure: "Every year, 45,000 Croatians leave their homeland."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: Present
- (b) Proportion: Missing — 45,000 out of approx. 3.9 million inhabitants = approx. 1.15% per year. This relativisation is absent.
- (c) Trend: Missing — Is emigration rising, falling, constant?

Missing context	Return migration rate is also absent — how many return?
Effect	Absolute figure without relativisation appears more dramatic than the proportion.

Finding 3: Forecast 40,000–60,000 emigrants to Switzerland

Timestamp 13:17

Figure: "a further 40,000 to 60,000 persons from Croatia will emigrate to Switzerland, in the next two to three years."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: Present
- (b) Proportion: Missing — 40,000–60,000 on top of the current approx. 30,000 Croatians in Switzerland would represent a doubling to tripling. This context is absent.
- (c) Trend: Missing — Model foundations, confidence intervals, comparison with forecasts for other EU countries after the introduction of freedom of movement are absent.

Missing context	The broadcast itself briefly relativises (13:30: "From a Swiss perspective, this figure seems very high"), without however citing a counter-figure.
Effect	Dramatic forecast without methodological contextualisation.



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

Summary: Several figures are presented without the complete triad (absolute value/proportion/trend), which amplifies the drama of emigration. The forecast of 40,000–60,000 is presented as a scientific result without confidence intervals or methodological critique.



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

Association 1: Gilets jaunes as a "melting pot"

Timestamp	16:43
Quote	<i>"But the movement is increasingly becoming a melting pot for those who are generally dissatisfied and angrily oppose President Macron and his reform zeal."</i>
	Technique: The Gilets-jaunes movement is associated through the term "melting pot" with diffuse, irrational dissatisfaction rather than with concrete social demands (purchasing power, inequality).
Effect	Delegitimation of the protest movement through association with mere "anger" rather than political content.

No conspiracy theorist framing detected.

Summary: Guilt by association is weakly pronounced in this broadcast. The only relevant association concerns the Gilets jaunes, whose concerns are emptied of content through the "melting pot" formulation. The score remains low, as no systematic discrediting through association takes place.



7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: Opening with maximum emotional impact

Position: 00:10 (beginning)

Content: "The world is searching for answers to this question." — Direct opening with the Bucha topic, before any context or classification is provided.

Timing effect

The broadcast begins with the emotionally most powerful topic (war crimes, corpses, mass graves) and thereby sets the emotional tone for the entire broadcast. Viewers are placed in a state of heightened emotional activation before analytical contextualisation is possible.

Finding 2: Bencic's incisive statement as the last word in the Croatia block

Position: 11:47 (end of the Croatia block)

Content: "But the problem is, they stole the glass."

Timing effect

The most hard-hitting, most emotional statement of the Croatia block comes from the left-green opposition politician and is placed as the last word before the demography expert. Prime Minister Plenkovic is not given a closing statement.

Finding 3: Positive Macron record shortly before the election

Position: 14:01–19:41 (three days before the runoff election)

Content: Macron portrait with predominantly positive framing ("star qualities", "political skill", "crisis manager")

Timing effect

The portrait appears three days before the runoff election (24:42: "in three days the head of state will be elected") and could function as electoral assistance, even if it is formally framed as a retrospective.

Summary: The emotional opening with Bucha images and the strategic placement of Bencic's catchphrase at the end of the Croatia block are the strongest timing findings. The Macron portrait shortly before the election is temporally sensitive.



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: Emotional language regarding Russian war crimes without equivalent

Timestamp 02:10

Triggering event: Mayor Markushin describes alleged Russian war crimes in Irpin.

Reaction: "His account of what is said to have happened makes the blood run cold."

Comparison

No analogous event in the broadcast in which Ukrainian conduct of warfare or Western arms deliveries are commented on with similar emotional language. At the time of broadcast, there were already reports of Ukrainian artillery in residential areas — these are not mentioned.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — the emotional commentary ("makes the blood run cold") is directed exclusively at Russian actions.

Finding 2: Croatian government as "main culprit"

Timestamp 10:47

Triggering event: Presentation of Croatian emigration statistics.

Reaction: "He is for many the main culprit for the enormous emigration from Croatia."

Comparison

No analogous formulation for the left-green opposition (Bencic), although she is also part of the political system.

Asymmetry: Slightly demonstrable — the attribution of blame falls exclusively on the conservative Prime Minister.

Degree of outrage: 2/5 — isolated, but clear in "makes the blood run cold"

Selectivity: 2/5 — clear asymmetry, but not consistent throughout

Summary: Selective outrage is moderately pronounced in this broadcast. The strongest asymmetry lies in the emotional commentary on Russian acts of war without an equivalent reaction to other parties to the conflict. The attribution of blame in the Croatia block falls exclusively on the conservative head of government.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1: Complete absence of the Russian perspective

Timestamp 01:05–08:05 (entire Ukraine block)

Missing perspective: Russian government position on Bucha (denial, counter-narratives)

Relevance: In April 2022, the Russian rebuttal was publicly known and part of the international information war. Balanced reporting would have had to include this position — even in order to refute it.

Impact: Viewers receive a one-sided picture that does not allow them to assess the state of evidence. The broadcast presents allegations as factually established, even though the forensic investigation was still in its early stages at the time of broadcast.

Finding 2: Missing Swiss domestic politics on freedom of movement

Timestamp 09:03

Missing perspective: SVP position on freedom of movement, domestic political debate

Relevance: Freedom of movement with Croatia is politically controversial in Switzerland. The broadcast treats it as an uncontested fact.

Impact: Swiss viewers receive no picture of the domestic political debate on a topic that directly affects them.

Finding 3: Missing criticism of Macron's conduct of office from the right

Timestamp 14:01–19:41

Missing perspective: Conservative or right-wing populist criticism of Macron (Marine Le Pen, Éric Zemmour)

Relevance: Three days before the runoff election between Macron and Le Pen, the perspective of the main opposing candidate is completely absent.

Impact: The Macron portrait functions like a campaign contribution for Macron, since the strongest opposing candidate is not given a voice and her arguments are not presented.

Summary: The broadcast exhibits systematic omissions that structurally favour a particular worldview: pro-Ukrainian/anti-Russian in the Ukraine block, pro-freedom-of-movement in the Croatia block, pro-Macron in the France block. These patterns are consistent and not coincidental.

The Bucha revelations of April 2022 triggered international outrage and led to calls for war crimes tribunals. The debate was characterised by Western indignation, Russian denials and questions about the securing of evidence. At the same time, the question arose as to whether peace negotiations were still possible after Bucha. In the Croatian context, freedom of movement is a politically sensitive topic in Switzerland, which the SVP fundamentally rejects, while SP/FDP/Centre support it.

Proportion of perspectives covered

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

Ukraine/Bucha:



[A] Ukrainian government / military: Portrayal of war crimes from the Ukrainian perspective

[B] International forensic investigators / investigators: Methodical securing of evidence

[C] Russian rebuttal: Russia denies responsibility — this position is completely absent

[D] Independent war observers / OSCE: Neutral assessment of the state of evidence

[E] International law experts: Legal classification of what constitutes a war crime

[F] Historical context: Comparison with other war crimes documentations

Croatia/Freedom of movement:

[G] Swiss employers: Perspective on Croatian workers

[H] SVP/Migration-critical voice: Swiss domestic politics on freedom of movement

[I] Croatian returnees: Experiences of Croatians who have returned

[J] EU perspective: Freedom of movement as a fundamental EU right

[A] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 02:06 — Quote: "Mayor Alexander Markushin accuses Russia of serious war crimes" — Assessment: Ukrainian perspective prominently represented, but exclusively through local politicians and survivors, not through official government representatives.

[B] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 02:47 — Quote: "International forensic investigators are also active in Ukraine to document possible war crimes" — Assessment: Fred Abrams of HRW provides methodological insights, however HRW is not a neutral forensic authority.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The Russian position (denial, counter-narratives) is not mentioned or contextualised at any point. This is the most serious omission for balanced war reporting.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: OSCE, UN observers or other neutral international authorities are not given a voice.

[E] INDICATED

Timestamp: 03:34 — Quote: "hopefully it will then be evidence that can now be used in court" — Assessment: The legal dimension is indicated, but no international law expert explains the standards of proof for war crimes tribunals.

[F] INDICATED

Timestamp: 03:48 — Quote: "Bosnia, Rwanda, Syria and also in Ukraine further such massacres would come to light" — Assessment: Historical comparison is briefly mentioned, but not elaborated upon.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Swiss employer perspective on Croatian immigration is completely absent.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Not a single Swiss domestic political voice on freedom of movement, even though the topic directly concerns Switzerland.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No voice from Croatians who have returned or are considering returning.



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

[J] INDICATED

Timestamp: 09:03 — Quote: "Since the beginning of the year, full freedom of movement between the two countries has been in effect. Just as with the rest of the EU" — Assessment: EU context is mentioned as a fact, not contextualised as a political perspective.

Completeness score: 4/10

Reasoning: The Ukraine report completely omits the Russian rebuttal and neutral international observers, which is methodologically problematic for a topic involving active information warfare. The Croatia report completely ignores the Swiss domestic political dimension of freedom of movement. Of 10 relevant perspectives, only 2 are fully addressed, 3 are indicated and 5 are omitted.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: Bucha as "proof" rather than "suspicion"

Timestamp	01:05
Quote	"Since this week, the name Bucha has stood as a symbol for the brutality of the war in Ukraine."
Manipulation	The sentence establishes Bucha as a symbol of Russian brutality before any evidence has been presented. "Symbol" is a framing that presupposes guilt.
Why problematic	At the time of broadcast, the forensic investigation had not yet been completed. The framing as an established symbol prejudices the outcome of the investigation.

Finding 2: Croatian government as failure

Timestamp	13:54
Quote	"It is a declaration of bankruptcy for the politicians here in Zagreb."
Manipulation	The reporter (Peter Balzli) uses an evaluative closing formulation that portrays the conservative Croatian government as having failed. This is not news, but a verdict.
Why problematic	The formulation adopts the perspective of the left-green opposition (Bencic) as an editorial conclusion, without identifying it as an opinion.

Finding 3: Macron as "crisis manager" and "doer"

Timestamp	19:22
Quote	"Macron as crisis manager, as a doer. An image that he will likely continue to cultivate, should he be re-elected."
Manipulation	The portrait closes with a positive characterisation of Macron that confirms rather than questions his "image" as a crisis manager.
Why problematic	Three days before the election, this framing functions like an implicit electoral recommendation. Le Pen's counter-narratives are not presented.

Summary: The framing of the broadcast is consistent: Russia as perpetrator (without rebuttal), Croatian conservatives as failures, Macron as a competent crisis manager. These framings are not neutral, but reflect a particular political worldview.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: "Atrocities" as fact

Timestamp	01:55
Quote	<i>"mercilessly reveal wartime atrocities"</i>
Manipulation	"Atrocities" is an evaluative term that presupposes guilt. At the time of broadcast, the forensic investigation had not yet been completed.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "alleged war crimes" or "killings whose circumstances are still being investigated". The use of "atrocities" as a fact prejudices the outcome of the investigation.

Finding 2: "Left-green opposition politician"

Timestamp	11:33
Quote	<i>"The Prime Minister received sharp criticism in parliament from the left-green opposition politician Sandra Bencic."</i>
Manipulation	The political classification of Bencic as "left-green" is correct, but the formulation "received criticism" implies that the criticism was justified (one "receives" something that is owed to one).
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "the left-green opposition politician Sandra Bencic criticised him". The formulation "received criticism" is subtly evaluative.

Finding 3: "Declaration of bankruptcy"

Timestamp	13:54
Quote	<i>"It is a declaration of bankruptcy for the politicians here in Zagreb."</i>
Manipulation	"Declaration of bankruptcy" is an extreme value judgement presented as an editorial conclusion, not as a quote from a source.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "The emigration figures pose major challenges for Croatian government policy." The use of "declaration of bankruptcy" adopts opposition rhetoric as an editorial voice.

Summary: The word choice of the broadcast is not neutral at several key moments: "atrocities" prejudices forensic results, "declaration of bankruptcy" adopts opposition rhetoric as editorial opinion, and "received criticism" is subtly evaluative.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: No critical follow-up question to correspondent Tschirki

Timestamp 05:42

Triggering event: Presenter asks Tschirki about the significance of Bucha.

Quote (presenter) *"Ms Lucia, the images from Bucha have horrified the world. Apparently, however, Bucha is not an isolated case. What is known about this in the country itself?"*

Comparison No question about the Russian rebuttal, no question about standards of proof, no question about Ukrainian acts of warfare. The question presupposes the premise ("world horrified", "not an isolated case") as given.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — the question is not formulated neutrally, but confirms the previous framing.

Finding 2: No follow-up question on forecast methodology with Sterc

Timestamp 13:17

Triggering event: Sterc presents forecast of 40,000–60,000 emigrants.

Quote (presenter/reporter) *No follow-up question — the forecast is adopted without comment, merely relativised with the note "From a Swiss perspective, this figure seems very high" (13:30), without a counter-figure or methodological critique.*

Comparison No analogous situation in the broadcast.

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable as selective, but methodologically insufficient.

Summary: Moderation behaviour is predominantly uncritical towards all guests. The strongest asymmetry lies in the formulation of the question to Tschirki, which confirms rather than questions the premises of the reporting. Since no guests with opposing positions were invited, a complete asymmetry analysis is methodologically limited.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1: Tschirki vs. hypothetical Russian voice

To Lucia
Tschirki, 05

42: "the images from Bucha have horrified the world. Apparently, however, Bucha is not an isolated case. What is known about this in the country itself?" — soft, premise-confirming

To Russian
voice

Not invited — no question possible

Comparison

The question to Tschirki presupposes Russia's guilt as given. A Russian voice would have had to be confronted with significantly harder questions — but it was not invited at all.

Asymmetry 2: Plenkovic vs. Bencic (indirectly)

To Plenkovic
(via archive
material), 10

59: No direct question — statements are presented without comment

To Bencic
(directly), 11

55: Direct questioning with opportunity for elaboration

Comparison

Bencic receives more space for direct statements than Plenkovic, who only gets to speak via archive material.

Summary: Question asymmetry is moderate in this broadcast, since hardly any direct interviews with opposing positions take place. The strongest asymmetry lies in the structural exclusion of Russian voices, who are given no opportunity to respond.



14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: Croatia block — apparent balance

Timestamp

10:47–12:13

Construct: The broadcast presents both Prime Minister Plenkovic (conservative) and Bencic (left-green) — apparently balanced.

Analysis

The balance is false, because Plenkovic only gets to speak via archive material and has no opportunity to reply to Bencic's criticism. Bencic gets the last word with the most incisive statement. The editorial conclusion ("declaration of bankruptcy", 13:54) adopts the opposition position.

Summary: False balance is weakly pronounced in this broadcast. The Croatia block simulates a balance between government and opposition that, on closer inspection, is weighted in favour of the opposition. In the Ukraine block there is no balance — here no attempt is made at all to include a counter-perspective.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: Russia as perpetrator is established — the question of evidence is not on the agenda

Established agenda element: Russia has committed war crimes in Ukraine — this is treated as a premise, not as a thesis to be investigated.

Timestamp

01:05 — Evidence: "the name Bucha has stood as a symbol for the brutality of the war in Ukraine"

Alternative agenda: The question of how secure the state of evidence is, what standards of proof apply to war crimes tribunals, and what the Russian rebuttal says does not come onto the agenda.

Finding 2: Freedom of movement as an uncontested good

Established agenda element: Freedom of movement with Croatia is positive — the problem is Croatian emigration, not Swiss immigration.

Timestamp

09:03 — Evidence: "Since the beginning of the year, full freedom of movement between the two countries has been in effect. Just as with the rest of the EU"

Alternative agenda: The question of whether freedom of movement is unreservedly positive from a Swiss perspective does not come onto the agenda. SVP positions are not mentioned.

Finding 3: Macron's reform course as legitimate — resistance as an obstacle

Established agenda element: Macron's reforms are fundamentally correct — resistance (trade unions, Gilets jaunes) is an obstacle to be overcome.

Timestamp

16:06 — Evidence: "Already one year after taking office, the first major crisis. Macron's plans for a reorganisation of the state railway company drives railway workers onto the streets. Out of fear that they might lose their privileges through the upheavals."

Alternative agenda: The substantive arguments of the trade unions and Gilets jaunes (loss of purchasing power, social inequality) do not come onto the agenda. "Privileges" is an evaluative term that delegitimises the workers' position.

Summary: The agenda-setting of the broadcast is consistent: Russia as perpetrator, freedom of movement as fact, Macron's reform course as legitimate. Counter-positions do not come onto the agenda, which structurally establishes a particular political worldview as "normal".



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 4.8 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 4.2 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 7):** The systematic omission of the Russian rebuttal in the Ukraine block, the Swiss domestic political debate on freedom of movement and the Le Pen perspective in the Macron block creates a consistently one-sided picture. These omissions are not coincidental, but follow a recognisable pattern: positions that contradict the implicit worldview of the broadcast are not presented.
- 2. Completeness / Agenda-Setting (Score 7/6):** The broadcast establishes certain premises as uncontested facts (Russia as perpetrator, freedom of movement as a good, Macron's reform course as legitimate) and thereby prevents viewers from developing an independent assessment. This is the most subtle and most effective technique of the broadcast.
- 3. Expert selection / Source selection (Score 6/6):** The concentration on Western advocacy NGOs (HRW, Amnesty) as apparently neutral forensic experts without disclosure of their structural conflicts of interest is methodologically problematic and reinforces the one-sided portrayal of the Ukraine conflict.

Core messages of the broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "Russia has systematically committed war crimes in Ukraine — this is an established fact that must be documented and brought before a court."

Technique: Framing (Bucha as symbol), source selection (only Western NGOs), omission (no Russian rebuttal) — evidence: 01:05, 02:10, 04:20

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "The Croatian government has driven the country into a demographic crisis through poor policy — freedom of movement with Switzerland is a consequence of this failure."

Technique: Word choice ("declaration of bankruptcy"), timing (Bencic's catchphrase as last word), agenda-setting (freedom of movement as uncontested fact) — evidence: 11:47, 13:54

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Emmanuel Macron is a competent, reform-oriented statesman who does the right thing despite resistance — he deserves a second term."

Technique: Framing (crisis manager, doer), omission (no Le Pen perspective), timing (portrait three days before the election) — evidence: 19:22, 24:42

- Clear one-sidedness (5–6) — Overall score 4.5, but structural patterns justify this classification

Reasoning: The overall score of 4.5 lies on the boundary between "slight tendency" and "clear one-sidedness". The structural patterns — consistent omission of counter-positions, advocacy NGOs as neutral experts, evaluative editorial comments as conclusions — justify the classification as "clear one-sidedness". Pursuant to Art. 4 RTVA, the accurate representation of facts and diversity of opinion on contested topics is violated: the Russian rebuttal regarding Bucha, the Swiss domestic political debate on freedom of movement and the Le Pen perspective three days before the runoff election are systematically absent. The broadcast thus does not fully fulfil the statutory mandate for balanced reporting.

CONCLUSION

The analysed 10vor10 broadcast from April 2022 has an overall score of 4.5/10 and is to be classified as clearly one-sided. The dominant manipulation techniques are selective omission (Russian rebuttal, Swiss domestic politics, Le Pen perspective), framing through evaluative editorial comments ("declaration of bankruptcy", "makes the blood run cold") and the presentation of advocacy NGOs (HRW, Amnesty) as neutral forensic experts without disclosure of their structural conflicts of interest. Pursuant to Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA, editorial broadcasts must accurately represent facts and events so that the public can form its own opinion, and at contested topics must adequately express the diversity of views — this is not fully fulfilled in all three main blocks of the broadcast. Particularly serious is the complete absence of the Russian rebuttal in the Ukraine block, as this prevents viewers from being able to assess the state of



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

evidence themselves. The broadcast is not to be classified as a gross violation of the accuracy requirement, but exceeds the threshold of clear one-sidedness through consistent, cross-topic omissions and evaluative editorial comments.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.8/10

Significant imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

4.2/10

Significant imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

4.5/10

Significant imbalance

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

Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No material patterns recognisable; broadcast meets the accuracy requirement.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated irregularities; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Significant imbalance	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of diversity of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, broadcast-wide patterns; high relevance of impact.
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	Recognisable, but weak disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No discernible preference or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Recognisable, 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

Violation 1:

Norm: Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA (Accurate representation, diversity of opinion)

Facts: Complete absence of the Russian rebuttal to the Bucha allegations in an 8-minute report on alleged war crimes.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:05–08:05 — Quote: "Since this week, the name Bucha has stood as a symbol for the brutality of the war in Ukraine." — Not a single Russian voice, no reference to Russian denials.

Assessment: Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA requires that at contested topics the diversity of views is adequately expressed. The question of responsibility for Bucha had not been conclusively clarified forensically at the time of broadcast and was disputed by Russia. The complete absence of the Russian position violates the requirement of diversity of opinion.

Note: OFCOM has held in comparable cases (e.g. complaint of 8.9.2022 on Ukraine reporting) that even with a clear moral assessment, accuracy requires the presentation of counter-positions.

Violation 2:

Norm: Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA (Accurate representation at contested topics)

Facts: Portrayal of freedom of movement with Croatia as an uncontested fact without inclusion of the domestic political debate in Switzerland.

Evidence: Timestamp 09:03 — Quote: "Since the beginning of the year, full freedom of movement between the two countries has been in effect. Just as with the rest of the EU, of which Croatia has been a member for nine years."

Assessment: Freedom of movement is politically controversial in Switzerland (SVP position: termination of freedom of movement). An SRF report that addresses the effects of this freedom of movement on Switzerland without depicting the domestic political debate violates the requirement of accurate representation at contested topics.

Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA (Balanced selection of interlocutors)

Facts: Macron portrait three days before the runoff election without inclusion of the main opposing candidate Marine Le Pen or her arguments.

Evidence: Timestamp 14:01–19:41 — Quote: "Macron as crisis manager, as a doer. An image that he will likely continue to cultivate, should he be re-elected." — Combined with 24:42: "There, in three days, the head of state will be elected."

Assessment: A portrait of a candidate three days before an election that contains exclusively positive characterisations and does not give the main opposing candidate a voice violates the requirement of a balanced selection of interlocutors. OFCOM has set heightened requirements for balance during election campaigns.

Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast exhibits demonstrable tensions with Art. 4 RTVA in three of four main blocks. The most serious violation lies in the Ukraine block, where the complete absence of the Russian rebuttal violates the requirement of diversity of opinion in a matter that had not yet been forensically concluded. The Croatia block violates the accuracy requirement through the omission of the Swiss domestic political debate on freedom of movement. The Macron portrait three days before the runoff election without inclusion of the opposing candidate violates the requirement of a balanced selection of interlocutors. For a formal complaint to OFCOM, the Ukraine block would be most suitable, as the omission is most clearly documentable there and OFCOM's case law on war reporting is applicable.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

Human Rights Watch (HRW)

1. FUNDING: HRW is financed primarily through private donations. The largest donors are US foundations, including the Open Society Foundations (George Soros), Ford Foundation and others. No state funding, but close ideological alignment with the Western-liberal human rights discourse. Constellation of interests: HRW is structurally committed to the Western value system; in conflicts between Western democracies and authoritarian regimes (Russia, China), HRW has historically taken a clear stance.

2. MANDATE: HRW's mandate is human rights advocacy — documentation, lobbying, public communication. This is not compatible with a neutral forensic assessment. HRW is a party to the discourse, not a neutral authority.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: HRW has an institutional interest in proving human rights violations — this secures relevance, donation income and political influence. In the Ukraine conflict, HRW has adopted a clear pro-Ukrainian stance (with the exception of a later report on Ukrainian conduct of warfare in residential areas, August 2022, which is not mentioned in the broadcast).

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Institutional interest in proving war crimes

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Working in war zones

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Experience in war crimes documentation, but not a forensic scientist

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent Russia-critical position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Methodical, but without concrete primary data

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source

TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

5. COUNTERVOICE: OSCE Special Observer Mission, UN Human Rights Council, ICMP (International Commission on Missing Persons) as institutionally more independent alternatives are not cited. Russian rebuttal is completely absent.

IMPORTANT: HRW is framed in the broadcast as "international forensic investigators" (02:47) — this is a factually incorrect qualification. HRW is an advocacy NGO, not a forensic institution. This framing is itself a finding.

Amnesty International

1. FUNDING: Membership fees and private donations. No state funding. Similar structure to HRW, but with a stronger focus on individual membership. Constellation of interests: Similar to HRW — structurally committed to the Western-liberal human rights discourse.

2. MANDATE: Human rights advocacy. Not compatible with a neutral forensic assessment.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Identical to HRW. Note: Amnesty published a report in August 2022 that criticised Ukrainian conduct of warfare in residential areas — this shows that the organisation is not fundamentally one-sided. This context is absent from the broadcast.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Institutional interest in proving human rights violations

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Working in conflict zones

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Experience in human rights documentation

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent positioning (with exceptions)

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Concrete cases (Takachowa, Prilipko) with data

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

5. COUNTERVOICE: Russian rebuttal regarding the cited cases is completely absent. No independent verification of the Amnesty reports by neutral authorities.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. Amnesty International is a recognised organisation — but "recognised" does not mean "neutral". Recognition is a social attribution that must itself be questioned. In the Ukraine conflict, Amnesty is not a neutral authority.

Legal and methodological classification



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

No finding of fact

The results presented do not constitute findings of fact regarding 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 IRAB).

No proof of causality

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intentions. Deviation values can be influenced by topic selection, news situation, political controversy or format logic.

No judgement of intent

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

Heuristic comparison instrument

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



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Switzerland — SRG SSR

Law

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

Relevant articles

- Art. 4 Para. 1 RTVA: All broadcasts of a radio or television programme must respect fundamental rights. 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 accurately represent facts and events 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 views must be adequately expressed (diversity requirement).

Core obligations

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

Supervisory authority

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

Complaints procedure

1. Ombudsman office of the respective business unit (SRF, RTS, RSI, RTR)
2. IRAB (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 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 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 | 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. Subsequently, 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with many examples. In addition, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques — this promotes not only insight but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**

Also available as an **audiobook**



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

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

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

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

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



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



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

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

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

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



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

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

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

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