



## SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2023-11-09 10 vor 10 vom 09.11.2023

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2023-11-09 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 13:51

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**5.6/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

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

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

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

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**3.2 / 10**

*Left-favouring*

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

← Left

Right →

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

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



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Switzerland is a consensus democracy with a seven-member Federal Council composed according to the magic formula. At the time of broadcast (October/November 2023, shortly after the National Council elections of 22 October 2023), the Federal Council consists of: SVP (2 seats: Ueli Maurer/Albert Rösti, Karin Keller-Sutter), SP (2 seats: Alain Berset, Elisabeth Baume-Schneider), FDP (2 seats: Ignazio Cassis, Viola Amherd), Centre (1 seat: Beat Jans not yet a candidate — Berset is stepping down). There is no classic government/opposition divide; all major parties are included.

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, single health insurer, EU rapprochement
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Economic freedom, lean state, bilateral agreements
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatism, family relief, centrist course
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Climate protection, net zero 2030, disarmament
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Green economy, liberal migration, EU ties
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Christian values, centrist course

The broadcast falls in a politically charged phase immediately after the 2023 National Council elections, in which the SVP made strong gains. The succession of Federal Councillor Alain Berset (SP) is a central domestic political issue. At the same time, the Hamas attack on Israel of 7 October 2023 dominates the international agenda and generates debates in Switzerland about Islamism, terrorist financing and the role of Qatari funds. Wolf policy and energy policy under the new DETEC head Albert Rösti (SVP) are further lines of conflict between the left-green and bourgeois camps.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is the public broadcaster of Switzerland and is subject to the RTVA (Radio and Television Act). Art. 4 RTVA obliges SRF to present facts accurately, to reflect a diversity of opinions on controversial topics and to make a balanced selection of interlocutors. As Switzerland's largest media organisation funded by licence fees, SRF bears a particular democratic responsibility to represent all political forces proportionally and fairly.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. party programme position
SVP	-2	15:27 "what Röstli has done now goes too far" — Party programme position: SVP in favour of wolf regulation and media financing reform — SP candidates criticise Röstli (SVP Federal Councillor) without rebuttal; SVP position not presented — distorted by omission
SP	+3	13:09–17:15 — SP candidates presented at length, favourably, with a home-game atmosphere; programme positions (health, climate, social affairs) correctly reproduced — correct, but framed one-sidedly positively
FDP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — omitted
Centre	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — omitted
Greens	0	Not directly mentioned; vegan segment touches on climate positions without party reference — omitted
GLP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — omitted
EVP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — omitted

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: SP (Score +3) — Programme positions on health, climate and social policy are presented correctly and in detail
- Strongest distortion: SVP (Score -2) — SVP Federal Councillor Röstli is criticised by SP candidates without the SVP position on wolf regulation or SRG financing being presented
- Average deviation from 0: 0.7
- Conclusion: The broadcast treats the SP Federal Council candidacy as the only domestic party-political topic and gives SP candidates an uncritical platform. The criticism of SVP Federal Councillor Röstli (wolves, SRG financing) goes unchallenged, as no SVP voice is heard. All other parties are simply absent.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast data

- Title: SRF 10 vor 10
- Date: 09.11.2023
- Presenter: Adi Mittenland (closing remarks 24:16)
- Reporters: Pascal Schumacher (Qatar segment), Christoph Leisibach (Brian segment), Georg Halter & Matthieu Kling (SP segment), Mauro Füller (vegan segment)

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Georges Malbruneau	French Middle East expert, book author	No party	Neutral/academic
Saida Kelamesali	Expert on Islamism	No party	Security policy
Giorgio Lercher	Former prisoner, influencer	No party	Civil society
Unnamed expert (resocialisation)	Expert on criminal justice/resocialisation	No party	Subject expert
Managing director ZSGE	Foundation Zurich	No party	Social work
Brian's lawyer	Lawyer of Brian Keller	No party	Legal
SP candidate 1 (Nordmann)	National Councillor SP	SP	Left (2.5)
SP candidate 2 (Jon Pult)	National Councillor SP	SP	Left (2.5)
SP candidate 3 (Beat Jans)	Cantonal Councillor BS	SP	Left (2.5)
SP candidate 4 (Daniel Jositsch)	Council of States SP	SP	Left (2.5)
SP candidate 5 (others)	SP members	SP	Left (2.5)
Audience voices Olten (3 persons)	SP party base	SP-aligned	Left
Joël Cashelin	Futurist, author	No party	Progressive
Lya Bali	Head of nutritional medicine, Inselspital Bern	No party	Medical
Cyril Brunner	ETH climate researcher	No party	Science

### Main topic

The broadcast covers four segments: (1) Qatari terrorist financing via NGOs with Swiss connections, (2) resocialisation of the well-known prisoner Brian, (3) SP Federal Council candidacy roadshow, (4) thought experiment on a vegan world.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard facts

## 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: Saida Kelamesali — Expert on Islamism

Timestamp	04:16–05:00
Statement	"The so-called investments that Qatar has made in Switzerland have always been suspicious to me. Because these are not simply normal investments, as one is accustomed to. Rather, they are always connected to a worldview. They are always connected to their Islamist ideology."
Classification	Islamism expert; no institutional affiliation mentioned in the transcript; generalises all Qatari investments as "Islamist ideological"
Missing countervoice	Islamic studies scholar who differentiates between state investments, conservative Islam and terrorist financing

#### Source in-depth check:

**(a) FINANCING:** Institutional affiliation not mentioned; unclear whether state-funded, privately funded or NGO-funded. No conflict of interest discernible, but also no transparency.

**(b) MANDATE:** As an "expert on Islamism", her mandate is oriented towards threat analysis — structurally inclined to emphasise threats.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — No obvious financial dependency discernible, but mandate bias

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public criticism of Islamist networks can entail risks

D3 Subject expertise: +1 — Islamism expertise relevant, but statement goes beyond area of expertise (generalises all Qatar investments)

D4 Opinion consistency: 0 — No comparative statements available

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — "Always been suspicious" is evaluative, not data-based; no evidence for "Islamist ideology" in all investments

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (assessment, no primary documents)

**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

**(c) SUBJECT EXPERTISE:** The statement is framed as expert assessment, but is a blanket evaluation without differentiation between legal conservative investments and terrorist financing. Technique No. 2 (source selection) applies.

#### Expert 2: Georges Malbruneau — French Middle East expert, book author

Timestamp	02:33–03:19
Statement	"The organisation undoubtedly does excellent work, but there are also problematic areas. They promote Islam through associations, but only the kind that suits them, which is more conservative than most European countries would wish."



### Classification

Book author with access to internal documents; more nuanced statement than Kelamesali; no institutional affiliation mentioned

### Source in-depth check:

**(a) FINANCING:** Book author — publisher financing; possible interest in attention for the book (published 2020, relevant again in the context of the Hamas attack in 2023)

**(b) MANDATE:** Middle East expert with access to documents; mandate compatible with factual assessment

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Book sales interest; sensationalisation increases relevance

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Criticism of Qatar can generate diplomatic and personal risks

D3 Subject expertise: +2 — Direct document analysis, Middle East expertise

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Book published 2020, statements consistent

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Nuanced statement ("undoubtedly excellent work, but...")

D6 Source level: +1 — Secondary, but based on primary documents

**TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN**

**(c) SUBJECT EXPERTISE:** Malbruneau is the most credible source in the Qatar segment; however, his differentiation is placed in a more one-sided context by the broadcast framing (terrorist financing as the main topic).

### Expert 3: Cyril Brunner — ETH climate researcher

#### Timestamp

21:54–22:43

#### Statement

"To achieve the climate targets we have set, veganism is not a prerequisite. But if we were to give up livestock from tomorrow, it would be 0.15 degrees cooler in 2050."

#### Classification

ETH researcher; institutionally independent; statement clearly quantified

### Source in-depth check:

**(a) FINANCING:** ETH Zurich — state-funded; no direct conflict of interest in climate research

**(b) MANDATE:** Climate research; mandate compatible with neutral assessment

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No discernible interest ties

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Mainstream climate research, no particular risk

D3 Subject expertise: +2 — ETH climate researcher, directly responsible

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent with ETH research lines

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Clear figures (0.15 degrees, 10% of the 1.5-degree target)

D6 Source level: +1 — Own research, secondary presentation

**TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN**

### Expert 4: Joël Cashelin — Futurist, author

#### Timestamp

18:49–21:06

#### Statement

"I think they would become very angry and they would probably rebel."

#### Classification

Futurist and author; speculative character of statements; no institutional background mentioned

### Source in-depth check:

**(a) FINANCING:** Book author; interest in attention for topic

**(b) MANDATE:** Future research is by definition speculative; mandate not compatible with empirical statements

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Book sales interest; utopia framing increases relevance

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No discernible risk

D3 Subject expertise: 0 — Future research is not an empirical discipline; statements on nutrition, society, economy go beyond area of expertise

D4 Opinion consistency: 0 — No comparative statements available

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — "I think" dominates; little data



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

D6 Source level: -1 — Tertiary (speculation about speculation)  
**TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

*Missing expert groups:*

- Swiss Farmers' Union / agricultural expert (vegan segment)
- Islamic studies scholar with a more nuanced assessment of Qatar (Qatar segment)
- Criminologist with a more critical stance on Brian's release

**Source traffic light for participants:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Traffic light
Saida Kelamesali — Expert on Islamism	0	+1	+1	0	-1	0	+1	<b>YELLOW</b>
Georges Malbruneau — French Middle East expert, book author	-1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+5	<b>GREEN</b>
Cyril Brunner — ETH climate researcher	+1	0	+2	+1	+2	+1	+7	<b>GREEN</b>
Joël Cashelin — Futurist, author	-1	0	0	0	-1	-1	-3	<b>YELLOW</b>

*Summary:*

Expert	Source traffic light	Main problem
Kelamesali	YELLOW (+1)	Generalisation, mandate bias
Malbruneau	GREEN (+5)	Book sales interest, but nuanced
Brunner	GREEN (+7)	No problems
Cashelin	YELLOW (-3)	Speculative, no area of expertise



## 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: Internal documents Qatar Charity (via Malbruneau/Cheneau)

#### Timestamp

02:33–02:49

#### Statement

"have evaluated thousands of confidential documents of the Qatari charitable organisation Qatar Charity"

**(a) Financing and sponsorship:** Book project by two French journalists/experts; publisher financing

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Book sales benefit from attention; documents not independently verified

**(c) Missing counter-source:** Qatar Charity itself; independent verification of the documents

### Source 2: YouTube video Omar Abdelkafi

#### Timestamp

03:48–04:07

#### Statement

"Congratulations, my sons, on everything you have accomplished and will accomplish. God be with you."

**(a) Financing:** Publicly accessible YouTube video

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** None — primary source

**(c) Missing counter-source:** Context of the video (when recorded, full content); no clarification of whether Abdelkafi has a direct connection to Qatar Charity

### Source 3: Federal Prosecutor's Office

#### Timestamp

07:09–07:23

#### Statement

"The Federal Prosecutor's Office confirms to 10 vor 10 that investigations are ongoing on suspicion of terrorist financing."

**(a) Financing:** State

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** None in confirming ongoing investigations

**(c) Missing counter-source:** Specific details on suspects; classification of the investigation phase

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 02:09–02:20

Claim: "Since the violent seizure of power by Hamas in 2007, billions are said to have flowed from Doha into the Gaza Strip."

Word marker: "are said to"

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

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 01:16–01:25



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

Claim: "It is to be assumed that the terrorists would hardly have had such military power without hundreds of millions of francs from the Persian Gulf."

Word marker: "It is to be assumed"

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

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 06:40–06:44

Claim: "95% of the main beneficiaries of Qatari welfare in western countries are associations that propagate conservative Islam."

Word marker: No explicit markers, but figure without source citation

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

Summary: The source selection in the Qatar segment is structurally one-sided: all sources support the terrorist financing thesis, not a single one questions it. Three rumour points raise the score to 6; the billions claim and the 95% figure are without primary source.



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Qatar segment (terrorist financing): approx. 5:30 min. (23%)
- Brian segment (resocialisation): approx. 5:00 min. (21%)
- SP Federal Council segment: approx. 4:30 min. (19%)
- Vegan segment: approx. 7:00 min. (29%)
- Moderation/transitions: approx. 2:00 min. (8%)

Within SP segment:

- SP candidates (speaking time): approx. 2:30 min.
- Audience voices (positive): approx. 1:00 min.
- Moderation text: approx. 1:00 min.
- Critical voices: 0 min.

Within vegan segment:

- Pro-vegan/climate protection arguments: approx. 4:30 min.
- Critical/neutral voices (Lya Bali): approx. 1:30 min.
- Agricultural perspective: 0 min.

Summary: The time distribution within the segments is asymmetric: in the SP segment, only SP candidates and favourable party base voices receive speaking time; in the vegan segment, pro-vegan arguments dominate. The Qatar segment is balanced in terms of time, but one-sided in content (all sources support the same thesis).



<b>4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)</b>							<b>7/10</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	8	9	10

#### Omission 1:

##### Context

SVP position on wolf regulation and SRG financing reform is completely absent

Relevant at: 15:09–15:41 (SP candidates criticise Röstli)

##### Effect

The criticism of SVP Federal Councillor Röstli stands unchallenged; viewers receive only the SP perspective on these political decisions. The SVP's justification for wolf regulation (protection of agriculture, proportionality) and for the SRG financing reform (austerity package, media reform) is not presented.

#### Omission 2:

##### Context

No voice from the Swiss Muslim community in the Qatar segment

Relevant at: 00:06–07:23 (entire Qatar segment)

##### Effect

The segment connects Qatari investments, conservative Islam and terrorist financing without differentiation. Swiss Muslims are implicitly placed in a terrorist financing context without their perspective being heard. This violates the requirement of accurate presentation.

#### Omission 3:

##### Context

Economic and social consequences for Swiss agriculture in the vegan segment are absent

Relevant at: 17:53–23:15 (entire vegan segment)

##### Effect

The segment treats a vegan world primarily as a climate protection instrument and utopia, without addressing the economic consequences for Swiss farmers, mountain agriculture and rural regions. This creates a one-sidedly positive picture.

Summary: The systematic omissions affect all three politically relevant segments: in the SP segment the counter-perspective to the Röstli criticism is missing, in the Qatar segment the Muslim community is missing, in the vegan segment agriculture is missing. The pattern is consistent: positions that contradict the left-green worldview are omitted.

### Missing voices

- Qatari embassy/Qatar Charity (spokesperson): Would have presented the official Qatari position on the allegations and ensured the right of reply
- Swiss Muslim Council or Islamic umbrella organisation: Would have differentiated between conservative Islam and terrorist financing and identified risks of stigmatisation
- SVP spokesperson on Röstli criticism: Would have presented the SVP position on wolf regulation (animal protection vs. agriculture) and SRG financing reform
- Swiss Farmers' Union: Would have quantified the economic and social consequences of a vegan world for Swiss agriculture
- Critical SP party base voice: Would have articulated scepticism towards individual candidates or the candidate selection



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

- Independent terrorist financing researcher: Would have methodologically contextualised the robustness of the Qatar-Hamas connection thesis
- Criminal justice expert with a more critical stance on Brian's release: Would have given greater weight to the court's assessment of the risk of reoffending
- Nutritional scientist focusing on malnutrition risks of global veganism: Would have presented the medical risks of forced vegan nutrition for vulnerable population groups (children, pregnant women, the elderly) in developing countries



## 5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 02:11–02:20

Figure: "billions from Doha are said to have flowed into the Gaza Strip"

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value mentioned (billions) — (b) Share missing (share of Hamas budget? share of Qatar GDP?) — (c) Trend missing (development over time?)

#### Missing context

How much of this actually flowed to Hamas vs. civilian administration? What share of Qatari state expenditure?

#### Effect

"Billions" sounds like massive terrorist financing; without contextualisation a distorted picture emerges.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 06:45–06:53

Figure: "95% of the main beneficiaries of Qatari welfare in western countries are associations that propagate conservative Islam."

Dimensions: (a) Share mentioned (95%) — (b) Absolute value missing (how many associations? how much money?) — (c) Trend missing

#### Missing context

No source citation for the 95% figure; no definition of "conservative Islam"

#### Effect

The precision of the figure (95%) suggests scientific robustness that is not present.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 22:04–22:20

Figure: "it would be 0.15 degrees cooler in 2050" / "approximately 10 percent of that"

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value (+0.15 degrees) — (b) Share (10% of the 1.5-degree target) — (c) Trend indicated

#### Missing context

No indication of the uncertainty range; no contextualisation of the costs of a global vegan dietary transition

#### Effect

The figure is used as an argument for veganism without presenting the cost-benefit ratio.

Summary: The figures in the Qatar segment are without primary sources and without contextualisation; the 95% figure is particularly problematic. The ETH climate figure is methodologically sound, but lacks cost-benefit context.



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

<b>Association 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	03:30–03:55
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"Including in 2011 to the Islamic Cultural Centre near Lausanne. Documents available to 10 vor 10 show that Qatar Charity paid a total of 1.5 million francs towards this building. The centre advertised an appearance by the Egyptian hate preacher Omar Abdelkafi."</i>
Technique: Causal chain: Qatar Charity → Islamic Cultural Centre Lausanne → hate preacher Abdelkafi → Hamas support. The connection between the building financing (2011) and Abdelkafi's appearance is not established temporally or causally.	
<b>Effect</b>	Islamic cultural centres in Switzerland are implicitly associated with terrorist financing.

<b>Association 2:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	05:00–06:07
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"At the microphone Nicola Blanchot, convert and president of the self-proclaimed Islamic Central Council of Switzerland. IZRS for short. A familiar figure in the Swiss Salafist scene."</i>
Technique: Blanchot is discredited through adjectives ("self-proclaimed", "familiar figure in the Salafist scene") before his statements are presented. The connection to Qatar is established by Kelamesali ("an instrument for Qatar"), without evidence.	
<b>Effect</b>	Blanchot is framed as a Qatar instrument and Salafist without this connection being substantiated.

Chain of association:

Qatar → Qatar Charity → Islamic Cultural Centre Lausanne → hate preacher Abdelkafi → Hamas support → Islamic Central Council of Switzerland (Blanchot) → Salafist scene

For Nicola Blanchot (as implicitly negatively framed actor):

SOURCE CHECK:

- Does this actor work with verifiable primary sources? Not assessable from transcript
- Are his core statements falsifiable? Not assessable

RISK MATRIX:

- What has he lost? Reputation through media coverage
- What does he gain? Attention, community strengthening
- Net: Unclear ratio

TONALITY: From the transcript: "With our soul, with our blood we will redeem you, Palestine" — emotional, appellative

RESULT CATEGORY: B — Borderline case (partly verifiable connections to conservative Islamic networks, but terrorist financing connection not substantiated)

Summary: The chain of association Qatar → Islam → terrorism is constructed through several unsubstantiated connecting steps. The Islamic Cultural Centre Lausanne and Nicola Blanchot are placed in a terrorist financing context through guilt by association, without direct evidence of terrorist financing being present.



## 7. TIMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:06–00:26 (teaser, start of broadcast)

Content: "From the country, hundreds of millions of francs are said to flow to the radical Islamic terrorist organisation Hamas. A charity organisation is also said to be involved, with entanglements reaching into Switzerland."

#### Timing effect

The teaser sets the frame for the entire broadcast: Qatar = terrorist financing = Swiss entanglement. The "said to" (subjunctive) is not perceived as uncertainty in the teaser, but as the announcement of a revelation. Viewers are already conditioned to a particular conclusion before the segment.

### Finding 2:

Position: 01:43–02:03 (start of Qatar segment)

Content: "These images went around the world. Hamas terrorists kill Israeli civilians. Hamas chief Ismail Haniyeh and his entourage celebrate the slaughter of Israelis in the safety of Doha in a luxury apartment."

#### Timing effect

The segment begins with the most emotionally charged images available (Hamas attack, celebrations in Doha) before factual information is presented. This creates maximum emotional charge before the analysis.

### Finding 3:

Position: 07:02–07:09 (end of Qatar segment)

Content: "Despite the success, the Hamas attack casts a strange light on Qatar and its connections, including in Switzerland."

#### Timing effect

The conclusion of the Qatar segment summarises the message before the Federal Prosecutor's Office information (which does not confirm a Qatar connection) follows. The conclusion precedes the final piece of evidence.

Summary: The timing in the Qatar segment is manipulative: emotional images at the beginning, unsubstantiated conclusion at the end, teaser conditions viewers before the segment. This is a classic technique for steering opinion.



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 01:53–02:03

Triggering event: Hamas attack on Israel of 7 October 2023; images of Haniyeh in Doha

Reaction: "Hamas chief Ismail Haniyeh and his entourage celebrate the slaughter of Israelis in the safety of Doha in a luxury apartment."

### Comparison

No analogous event in the broadcast in which Palestinian victims or other parties to the conflict are treated with comparable emotional language.

Asymmetry: The word choice "slaughter" is emotionally charged; Palestinian victims of the Israeli counter-strike are not mentioned. Since the broadcast treats the conflict from only one perspective, the asymmetry is structural, but the triggering event (Hamas attack) is real and serious. The asymmetry arises from the omission of the counter-perspective, not from a false reaction to the event itself.

Degree of outrage: 3/5 — Clear emotional language ("slaughter", "celebrate in luxury apartment")

Selectivity: 1/5 — Triggering event is real and serious; asymmetry arises through omission, not through selective reaction to comparable events

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 15:09–15:41

Triggering event: SP candidates criticise SVP Federal Councillor Röstli for wolf regulation and SRG financing reform

Reaction: Moderation text and segment leave criticism unchallenged; no follow-up question, no counter-statement

### Comparison

No analogous event in the broadcast in which SP positions are similarly criticised without rebuttal

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — SP candidates can attack Röstli (SVP) without the SVP position being presented. This is a structural asymmetry in the SP segment.

Degree of outrage: 1/5 — No explicit outrage, but implicit approval through absence of follow-up questions

Selectivity: 3/5 — Clear one-sidedness: SVP positions are not defended

Summary: The selective outrage is emotional in the Qatar segment, but partly justified by the triggering event. In the SP segment the asymmetry is structural in nature: SP candidates can attack Röstli without rebuttal.



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

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 00:06–07:23 (Qatar segment)

Missing perspective/fact: Differentiation between Qatari state financing, conservative Islam and direct terrorist financing

Relevance: The broadcast connects three different phenomena (state investments, religious promotion, terrorist financing) without clear demarcation. This is central to understanding the topic.

Impact: Viewers receive the impression that Qatari investments in Switzerland are generally suspected of terrorism — a conclusion the broadcast cannot substantiate.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 13:09–17:15 (SP segment)

Missing perspective/fact: No voice from other parties on the SP Federal Council candidacy; no critical party base voice; no contextualisation of the Röstli criticism

Relevance: The SP Federal Council election is a matter for the entire parliament; other parties have legitimate perspectives on the candidates.

Impact: The SP segment resembles an election campaign piece for the SP rather than journalistic contextualisation.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 17:53–23:15 (vegan segment)

Missing perspective/fact: Economic consequences for Swiss agriculture; food security in developing countries under global veganism

Relevance: A vegan world would have massive implications for Swiss mountain agriculture and global food security — central aspects of the thought experiment.

Impact: The thought experiment is framed as primarily positive (climate, health); structural problems are marginalised.

Summary: The broadcast exhibits systematic completeness deficiencies in all three politically relevant segments. The pattern is consistent: perspectives that contradict the left-green worldview or would increase complexity are omitted.

## Soft facts

The Hamas attack of 7 October 2023 has triggered a global debate about terrorist financing, the role of Qatar and Islamist networks in Europe. In Switzerland, Islamic organisations and their financing are under increased scrutiny. At the same time, the SP Federal Council succession for Alain Berset is a key domestic political issue, raising the question of which party will shape the Interior Department. The veganism discourse is part of a broader societal debate about nutrition, climate protection and animal husbandry, which is politically contested between left-green proponents and bourgeois-agricultural sceptics.

### Share of perspectives covered

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



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

**Qatar segment:**

**[A] Qatari government / Qatar Charity:** Own presentation of activities

**[B] Swiss Muslims / Islamic communities:** Differentiation between conservative Islam and terrorist financing

**[C] Swiss Federal Prosecutor's Office:** More concrete statements on ongoing investigations

**[D] Israeli or western intelligence services:** Verifiable figures on money flows

**[E] Critics of the terrorist financing thesis:** Scholars who view the Qatar-Hamas connection in a more nuanced way

**SP segment:**

**[F] Critical party base voices:** Who is sceptical of the candidates?

**[G] Parliamentary counter-perspective:** How do other parties assess the SP candidates?

**[H] SVP position on Röstli criticism:** Counter-statement on wolf policy and SRG financing

**Vegan segment:**

**[I] Swiss farmers/Farmers' Union:** Economic and social consequences for agriculture

**[J] Nutritional scientist with a more critical stance on veganism**

**[A] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Qatar Charity and the Qatari government did not respond (04:08–04:15), but are not represented by their own voice; one-sided presentation.

**[B] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No voice from the Swiss Muslim community differentiating between conservative Islam and terrorist financing; risk of generalisation.

**[C] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 07:09 — Quote: "The Federal Prosecutor's Office confirms to 10 vor 10 that investigations are ongoing on suspicion of terrorist financing." — Assessment: Mentioned, but without substantive content.

**[D] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No independent verification of the billions figures by intelligence services or international organisations.

**[E] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No academic counter-voice to the Qatar-Hamas connection thesis.

**[F] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Only positive audience voices from the SP base; no critical voices on the candidate selection.

**[G] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No voice from other parties on the SP Federal Council candidacy or on the Röstli criticism.

**[H] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: SVP position on wolf regulation and SRG financing reform is not presented, even though SP candidates directly attack Röstli.

**[I] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No voice from agriculture on the consequences of a vegan world; one-sided expert selection.



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

#### [J] INDICATED

Timestamp: 20:24 — Quote: "It would be a step into the unknown" — Assessment: Lya Bali expresses reservations, but remains within the pro-vegan basic tenor.

#### Completeness score: 3/10

---

**Justification:** Of ten relevant perspectives, only two are indicated and none is fully addressed. Particularly serious is the complete absence of counter-voices in the SP segment (no other parties, no critical party base) and in the Qatar segment (no Muslim community, no counter-perspective to the terrorist financing thesis). The vegan segment is somewhat more balanced, but here too the agricultural perspective is missing.



## Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

#### Finding 1:

<b>Timestamp</b>	00:06–00:26
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"From the country, hundreds of millions of francs are said to flow to the radical Islamic terrorist organisation Hamas. A charity organisation is also said to be involved, with entanglements reaching into Switzerland."</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	The word "entanglements" sets a criminal frame for all Qatari activities in Switzerland before the segment begins. "Entanglement" implies guilt or at least complicity.
<b>Why problematic</b>	Viewers are conditioned to a guilt hypothesis before the segment; neutral contextualisation is made more difficult.

#### Finding 2:

<b>Timestamp</b>	13:09–13:17
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"A hug here, a little kiss there. It is a home game for the five men and one woman who all want to reach the very top."</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	The SP segment is framed with warm, familial language ("home game", "hug", "little kiss"). This creates a positive emotional atmosphere for the SP candidates.
<b>Why problematic</b>	Political reporting should not favour a party through emotional warmth framing.

#### Finding 3:

<b>Timestamp</b>	17:53–18:03
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"If our world were to go vegan from tomorrow, 82 billion livestock animals would become virtually useless to us humans."</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	The thought experiment is framed as a utopia, not a dystopia. "Virtually useless" for livestock implies that their current utility is questionable — a normative assertion that is not identified as such.
<b>Why problematic</b>	The framing prejudices the conclusion of the thought experiment in the direction of veganism as desirable.

Summary: The framing is consistent across all three segments: Qatar/Islam = threat/entanglement; SP = warmth/home game; veganism = utopia/progress. These framings are not neutral and influence the reception of the content.



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



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	01:53–02:03
Quote	<i>"Hamas chief Ismail Haniyeh and his entourage celebrate the slaughter of Israelis in the safety of Doha in a luxury apartment."</i>
Manipulation	"Slaughter" is an extremely emotionally charged word; "luxury apartment" intensifies the moral outrage. This word choice is unusually emotional for a news broadcast.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "celebrate the attacks on Israel in Doha" — factually correct without emotional exaggeration.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	05:05–05:17
Quote	<i>"At the microphone Nicola Blanchot, convert and president of the self-proclaimed Islamic Central Council of Switzerland."</i>
Manipulation	"Self-proclaimed" is a discrediting adjective that calls into question the legitimacy of the organisation before Blanchot is given the floor. "Convert" is a characterisation that is implicitly used in this context as an explanation for radicalism.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "President of the Islamic Central Council of Switzerland (IZRS)" — without prior discrediting.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	07:02–07:09
Quote	<i>"Despite the success, the Hamas attack casts a strange light on Qatar and its connections, including in Switzerland."</i>
Manipulation	"Strange light" is an evaluative formulation that draws a conclusion the segment has not substantiated. "Connections" (plural) suggests a network that has not been demonstrated in the segment.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "raises questions about Qatar's role" — without implicit attribution of blame.

Summary: The word choice in the Qatar segment is consistently emotionally charged and discrediting. "Slaughter", "self-proclaimed", "strange light", "entanglements" — these terms set normative frames that go beyond factual reporting and touch on Art. 4 RTVA.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 15:27–15:41

Triggering event: SP candidate criticises SVP Federal Councillor Röstli for wolf regulation ("what Röstli has done now goes too far") and SRG financing reform ("He decided yesterday to take 170 million away from the SRG. By way of ordinance")

**Quote (presenter/reporter)** *No follow-up question, no contextualisation, no counter-statement*

**Comparison** No analogous event in the broadcast in which SP positions are similarly left unchallenged

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — SP candidates can attack the SVP Federal Councillor without the reporter asking follow-up questions or providing context. This is particularly striking because the SRG financing reform directly affects SRF (self-interest).

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 13:29–13:37

Triggering event: Children's questions to SP candidates ("Wouldn't you rather be King of England?")

**Quote (reporter)** *"The first questions are non-political. They come from children. But the answers to them are quite political."*

**Comparison** No analogous event with other parties in the broadcast

Asymmetry: The use of children's questions as an introduction creates a sympathetic, human atmosphere for SP candidates. Whether other parties are treated similarly cannot be assessed from the broadcast, but in this broadcast the technique is one-sided.

Summary: The moderation behaviour in the SP segment is strikingly uncritical: no follow-up questions on the Röstli criticism, no contextualisation, no counter-perspective. The children's questions technique creates a sympathetic atmosphere. Particularly problematic is the absence of a follow-up question on the SRG financing reform, since SRF as a directly affected party has a self-interest that would need to be disclosed.



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

<b>Asymmetry 1:</b>	
<b>To SP candidates, 16</b>	03–16:21: "Would you also accept the election as a Federal Councillor if you are not on the parliamentary group ticket?" / "Solar obligation on large roofs." — soft/neutral (yes-no format, no critical follow-up questions)
<b>To SVP/FDP/Centre</b>	No questions asked (not in broadcast)
<b>Comparison</b>	SP candidates are confronted with children's questions and yes-no questions; no critical questions on SP positions (single health insurer, tax increases, migration policy). Other parties are not given the floor.

<b>Asymmetry 2:</b>	
<b>To SP candidate (health), 14</b>	25–14:57: No question — candidate speaks uninterrupted about his vision
<b>To Qatar Charity / Islamic Cultural Centre</b>	No response to enquiries (04:08–04:15) — but no follow-up question as to why there is no response, no alternative source sought
<b>Comparison</b>	SP candidates receive speaking time without critical follow-up questions; Qatar Charity is implicitly found guilty through non-response.

Summary: The question asymmetry is structural: SP candidates receive soft questions and uninterrupted speaking time; critical follow-up questions on SP positions are completely absent. The non-response of Qatar Charity is framed as an implicit admission of guilt, without alternative explanations (e.g. language barrier, legal advice) being considered.



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

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp 03:03–03:09

Construct: "The organisation undoubtedly does excellent work, but there are also problematic areas."

#### Analysis

This formulation suggests a balanced presentation (positive and negative aspects), but the entire segment deals exclusively with the "problematic areas". The positive side is dealt with in half a sentence, the negative in five minutes. This is a false balance: the formal acknowledgement of both sides conceals the one-sidedness of the content.

Summary: The false balance is present in the Qatar segment, but not dominant. The broadcast purports to show both sides ("excellent work, but..."), but then deals exclusively with the negative side. In the SP segment there is no false balance — there is no attempt at all to establish balance.



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Qatari investments in Switzerland = suspicion of terrorism

**Timestamp** 00:06–00:26 — Evidence: "entanglements reaching into Switzerland"

Alternative agenda: Qatari investments could also be addressed as an economic partnership, diplomatic relations or legitimate religious promotion. The terrorist financing agenda is one of several possible framings.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Veganism as a climate protection instrument and societal utopia

**Timestamp** 17:53–18:03 — Evidence: "If our world were to go vegan from tomorrow..."

Alternative agenda: Food sovereignty, economic consequences for agriculture, cultural significance of meat consumption, food security in developing countries — these aspects are not placed on the agenda.

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: SP Federal Council candidacy as a positive event ("home game", warmth)

**Timestamp** 13:09–17:15 — Evidence: "A hug here, a little kiss there."

Alternative agenda: Critical contextualisation of the SP candidates, comparison with other parties, parliamentary perspective on the Federal Council election.

Summary: The agenda-setting of the broadcast establishes three consistent frames: Qatar/Islam as a threat, SP as a sympathetic force, veganism as progress. These agenda-settings are not neutral and correspond to a left-progressive worldview.



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 5.9 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 5.2 / 10

### Dominant techniques

- 1. Guilt by Association (Score 7):** The broadcast constructs a chain of association from Qatar via Islamic organisations to Hamas, without substantiating the individual connecting steps. The Islamic Cultural Centre Lausanne and Nicola Blanchot are placed in a terrorist financing context through guilt by association. This technique is particularly problematic because it places Swiss Muslims collectively under suspicion.
- 2. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 7):** In all three politically relevant segments, perspectives that contradict the left-green worldview are systematically omitted: SVP position on the Röstli criticism, Muslim community in the Qatar segment, agriculture in the vegan segment. The pattern is consistent and structural.
- 3. Word choice and terminology (Score 7):** The word choice in the Qatar segment is consistently emotionally charged: "slaughter", "self-proclaimed", "strange light", "entanglements". These terms set normative frames that go beyond factual reporting and steer the reception of the content.

### Core messages of the broadcast

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "Qatari funds flow via Islamic organisations into Switzerland and indirectly finance terrorism."

**Technique:** Guilt by association, timing, word choice — Evidence: 00:06, 01:43, 03:30, 07:02

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "The SP Federal Council candidates are sympathetic, competent politicians who stand for the right values."

**Technique:** Framing (home game), omission (no criticism), question asymmetry (soft questions) — Evidence: 13:09, 14:25, 16:03

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "A vegan world would be better for the climate and health; the transition is challenging, but desirable."

**Technique:** Agenda-setting, expert selection (pro-vegan experts dominate), omission (no agricultural perspective) — Evidence: 17:53, 21:46, 22:48

**Justification:** The overall score of 5.6/10 corresponds to a clear one-sidedness. The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in several dimensions: in the SP segment, diversity of opinion is completely absent (no other parties, no critical voices); in the Qatar segment, unsubstantiated chains of association are framed as facts; in the vegan segment, balance between climate protection and agricultural perspectives is lacking. The one-sidedness is not confined to one segment, but runs consistently through the entire broadcast in one direction (left-progressive). Particularly serious is the unchallenged criticism of SVP Federal Councillor Röstli by SP candidates, since SRF as a public broadcaster has a particular duty of impartiality.

### CONCLUSION

The broadcast from October/November 2023 exhibits a clear one-sidedness that touches on Art. 4 RTVA in several dimensions. The SP segment is journalistically conceived not as reporting but as a platform for SP candidates: no critical follow-up questions, no other parties, no contextualisation of the Röstli criticism. The Qatar segment constructs through guilt by association and emotional word choice a connection between Qatari investments, conservative Islam and terrorist financing that is not fully supported by the evidence presented. The vegan segment sets climate protection and veganism as socially desirable without presenting the economic and social counter-arguments on an equal footing. The pattern is consistent: perspectives that contradict the left-progressive worldview (SVP position, Muslim community, agriculture) are systematically omitted. This corresponds to a structural imbalance that goes beyond individual editorial decisions and does not fully comply with the accuracy and balance requirements of Art. 4 RTVA.



## 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	5	●●●
4	OMISSION (Selective Omission)	7	●●●●
5	MANIPULATION OF FIGURES	5	●●●
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	7	●●●●
7	TIMING	5	●●●
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	4	●●
9	COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)	7	●●●●
10	FRAMING (Setting the frame)	6	●●●
11	WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY	7	●●●●
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	4	●●
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	5	●●●
14	FALSE BALANCE	3	●●
15	AGENDA-SETTING	6	●●●

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

**5.9/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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

**5.2/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**5.6/10**

*Significant imbalance*

*Averaged from hard facts and soft facts*



## KEY — Meaning of scores

### Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

### Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

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

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

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



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

### Assessment under Art. 4 RTVA

#### Violation 1:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (Accurate presentation)

Facts: In the Qatar segment, unsubstantiated claims ("billions are said to have flowed", "It is to be assumed") are used as the factual basis for conclusions. The chain of association Qatar → Islamic organisations → terrorist financing is not substantiated by primary sources.

Evidence: Timestamp 02:09 — Quote: "Since the violent seizure of power by Hamas in 2007, billions are said to have flowed from Doha into the Gaza Strip." / Timestamp 01:16 — Quote: "It is to be assumed that the terrorists would hardly have had such military power without hundreds of millions of francs from the Persian Gulf."

Assessment: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA requires accurate presentation of facts and events. The use of subjunctive and unverified claims as the basis for conclusions about Swiss entanglement in terrorist financing does not comply with the requirement of accurate presentation. The Federal Prosecutor's Office confirms ongoing investigations, but not a Qatar connection — this distinction is not clearly communicated.

#### Violation 2:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA (Diversity of opinion on controversial topics)

Facts: In the SP Federal Council segment, only the SP perspective is presented. The criticism of SVP Federal Councillor Röstli (wolf regulation, SRG financing reform) goes unchallenged. No other parties are given the floor.

Evidence: Timestamp 15:09 — Quote: "It cannot be that the wolf as a whole is in some way exterminated in Switzerland." / Timestamp 15:27 — Quote: "He decided yesterday to take 170 million away from the SRG. By way of ordinance."

Assessment: The Federal Council election is a controversial political issue that affects all parties. Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA requires the presentation of different viewpoints on controversial topics. The one-sided presentation in favour of the SP without a counter-perspective violates this requirement. Particularly problematic is the unchallenged criticism of Röstli on the SRG financing reform, since SRF as a directly affected party has a self-interest that would need to be disclosed.

#### Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (Accurate presentation) in conjunction with Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA (Diversity of opinion)

Facts: In the Qatar segment, Islamic organisations and mosques in Switzerland are placed in a terrorist financing context through guilt by association, without Swiss Muslims or Islamic communities being given the floor.

Evidence: Timestamp 03:20–03:55 — Quote: "Qatari millions also flow into Switzerland for charitable and cultural purposes. For example into Islamic institutions or mosques. Including in 2011 into the Islamic Cultural Centre near Lausanne."

Assessment: The connection between building financing (2011) and a hate preacher appearance (without date) is established without causal evidence. The affected community (Islamic Cultural Centre Lausanne, Swiss Muslims) is not given the floor. This violates both the accuracy requirement and the requirement of diversity of opinion.

### Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast exhibits violations of Art. 4 RTVA in three of four segments. The most serious violation lies in the SP segment: the one-sided presentation of the SP Federal Council candidacy without a counter-perspective and the unchallenged criticism of SVP Federal Councillor Röstli violate the diversity of opinion requirement of Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA. In the Qatar segment, the use of unverifiable claims as a basis for conclusions violates the accuracy requirement of Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA; the missing voice of the affected Muslim community reinforces this finding. The vegan segment is less serious, but the absence of the agricultural perspective represents an incompleteness that touches on the balance requirement. Overall, the broadcast does not fully meet the requirements of Art. 4 RTVA,



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

whereby the violations are not to be classified as gross or systematic in the sense of being subject to complaint, but do document a clear editorial imbalance.



## CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

### Qatar Charity (cited via Malbruneau/Cheneau documents)

- 1. FINANCING:** Qatar Charity is a Qatari NGO close to the state; the documents were evaluated by two French book authors — publisher financing, book sales interest
- 2. MANDATE:** Qatar Charity has a humanitarian mandate; the documents are interpreted by third parties, not by the organisation itself
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Book authors have an interest in attention; Qatar Charity has an interest in positive portrayal (not given the floor)
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1: -1 (book sales) / D2: +1 (risk for authors) / D3: +1 (document access) / D4: +1 (book 2020, consistent) / D5: 0 (mixed) / D6: +1 (primary documents, but secondary presentation) → TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Qatar Charity did not respond; no independent verification of the documents; no alternative interpretation

### Saida Kelamesali (Islamism expert)

- 1. FINANCING:** Institutional affiliation not mentioned; unclear
- 2. MANDATE:** Islamism expertise; structurally oriented towards threat analysis
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Mandate bias: Islamism experts have an institutional interest in emphasising threats (maintaining relevance, securing funding)
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1: 0 / D2: +1 / D3: +1 / D4: 0 / D5: -1 / D6: 0 → TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Islamic studies scholar who differentiates between conservative Islam and terrorist financing — not cited

### Foundation ZSGE (resocialisation)

- 1. FINANCING:** Foundation; probably partly publicly funded (Canton of Zurich); no details in the transcript
- 2. MANDATE:** Resocialisation of former prisoners; mandate compatible with positive portrayal of resocialisation programmes
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in positive portrayal of its own work and in public support for resocialisation programmes
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1: -1 (self-interest) / D2: 0 / D3: +2 (subject expertise) / D4: 0 / D5: +1 (factual) / D6: 0 → TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Victims' associations or security experts who give greater weight to recidivism risks — not cited

### ETH climate researcher Cyril Brunner

- 1. FINANCING:** ETH Zurich — state-funded; no direct conflicts of interest in climate research
- 2. MANDATE:** Climate research; mandate compatible with neutral assessment
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** No discernible direct conflict of interest; ETH research is peer-reviewed
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1: +1 / D2: 0 / D3: +2 / D4: +1 / D5: +2 / D6: +1 → TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Not necessary — statement is clearly quantified and methodologically transparent

*IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. The classification of Kelamesali as "expert on Islamism" is a social attribution made by the broadcast itself, without institutional affiliation or proof of qualification. This is itself a finding in the sense of criterion 1 (expert selection).*

### Legal and methodological classification



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

**No finding of fact**

The results presented do not constitute findings of fact about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a determination of individual responsibility.

**No legal ruling**

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of Art. 4 RTVA. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular IBOA).

**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 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 present facts and events accurately, so that the public can form its own opinion. Opinions and commentary must be recognisable as such.
- Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA: In the totality of editorial broadcasts, the diversity of events and opinions must be adequately expressed (diversity requirement).

#### Core obligations

---

- 1. Accuracy:** Accurate presentation of facts and events
- 2. Diversity of opinion:** Diversity of views on controversial topics
- 3. Balance:** Balanced selection of interlocutors

#### Supervisory authority

---

- IBOA (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
- 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. IBOA (if no agreement)
3. Federal Supreme Court (last instance)



## APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS

### Literature

---

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

### SVFAB Working Papers

---

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

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

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



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

## Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

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

To make our work solid, we depend on membership and patron contributions.

### Contact and further information:

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

**Bank details:** PostFinance – POFICHBE

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

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



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

## The following books are available from SVFAB

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



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

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**

Also available as an **audiobook**



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

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

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolkit — for everyone who has a microphone in front of 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 participate. Daily. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You learn not only how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

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

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

**Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.**



The SRG collects 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 IBOA, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

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

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

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