



Civil fascism in Sunday format – How Telebasel frames thinking



Sep. 18, 2025

Civil fascism in Sunday format

How Telebasel (swiss TV show) frames thinking

The e-ID is a prime example of the invisible weapons of propaganda: a sober administrative project is transformed into a moral battlefield. Those who oppose it are supposedly afraid, ridiculous, or even an enemy of the state. This was recently demonstrated in the Telebasel Sunday talk show ([September 14, 2025: e-ID, early French, PS restriction](#)), where three young politicians crossed swords. But the actual clash didn't take place between the SVP, the Young Socialists, and the GLP; it played out on a meta-level: in the framing.

Framing as a weapon

Framing means establishing an interpretive framework within which facts and opinions appear. The same words can inspire trust or generate fear, depending on how they are presented. The Left has perfected this craft. They know: whoever controls language controls thought. Telebasel demonstrated this perfectly. A Sunday talk show as a showcase for language politics.

- **Criticism = Fear** : Sascha Müller (JSVP) spoke about surveillance, data misuse, and the loss of freedom. His arguments are rational and understandable. But Telebasel frames them as mistrust, backwardness, and ridiculous fear. The viewer learns: Anyone who is skeptical is old-fashioned, fearful, and fundamentally irrational.
- **Support = progress** : The Young Socialists (Juso) and the Liberal Party (GLP), on the other hand, can shine with their future, trust, and modernity. Their words: opportunities, security, and competitiveness. The viewer should feel that those in favor of the e-ID are educated, young, cosmopolitan, and future-oriented. Those against it come across as grumpy people who want to turn back the clock.
- **The joker**: At the end, the editors set the ultimate frame: opponents supposedly come from the *right-wing extremist milieu* . Done. Stamp it on. Discussion is over. The message is clear: criticism of the e-ID = proximity to extremists. Who would seriously want to disagree with that?

This three-way divide functions like a psychological corset. The viewer is subtly told: There is a right side (trust, progress) and a wrong side (fear, right-wing extremism). Nothing exists in between. And anyone who isn't clearly on the "right" side automatically slips into the camp of the suspects. This isn't discourse; it's training through language.

The left-wing technique: guilt through proximity

Anyone who shares the same opinion as a supposed "right-winger" or "anti-system" is immediately equated with them. **This is classic guilt by association. Critics aren't refuted substantively, but morally contaminated.** An SVP argument? Immediately "right-wing extremist." An objection to surveillance? Already "state denial." Skepticism about a drug? Bam: "anti-vaxxer." A doubt about climate policy? And you're immediately branded a "climate denier." Anyone who takes even a single step aside, deviating from the official line, is immediately branded with the greatest shame imaginable.

This technique works so insidiously because it doesn't require any content. It thrives solely on the fear of social ostracism. No one wants to be considered a "Nazi" or "threat," so many keep quiet, even if they have good arguments. This not only poisons the debate but also nips any criticism in the bud. The result: a climate of self-censorship in which only those who dutifully join in the chorus speak out.

The chain of associations is always the same: Doubt = proximity to the "right" = proximity to "danger" = morally dead. This spares the left any real debate. After all, who wants to be mentioned in the same breath as neo-Nazis, "lateral thinkers," or enemies of the state? That's precisely what the method aims to do: not convince, but smear.

And the most powerful weapon in this arsenal is the accusation of anti-Semitism. Anyone who no longer fits into any other frame gets the ultimate label: anti-Semite. This is the ultimate killer, ending every debate before it can even begin. Once spoken, the stigma sticks, no matter how unfounded. It silences every critical voice, and that's precisely why this accusation is so popular with those who have run out of arguments.

Civil Fascism: The Moral Pillory

Whenever factual arguments no longer work, moral frames kick in. Then you are:

- Nazi
- State refusers
- Coronaleugner
- Klimaleugner
- Anti-vaccinationists
- anti-Semitic

In short: a disloyal asshole. becomes apparent *And this is precisely where what we call civil fascism* : not the overt terror of the state, but the subtle, socially accepted ostracism of the deviant. Not orders to shoot, but verbal commands. Not state terror, but social stigmatization. Civil fascism means the rule of moral labels. Those who disobey do not lose their freedom through imprisonment, but through exclusion from discourse and community.

Civil fascism functions through moral pillorying. There's no need for the police when the neighbors are already denouncing you. There's no need for censorship when editorial boards, talk shows, and social media mobs reliably publicly dismantle every critic. The message is: **Those who deviate lose their reputation, their job, and their circle of friends. That's precisely where power lies: not in violence, but in exclusion.**

Thus, every dissenting voice is declared a threat. Not to the state, but to the community. And who wants to be considered a threat to "society"? The pressure to obediently sing along is enormous. It's the same mechanism we saw in authoritarian regimes in the past, only today no one is arrested.

Instead, you're canceled, media-annihilated, and morally executed. The effect is the same: silence in the audience, conformity on stage. This is precisely what civil fascism is in the 21st century.

Left soft power = cognitive warfare

The whole thing isn't a coincidence, but a technique. Jonas Tögel calls it [cognitive warfare](#) : manipulation that targets the subconscious. Nudging, framing, moral cudgels. All methods that don't convince, but rather train. And the left uses these methods systematically. Why? Because without these tools, they often run out of arguments. Where facts aren't enough, the moral cudgel helps:

- Contradiction is not refuted but pathologized.
- Anyone who expresses criticism is declared a "threat."
- Anyone who doesn't join in the chorus of loyalism ends up on the list of suspects.

This strategy has long since taken on a life of its own. It's no longer just a rhetorical trick, but an entire political culture. A culture that relies less on dialogue than on discipline. Left-wing soft power is nothing more than training. The audience is supposed to react like Pavlov's dog: hear the signal, immediately obey morally.

It's important to understand: These methods don't target the intellect, but rather the gut feeling. Those who are constantly bombarded with buzzwords like "danger," "solidarity," "future," or "misanthropy" unconsciously begin to accept these frames as reality. This way, the population is not persuaded, but programmed.

The left has turned debate into a tribunal. It uses language like a weapon. Anyone who doesn't comply is branded. And anyone who dares to question the rules of the game immediately experiences the full force of the apparatus: first the stigma, then the exclusion. This is precisely how cognitive warfare works: quiet, subtle, but mercilessly effective.

The result: opinion training instead of debate

The population is no longer being enlightened, but rather educated. This is no longer journalistic discourse; it's social engineering. Telebasel is merely a symptom. Yet the apparatus functions the same way across Switzerland: **SRF, Blick, Tamedia (Tages-Anzeiger, Bund, Berner Zeitung, Basler Zeitung), and CH Media (Aargauer Zeitung, Luzerner Zeitung, St. Galler Tagblatt) use the same vocabulary, as if someone had sent out the memo.** Even the NZZ, which likes to portray itself as a liberal-conservative antithesis, adopts the prescribed framework at critical moments, only more elegantly packaged.

The irony: The very people who warn most loudly about "fascism" are the ones who practice it in its most subtle form. Not with boots and clubs, but with microphones and talk shows.

How could this happen?

The crucial question is: How did it come to this, that in Switzerland, precisely those who warn against fascism are themselves practicing it in a civilized way? The answer leads back to the ideological workshops of recent decades. A mix of the '68 cultural revolution, left-dominated universities, and globally funded NGOs has hijacked intellectual interpretive authority. There, they were trained in how to recode language, how to shift discourse, how to morally dismiss opponents. These cadres now sit in editorial offices, foundations, and party headquarters. And they use the same recipes: guilt by proximity, cancel culture, moral cudgels.

What we are experiencing is not a coincidence, but the result of a long-term march through the institutions. The left has succeeded in seizing the levers of soft power: from universities to NGOs to the studios of SRF. **There, the narratives are constructed that then condition the entire population.** It is an ecosystem in which politics, media, and activism mutually reinforce each other, and every dissenting voice is dispatched with the same weapon: moral exclusion.

Did no one notice?

Of course, many people noticed, but hardly anyone wanted to call it by its name. Some, especially politicians and journalists, didn't notice because they themselves had long since

become part of the apparatus. They mistook their progressive rhetoric for enlightenment and didn't realize they were just training people. Others were certainly aware of it but remained silent for fear of stigmatization: No one wants to be labeled a Nazi, a coronavirus denier, a climate denier, or an anti-Semite. The framing system creates a climate of fear and thus effective self-censorship.

While the general public instinctively senses that something is amiss, the constant barrage of language from SRF, Blick, Tamedia, and the like makes it difficult to clearly see the underlying mechanisms. The perfidious aspect of this is that the system disguises itself as "defending democracy." Anyone who criticizes it automatically appears as an enemy of democracy. This allowed civil fascism to grow without widespread resistance. **Because anyone who spoke up was immediately weeded out. Silence became the surest survival strategy.**

What can we do about it?

The crucial question is no longer simply: How does the framing work? But rather: How do we stop it? We can no longer allow this affluent, neglected caste to continue its course. A class of academics, officials, and media professionals who have never really had to achieve anything, yet presume to impose their indoctrinated ideologies on us. They talk about solidarity, but mean obedience. They talk about progress, but mean control.

The answer can no longer be simply "enlightenment." The apparatus laughs at this. A tougher response is needed: resistance through organization, through active counter-power, through the construction of our own structures. We must make the mechanisms visible, detoxify language, and regain the courage to speak the obvious, but no longer alone in private or on niche channels, but loudly, coordinated, and conspicuously.

Everyone can do their part: not swallow every frame, question concepts, dare to object, even if the club is immediately swung. But it's no longer enough to simply stand our ground. We must take the offensive, abandon self-censorship, and expose our opponents. Because silence is what makes civil fascism strong. But loud, mass dissent is what breaks it.

Concrete steps:

1. **Shaping our own terms** : Do not adopt the frames of the left, but establish our own language and thereby reclaim the sovereignty of interpretation.
2. **Strengthening the counter-public** : supporting alternative media, building our own platforms, disseminating information without filters.
3. **Practice contradiction** : In conversations, on podiums, on social media. Don't duck, but counter pointedly.
4. **Solidarity within** : Those under attack must not stand alone. Every campaign against critics must be met with immediate, broad opposition.

Only in this way can a counter-power emerge that is strong enough to break through the framing and reclaim dominance over language.

We need a fearless counter-public. Media that doesn't follow the same language. Citizens who won't allow themselves to be bullied. And a clear message to those who think they can

educate us: Your time is over. Democracy thrives not on curated ideas, but on free debate. Anyone who can't handle that has no place in public discourse.

And one thing must be clear: The supposed intellectual elite of the left is, in reality, often astonishingly bare. Slogans instead of substance, emotion instead of argument. Anyone who seriously contradicts them quickly realizes how thin the veil is. Therefore, it is our task to lift the curtain and show: The emperor is naked. As soon as the obvious is stated out loud, the entire spectacle collapses because it was never built on strength, but only on fear and silence.

And we call it by its name: civil fascism – nothing else.