



RAI DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-10-15_portaaporta_Regular_October_2025

Broadcast: RAI Programme | 2025-10-15 | Analysed on: 2026-05-24 10:55

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Riferimento: Contratto di servizio RAI Art. 7

OVERALL SCORE

6.9/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly unbalanced/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) classifies political parties on a left-right scale (0 = far left, 10 = far right). We use the Pew Research Center thresholds (2025): values <4.5 = Left, 4.5–5.5 = Centre, >5.5 = Right. This allows for an objective classification of the detected party bias.

Party	AVS	PD	M5S	Azione	NM	FI	Lega	Fdl
CHES	1.85	3.38	3.46	5.08	5.80	6.46	8.00	8.54
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Centre	Right	Right	Right	Right

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

7.1 / 10

Favourable to the right

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 provides political context and does not contribute to the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Italian government in office since 25 October 2022 is a centre-right coalition led by Giorgia Meloni (Fdi), composed of Fratelli d'Italia (the largest party with 119 seats in the Chamber), Lega (66 seats), Forza Italia (45 seats) and Noi Moderati (7 seats). The opposition is led by the Partito Democratico (69 seats), flanked by Movimento 5 Stelle (52 seats), Azione (21 seats), Alleanza Verdi Sinistra (12 seats), Italia Viva and +Europa.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Key position
AVS	2,30	12	Opposition	100% renewables, ius soli, LGBTQ+ rights
PD	3,40	69	Opposition (main)	Minimum wage, Green Deal, pro-EU
+Europa	3,80	2	Opposition	Pro-European integration, liberal-progressive
M5S	4,20	52	Opposition	Citizens' income, anti-corruption
Azione	4,90	21	Opposition	Liberal-reformist, centrist
Italia Viva	5,00	(in Az)	Opposition	Liberal-centrist
Noi Moderati	5,80	7	Government	Christian-democratic, moderate
Forza Italia	6,50	45	Government	Liberal-conservative, guarantism
Lega	8,10	66	Government	Sovereignism, flat tax, closed ports
Fdi	8,30	119	Government (PM)	Nation, traditional family, naval blockade

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has sharpened divisions between the government and the opposition: the Meloni coalition maintained a position of pragmatic support for the agreements mediated by Trump, while PD, M5S and AVS denounced Italian complicity in what they call a genocide. The issue of pro-Palestine demonstrations and violence in public squares has become a terrain of direct political confrontation, with the government accusing the opposition of fostering a climate of moral justification of violence. On the domestic front, tensions concern the justice reform, differentiated autonomy and the management of migration flows.

RAI is historically structured according to the principle of "lottizzazione", with RAI 1 traditionally close to the DC/FI, RAI 2 to the PSI and RAI 3 to the PCI/PD. Under the Meloni government, the TG1 directorship and the RAI Board of Directors were appointed with the influence of the governing coalition. The RAI Service Contract requires pluralism, completeness and impartiality of information, with a clear separation between news and commentary, pursuant to Article 6.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Representation in the broadcast vs. programmatic position
Fdi (Fratelli d'Italia)	+2	00:02:43 "Giorgia Meloni maintained the relationship with the United States that led to peace" — Programmatic position: pragmatic foreign policy, European sovereignism — partially correct, but presented in a laudatory manner without counterargument
PD (Partito Dem.)	-3	00:23:28 "Those in Parliament who are outside, and I am referring to Movimento 5 Stelle, Partito Democratico and Verdi Sinistra, have been saying for months that Italy is complicit in a genocide, stating a double falsehood" — Programmatic position: humanitarian corridors, integration, pro-EU — position distorted: reduced to a "lie" with no space for reply
M5S (Cinque Stelle)	-3	00:23:28 (same as above) — Programmatic position: regulation of migration flows, anti-corruption, transparency — grouped together with PD and AVS in an accusation of falsehood without counterargument
Lega	0	Not directly cited as a party — Programmatic position: closed ports, flat tax — absent
Forza Italia	0	Not directly cited as a party — Programmatic position: guarantism, pro-market — absent
AVS (Alleanza Verdi Sinistra)	-3	00:23:28 (same as above) — Programmatic position: solidarity-based reception, climate justice, anti-fascism — reduced to co-moral responsibility for street violence without reply

Summary of Party Bias

- Most accurate representation: Lega and FI (score 0 — absent, therefore not distorted)
- Strongest distortion: PD, M5S, AVS (score -3 each)
- Average deviation from 0: 1.5
- Conclusion: The broadcast devotes no space to representing the programmatic positions of the opposition. The only moment in which PD, M5S and AVS are mentioned is in a direct accusation formulated by Lucio Malan (Fdi), without any representative of those parties being present to reply. Fdi and the Meloni government are instead presented in a systematically positive manner through the uncontested statements of Malan and Senaldi.

Overall Left-Right Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -2.1

CLASSIFICATION: Favourable to the right

Rationale: The broadcast attributes credit for the Gaza truce to the Meloni government and Trump in an uncritical manner, while the opposition is cited exclusively as a source of "lies" and indirect moral responsibility for street violence. No centre-left guest is present to balance the positions expressed by Malan (Fdi) and Senaldi (deputy editor of Libero, a centre-right-oriented newspaper).



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: Porta a Porta
- Date (from file name): not specified in the text; internal content refers to events of January 2025 (Gaza truce, Italy-Israel match in Udine)
- Duration (estimated from transcript): approximately 87 minutes
- Host: Bruno Vespa
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Role	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Lucio Malan	FdI Senate group leader	FdI	Right (8.30)
Ettore Rosato	Deputy secretary of Azione, secretary of Copasir	Azione	Centre (4.90)
Pietro Senaldi	Deputy editor of Libero	None (journalist)	Centre-right
Peter Gomez	Editor of Il Fatto Quotidiano	None (journalist)	Centre-left
Federico Rampini	Journalist at Corriere della Sera (from New York)	None (journalist)	Liberal centre-right
Stefano Stefanini	Journalist at La Stampa	None (journalist)	Centre
Elisa Dossi	RAI News 24 journalist (injured in Udine)	RAI	Public service
Paolo Cirino Pomicino	Former DC parliamentarian	Former DC	Centre
Luciano De Carlis	President of the Italian Society for Organ Transplantation	None (physician)	N/A
Lorenzo Piemonti	Head of Regenerative Medicine, Ospedale San Raffaele Milano	None (physician)	N/A
Andrea Cusimano	Lecturer in Osteology, University of Boni / Cornell University	None (physician)	N/A
Jacopo Romagnoli	Head of kidney transplants, Centro di Medicina	None (physician)	N/A
Stefano Zecchi	Philosopher	None (academic)	Centre-right
Conchita Borrelli	Journalist (in studio)	RAI	Public service

Main Topic

The broadcast addresses three distinct subjects: the Gaza truce and its geopolitical implications; the street clashes in Udine during the Italy-Israel match; the topic of longevity, organ transplants and the dream of immortality of Putin and Xi Jinping.

Public Debate Context



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

The Gaza truce, mediated by Qatar, Egypt and the United States under the Trump presidency, has reopened the debate in Italy on the role of the Meloni government in Middle Eastern foreign policy and on the legitimacy of pro-Palestine demonstrations. The violence in Udine has fuelled the confrontation between those who attribute moral responsibility to the parliamentary opposition and those who draw a clear distinction between peaceful demonstrators and the violent fringe. The topic of longevity and transplants is treated in a popular-science manner, without a direct connection to the political debate, but included in the same broadcast with an entertainment logic.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hardfacts — 9 quantifiable and scientifically verifiable techniques

1. EXPERT SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Lucio Malan — Fdl Senate group leader

Timestamp: 00:01:55

Statement: "Hamas is explicitly isolated from the rest of the Arab world [...] this is very encouraging for the future."

Framing: Party politician from the governing party, not an expert in Middle Eastern geopolitics. Direct interest in presenting the truce as a success of the Meloni government.

Missing opposing voice: An independent geopolitical analyst or an opposition diplomat.

In-depth source verification:

(a) FUNDING: Parliamentarian paid by the Italian state, member of Fdl (governing party). Institutional interest in highlighting the government's work.

(b) MANDATE: The parliamentary mandate is incompatible with a neutral assessment of the foreign policy of one's own government.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions):

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Member of the governing party, direct interest in presenting the truce as a success

D2 Personal risk: -1 — No risk in aligning with the government narrative

D3 Competence: -1 — Politician, not an expert in Middle Eastern geopolitics

D4 Consistency of opinions: +1 — Position consistent with the Fdl line

D5 Emotionality vs. data: 0 — Mix of data and political assessments

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (political opinion)

• TOTAL: -3 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Presented as an authoritative voice without the political conflict of interest being made explicit. Technique no. 2 (source selection).

Expert 2: Federico Rampini — Journalist at Corriere della Sera (from New York)

Timestamp: 00:26:02

Statement: "what happened positively in recent days happened because there was a turning point on 21 June when Trump decided to bomb Iran."

Framing: Journalist with known editorial positions of an Atlanticist-conservative orientation. Not an expert in international law or Middle Eastern history in an academic sense.

Missing opposing voice: An analyst critical of Trump's policy in the Middle East.

In-depth source verification:

(a) FUNDING: Employee of Corriere della Sera (RCS MediaGroup, mixed private shareholding). No direct conflict of interest, but a recognisable editorial orientation.



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

(b) MANDATE: Journalist, not an academic. The mandate is compatible with the expression of opinions, but not with the function of a neutral expert.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — No direct conflict

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Expresses positions that are sometimes against the current in the Italian debate

D3 Competence: +1 — Journalist experienced in American affairs, but not a Middle East specialist

D4 Consistency of opinions: +2 — Consistent positions over time

D5 Emotionality vs. data: -1 — Assertive tone, limited recourse to primary sources

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source

• TOTAL: +3 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Presented as an authoritative geopolitical analyst without specific qualification of his field of competence.

Expert 3: Pietro Senaldi — Deputy editor of Libero*

Timestamp: 00:23:25

Statement: "Those in Parliament who are outside, and I am referring to Movimento 5 Stelle, Partito Democratico and Verdi Sinistra, have been saying for months that Italy is complicit in a genocide, stating a double falsehood."

Framing: Deputy editor of Libero, a centre-right-oriented newspaper. Editorial position structurally aligned with the Meloni government.

Missing opposing voice: A journalist from a centre-left outlet (e.g. La Repubblica, Il Manifesto).

In-depth source verification:

(a) FUNDING: Libero is a private newspaper with an explicit centre-right editorial orientation.

(b) MANDATE: Incompatible with a neutral assessment of the positions of the cited opposition.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Editorial orientation structurally opposed to the cited opposition

D2 Personal risk: -1 — No risk in attacking the opposition

D3 Competence: 0 — Experienced journalist, but not a Middle East specialist

D4 Consistency of opinions: +1 — Positions consistent with Libero's editorial line

D5 Emotionality vs. data: -2 — Assertion ("double falsehood") without factual support in the broadcast

D6 Source level: -1 — Tertiary source (opinion on others' opinions)

• TOTAL: -5 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Presented as an authoritative journalistic voice without Libero's editorial orientation being made explicit.

Missing expert groups:

- Expert in international humanitarian law
- Representative of a humanitarian organisation operating in Gaza
- Journalist from a centre-left outlet

Summary (matrix result per expert):

- Malan: YELLOW (-3) — politically compromised source, presented as authoritative
- Rampini: YELLOW (+3) — competent but non-specialist source, assertive tone
- Senaldi: RED (-5) — structurally partisan source, undocumented claims



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (fact-checking)

Definition: Which sources are cited? Are they diverse and independent?

Source 1: Wall Street Journal (cited in the longevity segment)

Timestamp: 01:07:24

Statement: "Shedding light on the investments is an analysis by the Wall Street Journal. Over the last 25 years, more than 12.5 billion dollars have been committed to the sector."

- (a) **Funding and ownership:** News Corp (Rupert Murdoch), conservative-liberal editorial orientation.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** None directly on the topic of longevity.
- (c) **Missing opposing source:** Critical analysis of longevity investments from an ethical or public health perspective.

Missing opposing source: Peer-reviewed academic studies on the topic.

Source 2: Trump's statements (cited indirectly)

Timestamp: 00:01:09

Statement: "Trump says, I decided that Hamas should do the policing at this moment."

- (a) **Funding:** Primary source (presidential statement), but cited without verification of the original context.
- (b) **Conflict of interest:** None directly, but the citation is used to legitimise the narrative of the truce as a "diplomatic triumph of Trump".
- (c) **Missing opposing source:** Critical analysis of Trump's decision to entrust policing functions to Hamas.

Verification of undocumented claims (penalties):

Undocumented claim 1:

Timestamp: 00:23:25

Claim: "has been saying for months that Italy is complicit in a genocide, stating a double falsehood"

Linguistic marker: assertive claim without citation of a primary source

Primary source present: no — penalty +1

Undocumented claim 2:

Timestamp: 00:26:39

Claim: "what happened positively in recent days happened because there was a turning point on 21 June when Trump decided to bomb Iran"

Linguistic marker: causal claim without source

Primary source present: no — penalty +1

Summary: The broadcast relies predominantly on guests' opinions without citation of verifiable primary sources. The most controversial claims (moral responsibility of the opposition, the decisive role of the bombing of Iran) are presented as facts without documentation.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time among the different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Bruno Vespa (host): approx. 12 min. (14%)
- Elisa Dossi (RAI News 24, testimony): approx. 10 min. (11%)
- Lucio Malan (Fdl — government): approx. 8 min. (9%)
- Federico Rampini (liberal centre-right): approx. 10 min. (11%)
- Pietro Senaldi (Libero — centre-right): approx. 7 min. (8%)
- Ettore Rosato (Azione — centrist opposition): approx. 8 min. (9%)
- Peter Gomez (Il Fatto Quotidiano — centre-left): approx. 4 min. (5%)
- Stefano Stefanini (La Stampa — centre): approx. 6 min. (7%)
- Medical experts (De Carlis, Piemonti, Cusimano, Romagnoli): approx. 15 min. (17%)
- Paolo Cirino Pomicino (former DC): approx. 5 min. (6%)
- Stefano Zecchi (philosopher): approx. 3 min. (3%)

Summary: Centre-right voices (Malan, Senaldi, Rampini) account for approximately 28% of speaking time in the political segment, compared to 14% for Rosato (centre) and 5% for Gomez (centre-left). No voice from PD, M5S or AVS is present. The distribution is structurally unbalanced in favour of government and centre-right positions.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What is not shown, despite being relevant?

Omission 1:

Context: No voice from the parliamentary opposition (PD, M5S, AVS) on the truce and the demonstrations.

Relevant at: 00:23:28 — Malan accuses PD, M5S and AVS of "double falsehood"

Effect: The accusation remains unchallenged, transforming a political opinion into an uncontested fact.

Omission 2:

Context: No data on the humanitarian situation in Gaza (civilian deaths, displaced persons, destruction of infrastructure).

Relevant at: 00:36:59 — Segment on the West Bank shows settler violence, but without aggregate data on the conflict.

Effect: The truce is presented as a positive event without contextualising the humanitarian toll of the conflict.

Omission 3:

Context: No mention of the International Criminal Court investigations into Netanyahu and the arrest warrants issued.

Relevant at: 00:43:02 — Rosato criticises Netanyahu but does not mention the ICC proceedings.

Effect: The discussion of Israeli responsibility remains incomplete and lacks any reference to international law.

Summary: The most significant omissions concern the voices of the opposition and the legal-humanitarian context of the conflict. These omissions are not incidental but structural: the broadcast is constructed in such a way as to present the truce as a success without any elements of counterargument.

Missing voices

- PD/M5S/AVS representative: Would have brought the parliamentary opposition's position on the truce and the demonstrations, allowing a counterargument to Malan's accusations.
- Expert in international law: Would have clarified the legal qualification of the conflict (genocide, war crimes) on a normative basis, not a political one.
- UNHCR or MSF representative: Would have provided updated data on the humanitarian situation in Gaza, absent from the broadcast.
- Sociologist specialising in social movements: Would have analysed the black bloc phenomenon and its structural distinction from peaceful movements.
- Critical Israeli voice (e.g. B'Tselem, Peace Now): Would have balanced the narrative on the West Bank with the perspective of Israeli civil society opposed to the settlers.
- European diplomat: Would have replied to Rampini's thesis that "Europe counts for nothing", bringing data on EU diplomatic pressure.
- Peaceful demonstrator from Udine: Would have distinguished their own position from that of the violent individuals, avoiding the implicit generalisation in the broadcast's narrative.
- Criminal lawyer: Would have analysed the legal implications of the arrests and individual responsibilities in the clashes.



5. DATA MANIPULATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:07:51

Data: "Hamis still has 25,000 militants"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value present; (b) proportion absent (relative to how many there were before the conflict?); (c) trend absent (increase or decrease compared to the start of the conflict?)

Missing context: Neither the source of the data nor a comparison with initial estimates is provided (30,000–40,000 militants were estimated in 2023).

Effect: The data is used to support the thesis that Hamas "won" militarily, without verification of the source or contextualisation.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:07:29

Data: "more than 12.5 billion dollars committed to the [longevity] sector over the last 25 years"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value present; (b) proportion absent (relative to total investment in medical research?); (c) trend absent (growth or stability?)

Missing context: No comparison with other sectors of medical research is provided to assess the relevance of the data.

Effect: The data appears impressive in absolute value but lacks comparative context.

Summary: Numerical data is used selectively, privileging the absolute value without proportion or trend. The data on Hamas militants is particularly problematic because it is used as a political argument without a verifiable source.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting by association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 00:23:25

Quote: "Those in Parliament who are outside, and I am referring to Movimento 5 Stelle, Partito Democratico and Verdi Sinistra, have been saying for months that Italy is complicit in a genocide, stating a double falsehood, in some way morally justifying it, because if there is an ongoing genocide and there is a genocide accomplice, something must be done."

Technique: Implicit causal chain: opposition's political position → moral justification of violence → street violence in Udine.

Effect: PD, M5S and AVS are implicitly associated with moral responsibility for the Udine clashes, without this causal link being demonstrated.

Association 2:

Timestamp: 00:26:02

Quote: "it is the European cultural climate [...] of a section of public opinion living in a state of collective hallucination"

Technique: Those who demonstrate for Palestine are associated with a "state of collective hallucination", implicitly equating them with the violent individuals.

Effect: Peaceful protest is delegitimised through a collective psychological diagnosis.

Association 3:

Timestamp: 00:26:02

Quote: "what strikes me [...] is the European cultural climate [...] What strikes me, apart from the violent individuals who existed in the 70s, who even had the P38, who shot to kill, but who had bad teachers with university chairs"

Technique: Contemporary demonstrators are associated with the terrorists of the 1970s through the reference to "bad teachers".

Effect: The pro-Palestine protest is inserted into a genealogy of Italian terrorism.

Chain of association: Parliamentary opposition → "double falsehood" → moral justification of violence → street violence → 1970s terrorism

Summary (category assignment with matrix rationale):

- PD/M5S/AVS: not classifiable as "conspiracy theorists", but implicitly associated with violence without causal evidence. The associative chain is constructed rhetorically, not demonstrated empirically.



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

Definition: Strategic placement of information (beginning/middle/end).

Finding 1:

Position: 00:23:25 (mid-broadcast, after the emotional testimony of Elisa Dossi)

Content: Malan's accusation against PD, M5S and AVS of "double falsehood" and moral responsibility for the violence.

Timing effect: The accusation is formulated immediately after the emotionally engaging testimony of the injured journalist, exploiting the audience's emotional peak to maximise the impact of the association between the opposition and violence.

Finding 2:

Position: 00:01:21 (opening of the broadcast)

Content: "since the absolute credit for having brought about this truce must be attributed to him without any shadow of doubt" (referring to Trump)

Timing effect: Credit for the truce is attributed to Trump in the very first line of the broadcast, before any analysis, setting the interpretive frame for the entire subsequent debate.

Summary: Timing is used strategically at two key moments: the opening (attribution of credit to Trump) and the post-emotional moment (accusation against the opposition). Both placements maximise the persuasive impact of the most controversial claims.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Definition: Outrage towards certain positions but not towards comparable ones.

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. A reaction can only be evaluated as selective if comparable events in other positions have not produced an analogous reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:23:25

Triggering event: Street violence in Udine during a pro-Palestine demonstration

Reaction: "These individuals instead want to continue the war [...] they are trying to bring it to Italy. Truly unacceptable because throwing stones means attempting to kill." (Malan)

Comparison: No analogous reaction of outrage towards the violence of Israeli settlers in the West Bank, documented in the segment at 00:37:48 ("They demolished my house and my neighbour's and in the last two years they have destroyed another 24 houses. [...] They beat my mother and sprayed something in my little sister's eyes.")

Asymmetry: The violence of the demonstrators in Udine generates explicit outrage and attribution of political responsibility; the violence of the settlers in the West Bank is documented but does not generate a comparable emotional reaction from the guests.

Degree of outrage: 4/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:26:16

Triggering event: Pro-Palestine demonstrations in Europe

Reaction: "a section of public opinion living in a state of collective hallucination" (Rampini)

Comparison: No analogous reaction towards supporters of Netanyahu's policies or towards those who supported the bombing of Iran.

Asymmetry: The outrage is directed exclusively towards pro-Palestine demonstrators, not towards comparable political positions on the opposite side.

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Summary: Outrage in the broadcast is structurally asymmetric: maximum towards the violence of pro-Palestine demonstrators and towards the positions of the parliamentary opposition, absent towards settler violence in the West Bank and towards Netanyahu's policies. This asymmetry is not incidental but reflects the dominant political frame of the broadcast.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — GENERAL FRAMEWORK

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: How completely does the broadcast represent the topic? Are relevant perspectives, facts or actors systematically omitted?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:23:28

Missing perspective/fact: Official position of PD, M5S and AVS on the truce and the demonstrations.

Relevance: Malan formulates a direct accusation against these parties; in the absence of a reply, the accusation effectively goes unchallenged.

Impact: The audience receives a distorted image of the opposition's positions, reduced to "lies" with no possibility of verification.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:44:00 (approximately)

Missing perspective/fact: International Criminal Court arrest warrants against Netanyahu and Gallant (issued in November 2024).

Relevance: The discussion of Israeli responsibility and Netanyahu's political future is incomplete without this element.

Impact: The broadcast discusses Netanyahu's political future without mentioning the ongoing international criminal proceedings.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:13:43 (Udine segment)

Missing perspective/fact: No interview with peaceful demonstrators among the 9,000 people present.

Relevance: The segment documents the violence of the fringe (approximately 100 people) but gives no voice to the peaceful majority.

Impact: The visual and verbal narrative tends to conflate the violent fringe with the entire demonstration.

Summary: The broadcast presents systematic gaps that are not incidental: the omissions always concern voices critical of the government, of Israel or of the broadcast's dominant narrative. This constitutes a structural selective omission.

End of Hardfacts — Beginning of Softfacts

Share of perspectives covered

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

- [A] Position of the parliamentary opposition (PD, M5S, AVS) on the truce and the demonstrations
- [B] Voice of a representative of the Palestinian community in Italy
- [C] Legal analysis of the criminal responsibility of the violent individuals vs. freedom of demonstration
- [D] Position of humanitarian organisations (UNHCR, Oxfam, MSF) on the situation in Gaza
- [E] Voice of an expert in international law on the legal qualification of the conflict
- [F] Critical Israeli perspective towards Netanyahu and the settlers (e.g. Peace Now, B'Tselem)
- [G] Sociological analysis of the black bloc phenomenon and its distinction from peaceful movements
- [H] Position of an expert in medical ethics on transplants and longevity



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

[I] Voice of a law enforcement officer injured in Udine

[J] Analysis of Europe's role in mediating the conflict (critical perspective towards the thesis "Europe counts for nothing")

[A] OMITTED

No representative of PD, M5S or AVS is present. The only reference to their positions is the accusation formulated by Malan at 00:23:28: "has been saying for months that Italy is complicit in a genocide, stating a double falsehood." Assessment: structural omission that prevents counterargument.

[B] OMITTED

No voice from the Palestinian community in Italy. The Udine segment cites slogans ("Free Palestine") but does not interview any peaceful demonstrator. Assessment: omission that impoverishes the understanding of the motivations of the 9,000 demonstrators.

[C] PRESENT

00:24:18 — "these are criminal offences" (Rosato). Treated superficially, without in-depth legal analysis. Assessment: touched upon but not developed.

[D] OMITTED

No reference to international humanitarian organisations. Assessment: relevant omission in a broadcast that discusses the humanitarian situation in Gaza.

[E] OMITTED

No expert in international law. The legal qualification of the conflict (genocide yes/no) is treated as a political question, not a legal one. Assessment: omission that leaves a central question of the debate unresolved.

[F] PRESENT

00:43:02 — Rosato: "the Netanyahu government, which I criticise very strongly because it has made incredible mistakes." Treated partially, without structured critical Israeli voices. Assessment: touched upon but not developed with primary sources.

[G] PRESENT

00:28:29 — Stefanini: "a group of violent individuals who insert themselves into a peaceful demonstration." Treated, but with a prevalence of the narrative of the opposition's moral responsibility. Assessment: partially treated.

[H] PRESENT

01:09:11 — Zecchi speaks of his personal experience with his sister's organ donation. Treated emotionally, not with systematic ethical analysis. Assessment: touched upon.

[I] TREATED

00:16:00 — Elisa Dossi describes in detail her own injuries and those of her colleague and the carabinieri. Assessment: treated with ample space.

[J] TREATED

00:27:32 — Stefanini: "Very little [has Europe counted]." Treated, but in a one-sided manner, without an opposing voice. Assessment: treated partially.

Completeness Score: 4/10

The broadcast adequately covers the government perspective and that of law enforcement, but systematically omits the voices of the parliamentary opposition, the Palestinian community, humanitarian organisations and experts in international law. The debate on the truce is conducted almost exclusively by voices favourable to the narrative of the Meloni government and Trump.

1. Italian Society for Organ Transplantation (SITO) — represented by Luciano De Carlis

1. FUNDING: Private scientific society, funded by membership fees and contributions from pharmaceutical and biomedical companies in the transplant sector.

2. MANDATE: Compatible with a neutral assessment of scientific progress in the field of transplants; not compatible with a neutral assessment of health policies concerning the funding of the sector.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Institutional interest in promoting organ donation and highlighting the sector's progress. No direct conflict on the topics addressed in the broadcast.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX: D1 Conflict of interest: 0 / D2 Personal risk: +1 / D3 Competence: +2 (sector specialist) / D4 Consistency: +2 / D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 / D6 Source level: +2 (primary source in own field) → TOTAL: +8 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

5. OPPOSING VOICE: Not necessary for the scientific content addressed; would be useful for the ethical and health policy implications.

Präsident: Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adresse:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

2. Ospedale San Raffaele di Milano — represented by Lorenzo Piemonti

1. FUNDING: Private foundation (Fondazione Centro San Raffaele), with public (SSN) and private funding. Catholic orientation.
2. MANDATE: Compatible with a neutral assessment of medical research; the confessional orientation could influence positions on ethical issues (end of life, experimentation on embryos).
3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Institutional interest in highlighting research in regenerative medicine. No direct conflict on the topics addressed.
4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX: D1: 0 / D2: +1 / D3: +2 / D4: +2 / D5: +1 / D6: +2 → TOTAL: +8 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
5. OPPOSING VOICE: A secular bioethicist could have balanced the ethical implications of regenerative medicine.

3. Wall Street Journal (cited in the longevity segment)

1. FUNDING: News Corp (Rupert Murdoch), private shareholding, conservative-liberal editorial orientation.
 2. MANDATE: Economic-financial journalism; compatible with analysis of investments in the longevity sector.
 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: No direct conflict on the topic of longevity; possible orientation favourable to private investment in research.
 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX: D1: 0 / D2: +1 / D3: +1 / D4: +1 / D5: +1 / D6: +1 (secondary source citing its own data) → TOTAL: +5 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
 5. OPPOSING VOICE: A critical analysis of longevity investments from a public health or ethical perspective would have balanced the narrative.
- IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not an objective qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be verified.



Softfacts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How is the topic fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:01:21

Quote: "since the absolute credit for having brought about this truce must be attributed to him without any shadow of doubt"

Manipulation: The truce is framed as a "diplomatic triumph of Trump" from the very opening, before any critical analysis.

Why problematic: The "absolute credit" frame excludes a priori any discussion of the role of Qatar, Egypt, the UN and the pressure of international civil society. The host himself uses this formulation, not a guest.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:23:25

Quote: "Yes, evidently they are unhappy about the peace. They wanted, they would have wanted the war to continue."

Manipulation: Pro-Palestine demonstrators are framed as "in favour of war", reversing their stated position (immediate ceasefire).

Why problematic: It attributes to the demonstrators an intention opposite to the one they declared, without evidence. It is a frame inversion that transforms those calling for peace into those who want war.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:26:23

Quote: "a section of public opinion living in a state of collective hallucination, deluding itself that the European square counts for something in the Middle East, when it counts for nothing"

Manipulation: Political dissent is framed as a cognitive pathology ("collective hallucination"), not as a legitimate position.

Why problematic: It delegitimises dissent through a collective psychological diagnosis, removing it from rational debate.

Summary: The dominant framing of the broadcast is built on three axes: Trump/Meloni as architects of peace, the opposition as a source of lies and violence, demonstrators as irrational subjects. This frame is established in the opening lines and maintained consistently throughout the political segment.



11. WORD AND TERM CHOICE

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What language is used? What connotations are created?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:23:25

Quote: "double falsehood"

Manipulation: Defining the opposition's position on genocide as a "double falsehood" is a value judgement presented as a fact.

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "a position that the government contests" or "an assessment that other experts do not share". "Falsehood" implies intentional lying, not mere interpretive disagreement.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:26:23

Quote: "collective hallucination"

Manipulation: Clinical-psychiatric term applied to a political position.

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "an assessment I do not share" or "a perspective I consider mistaken". "Hallucination" pathologises dissent.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:30:47

Quote: "the political vacuum of the opposition which, not knowing what to do, having nothing else to cling to, clings to the victims of Gaza to find its own identity and its own political glue"

Manipulation: The opposition's positions on Gaza are reduced to electoral instrumentalisation ("political glue"), denying the possibility of a genuine ethical position.

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "the opposition has chosen to make Gaza a central theme of its own agenda". The formulation used implies cynicism and opportunism without evidence.

Summary: The broadcast's lexicon is systematically asymmetric: neutral or positive terms for government positions, pathologising or morally degrading terms for the positions of the opposition and demonstrators.



12. HOST BEHAVIOUR

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Asymmetries in follow-up questions, interruptions, expressions of sympathy.

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. An intervention can only be evaluated as asymmetric if comparable events with other guests have not produced an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:23:52

Triggering event: Malan accuses PD, M5S and AVS of "double falsehood" and moral responsibility for the violence.

Quote (host): "I would be cautious in attributing responsibility to Westerners." (Rosato)

Comparison: Vespa does not intervene to ask Malan to document the claim about the "double falsehood"; he intervenes instead when Rosato attempts to moderate the accusation.

Asymmetry: The host does not ask Malan for evidence of his claim, but allows Rosato to be interrupted in his attempt to balance the discourse.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:01:21

Triggering event: Opening of the broadcast on the Gaza truce.

Quote (host): "since the absolute credit for having brought about this truce must be attributed to him without any shadow of doubt"

Comparison: The host never uses analogously laudatory formulations for positions of the opposition or for actors critical of the government.

Asymmetry: The host himself adopts the "absolute credit" frame of Trump, not as a citation of a guest but as his own assessment.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:19:50

Triggering event: Elisa Dossi describes the uncertainty about who threw the stones at the journalists.

Quote (host): "Sorry Lisa, but did these demonstrators realise that you were in the line of fire of their stones?"

Comparison: The host does not pose analogously critical questions towards government positions or towards settler violence in the West Bank.

Asymmetry: The question steers the answer towards the thesis of the intentionality of the violence against journalists, without analogous pressure being applied to other topics.

Summary: The host does not maintain the neutrality required by the RAI Service Contract. He adopts the government frame in the opening, does not ask for documentation of the most controversial claims by centre-right guests, and steers questions in a way that reinforces the broadcast's dominant narrative.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Questions of different degrees of hardness/softness to different people.

Asymmetry 1:

To Malan, 00:01:55: "So, Malan." — [open question, no pressure]

To Rosato, 00:23:52: [no direct question; Rosato intervenes spontaneously to moderate Malan's accusation]

Comparison: Malan receives an open question that allows him to freely develop his own narrative; no guest is critically questioned on government positions.

Asymmetry 2:

To Senaldi (after the accusation against the opposition), 00:23:25: no verification question

To Elisa Dossi, 00:19:50: "Sorry Lisa, but did these demonstrators realise that you were in the line of fire of their stones?" — [question oriented towards the thesis of intentionality]

Comparison: Critical questions are directed exclusively towards the demonstrators (through Dossi), not towards the guests who formulate accusations against the opposition.

Summary: The host's questions are structurally asymmetric: open and non-critical towards centre-right guests, oriented and pressing towards topics concerning pro-Palestine demonstrators. No critical question is directed at government positions.



14. FALSE BALANCE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance despite a real imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:28:29

Construct: "a group of violent individuals who insert themselves into a peaceful demonstration, whose usefulness, whose intentions one may or may not agree with, but which exercises a known right of expression and freedom." (Stefanini)

Analysis: Stefanini introduces a distinction between peaceful and violent demonstrators, which might appear balanced. However, this distinction is immediately followed by: "The impression is that the violent individuals care very little about Palestine, Israel, the Gazans." The false balance consists in formally acknowledging the right to demonstrate and then emptying it of political content.

Summary: The broadcast occasionally uses the distinction between peaceful and violent demonstrators as a formal concession to balance, but the overall narrative tends to conflate the two categories through the frame of the opposition's moral responsibility.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What is taken for granted/normal? What does not enter the agenda?

Finding 1:

Established agenda item: The Gaza truce is a success of Trump and Meloni.

Timestamp: 00:01:21 — Evidence: "since the absolute credit for having brought about this truce must be attributed to him without any shadow of doubt"

Alternative agenda: The role of Qatar, Egypt, the UN and the pressure of international civil society; the humanitarian cost of the conflict that made the truce necessary.

Finding 2:

Established agenda item: Pro-Palestine demonstrations are a public order problem and a matter of moral responsibility of the opposition.

Timestamp: 00:23:25 — Evidence: "Those in Parliament [...] have been saying for months that Italy is complicit in a genocide, stating a double falsehood, in some way morally justifying it"

Alternative agenda: The demonstrations as an expression of legitimate political dissent; the distinction between the violent fringe and the peaceful movement; the political causes of the mobilisation.

Summary: The broadcast's agenda-setting is constructed in such a way as to make the government narrative appear natural and obvious, while critical perspectives do not even enter as hypotheses to be discussed. This is the deepest level of manipulation: not the distortion of facts, but the definition of which facts are relevant.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of Individual Scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	7	Three out of four guests in the political segment have a centre-right orientation; no independent expert in Middle Eastern geopolitics.
2	Source selection	H	7	Controversial claims presented without primary sources; two undocumented claims with penalties.
3	Time distribution	H	6	Centre-right voices account for 28% of political time compared to 5% for the centre-left.
4	Omissions	H	8	Structural absence of parliamentary opposition voices and humanitarian data on the conflict.
5	Data manipulation	H	4	Data used without proportion or trend; Hamas militant figure without a verifiable source.
6	Guilt by association	H	8	Implicit associative chain: opposition → moral justification → violence → 1970s terrorism.
7	Timing	H	6	Accusation against the opposition placed strategically after the emotional peak of Dossi's testimony.
8	Selective outrage	H	7	Maximum outrage for violence in Udine, absent for settler violence in the West Bank.
9	Completeness	H	8	Systematic omissions of ICC warrants, opposition positions, humanitarian data.
10	Framing	S	8	Frame "Trump/Meloni as architects of peace vs. opposition as source of violence" established in the opening and maintained.
11	Word choice	S	7	Pathologising lexicon ("collective hallucination", "double falsehood") for opposition positions.
12	Host behaviour	S	7	Host adopts the government frame in the opening; does not ask for documentation of the most serious accusations.
13	Question asymmetry	S	7	Open questions to centre-right guests, oriented questions on critical topics towards the demonstrators.
14	False balance	S	5	Formal distinction between peaceful and violent demonstrators emptied by the narrative of moral responsibility.
15	Agenda-Setting	S	8	The government narrative is presented as obvious; critical perspectives do not enter the agenda.

Results

- HARDFACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 6.8 / 10
- SOFTFACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 7.0 / 10



- OVERALL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 6.9 / 10

Dominant Techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Guilt by Association (Score 8):** The associative chain between the positions of the parliamentary opposition and street violence is explicitly constructed by Malan and is not challenged by the host. The connection is not demonstrated causally but is presented as obvious, exploiting the emotional context of Dossi's testimony.
- 2. Framing (Score 8):** The frame "Trump/Meloni as architects of peace vs. opposition as source of lies and violence" is established in the opening lines by the host himself ("absolute credit") and maintained consistently throughout the political segment. No guest challenges it structurally.
- 3. Omissions (Score 8):** The absence of any voice from the parliamentary opposition, of experts in international law and of humanitarian data on the conflict is not incidental but structural. The omissions systematically concern perspectives critical of the government narrative.

Key Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT): "The Gaza truce is a success of Trump and Meloni; those who criticised Israeli policy lied and contributed to the violence."

Technique: Framing + Guilt by Association — Evidence: 00:01:21, 00:23:25

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Those who demonstrate for Palestine are irrational, instrumentalised by the opposition or directly violent."

Technique: Word choice + Agenda-Setting — Evidence: 00:26:23, 00:30:47

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL): "Italy, thanks to the Meloni government, plays a positive and pragmatic role in international politics, unlike the opposition which fuels divisions."

Technique: Expert selection + Time distribution — Evidence: 00:02:43, 00:32:10

Classification of the Degree of Manipulation

Rationale: The broadcast presents a systematic imbalance that manifests itself on multiple levels simultaneously: selection of guests (no voice from the parliamentary opposition), framing (government narrative as obvious), lexicon (pathologisation of dissent), timing (accusations placed after emotional peaks) and structural omissions (ICC warrants, humanitarian data, PD/M5S/AVS positions). This is not the result of individual questionable editorial choices, but of a coherent pattern that constitutes a violation of the principle of impartiality enshrined in Article 6 of the RAI Service Contract. The overall score of 6.9/10 places the broadcast in the range of systematic imbalance.

CONCLUSION

The episode of Porta a Porta analysed presents a systematic imbalance that violates the principles of pluralism, completeness and impartiality of information enshrined in Article 6 of the RAI Service Contract. The broadcast attributes credit for the Gaza truce exclusively to Trump and Meloni from the very opening, without counterargument; accuses PD, M5S and AVS of "double falsehood" and moral responsibility for street violence without any representative of those parties being present to reply; and uses a systematically asymmetric lexicon that pathologises dissent ("collective hallucination") while presenting government positions as pragmatic and rational. The host does not maintain the neutrality required by the public service, personally adopting the government frame and not asking for documentation of the most controversial claims. The absence of experts in international law, humanitarian voices and representatives of the parliamentary opposition is not incidental but constitutes a structural selective omission that significantly alters the public's perception of the reality of the conflict and of the Italian political debate.



OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
2	SOURCE SELECTION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
5	DATA MANIPULATION	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
7	TIMING	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — GENERAL FRAMEWORK	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
10	FRAMING	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
11	WORD AND TERM CHOICE	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
12	HOST BEHAVIOUR	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
14	FALSE BALANCE	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
15	AGENDA-SETTING	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>

HARDFACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.8/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

SOFTFACTS SCORE (9-14)

7.0/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

6.9/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



LEGEND — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant anomaly detected.
1–2	Weak finding	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
3–4	Slight-to-moderate finding	Recognisable tendency; impact relevance from low to moderate.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance that influences the audience's opinion-forming potential.
6	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores equal to or greater than 6 are classified as "significant findings".
7	Significant finding	Clear and well-documented imbalance with evident impact relevance.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple individual findings documented under this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic and pervasive imbalance under this criterion.

Aggregate deviation index — Interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	No anomaly	No significant pattern detected; the broadcast respects the principle of balance.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but still within the tolerance margin.
4.1 – 6.0	Considerable imbalance	Multiple significant findings; relevant compromise of the plurality of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation	Pronounced and cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Maximum systemic partiality. Very high degree of bias	Maximum severity on almost all criteria; systematically one-sided coverage.

Political-party bias (from -5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	The party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime or presentation.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Recognisable but slight disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No detectable favouritism or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Recognisable but slight favouritism.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	The party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL FRAMEWORK (Service Contract Art. 6)

Assessment pursuant to RAI Service Contract Art. 6

The RAI Service Contract requires pluralism, completeness and impartiality of information, as well as separation between news and commentary.

Violation 1:

Norm: Service Contract Art. 6 — Pluralism of information

Facts: Total absence of representatives of the parliamentary opposition (PD, M5S, AVS) in a broadcast that discusses foreign policy and public order topics directly connected to their political positions.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:23:28 — "Those in Parliament who are outside, and I am referring to Movimento 5 Stelle, Partito Democratico and Verdi Sinistra, have been saying for months that Italy is complicit in a genocide, stating a double falsehood"

Assessment: The direct accusation against three opposition parties, formulated by a member of the governing party without the possibility of reply, violates the principle of pluralism. The public service cannot host political accusations without counterargument.

Violation 2:

Norm: Service Contract Art. 6 — Impartiality and separation between news and commentary

Facts: Host Bruno Vespa personally formulates a value judgement ("absolute credit") on a controversial political event, without distinguishing between news and commentary.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:01:21 — "since the absolute credit for having brought about this truce must be attributed to him without any shadow of doubt"

Assessment: A public service host cannot attribute "absolute credit" to a foreign political leader (Trump) at the opening of a broadcast without this assessment being balanced by alternative perspectives. This constitutes a violation of the principle of impartiality.

Violation 3:

Norm: Service Contract Art. 6 — Completeness of information

Facts: Systematic omission of information relevant to understanding the conflict: ICC arrest warrants against Netanyahu, humanitarian data on Gaza, the role of Qatar and Egypt in the mediation.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:43:02 — Discussion of Netanyahu's political future without any reference to the ICC arrest warrants issued in November 2024.

Assessment: The completeness of information required by the Service Contract implies that legally relevant and widely known facts cannot be omitted in a discussion that directly concerns them.

Violation 4:

Norm: Service Contract Art. 6 — Pluralism and impartiality

Facts: Use of pathologising language ("collective hallucination") by a guest to describe legitimate political positions, without the host intervening to restore a neutral register.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:26:23 — "a section of public opinion living in a state of collective hallucination"

Assessment: The host of a public service has a duty to intervene when the debate slides towards the delegitimation of dissent through collective psychological diagnoses. The absence of intervention constitutes editorial responsibility.

Overall Assessment of Service Contract Art. 6

The broadcast analysed presents multiple and concurrent violations of Article 6 of the RAI Service Contract. The violations are not episodic but structural: they concern the composition of the panel (absence of the opposition), the



host's behaviour (adoption of the government frame), the selection of content (systematic omissions) and the linguistic register (pathologisation of dissent). Taken together, these violations constitute a broadcast that does not respect the principles of pluralism, completeness and impartiality of information that the public service is required to guarantee pursuant to the Service Contract. In the context of formal proceedings, these elements would constitute a documented basis for a complaint to AGCOM pursuant to the current rules on par condicio and the obligation of informational pluralism.

IN-DEPTH SOURCE VERIFICATION (Mandatory for all specialist instances / NGOs / advisory centres cited)

1. Italian Society for Organ Transplantation (SITO) — represented by Luciano De Carlis

- 1. FUNDING:** Private scientific society, funded by membership fees and contributions from pharmaceutical and biomedical companies in the transplant sector.
- 2. MANDATE:** Compatible with a neutral assessment of scientific progress in the field of transplants; not compatible with a neutral assessment of health policies concerning the funding of the sector.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in promoting organ donation and highlighting the sector's progress. No direct conflict on the topics addressed in the broadcast.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of interest: 0 / D2 Personal risk: +1 / D3 Competence: +2 (sector specialist) / D4 Consistency: +2 / D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 / D6 Source level: +2 (primary source in own field) → TOTAL: +8 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
- 5. OPPOSING VOICE:** Not necessary for the scientific content addressed; would be useful for the ethical and health policy implications.

2. Ospedale San Raffaele di Milano — represented by Lorenzo Piemonti

- 1. FUNDING:** Private foundation (Fondazione Centro San Raffaele), with public (SSN) and private funding. Catholic orientation.
- 2. MANDATE:** Compatible with a neutral assessment of medical research; the confessional orientation could influence positions on ethical issues (end of life, experimentation on embryos).
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in highlighting research in regenerative medicine. No direct conflict on the topics addressed.
 - D1 Interessenkonflikt: 0
 - D2 Persönliches Risiko: +1
 - D3 Fachkompetenz: +2
 - D4 Meinungskonsistenz: +2
 - D5 Emotionalisierung vs. Daten: +1
 - D6 Quellenstufe: +2
- 5. OPPOSING VOICE:** A secular bioethicist could have balanced the ethical implications of regenerative medicine.

3. Wall Street Journal (cited in the longevity segment)

- 1. FUNDING:** News Corp (Rupert Murdoch), private shareholding, conservative-liberal editorial orientation.
- 2. MANDATE:** Economic-financial journalism; compatible with analysis of investments in the longevity sector.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** No direct conflict on the topic of longevity; possible orientation favourable to private investment in research.
 - D1 Interessenkonflikt: 0
 - D2 Persönliches Risiko: +1
 - D3 Fachkompetenz: +1
 - D4 Meinungskonsistenz: +1
 - D5 Emotionalisierung vs. Daten: +1
 - D6 Quellenstufe: +1
- 5. OPPOSING VOICE:** A critical analysis of longevity investments from a public health or ethical perspective would have balanced the narrative.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not an objective qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be verified.

Source credibility traffic light:

Präsident: Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adresse:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Ospedale San Raffaele di Milano — represented by Lorenzo Piemonti	0	+1	+2	+2	+1	+2	?	GREEN
Wall Street Journal (cited in the longevity segment)	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	?	GREEN

Legal and methodological framework

Not a determination of facts	The findings presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.
Not a legal judgement	The aggregate deviation index does not replace a legal assessment pursuant to RAI Service Contract Art. 7. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements falls exclusively within the competence of the relevant authorities (in particular AGCOM).
Not proof of causality	Statistical correlations must not be interpreted as proof of causal links or editorial intentions. Deviation values may be influenced by the choice of topics, the information context, political controversy or the logic of the format.
Not a judgement on intentionality	The analysis measures the observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a significant imbalance has been detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motivations or strategic objectives.
Heuristic comparison tool	The index serves the comparative recognition of patterns across thousands of broadcasts, not the precise metric measurement of individual segments. The threshold values serve as heuristic guidance, not as precise legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Italy — RAI

Laws

- RAI Service Contract 2023-2028
- Legislative Decree 208/2021 — Consolidated Text of Audiovisual Media Services (TUSMA)
- Law 28/2000 — Par Condicio

Relevant articles

RAI Service Contract 2023-2028

- Art. 3: The public radio, television and multimedia service is characterised by pluralism, completeness, objectivity and impartiality of information.
- Art. 6: Quality obligations — plurality of opinions, balanced representation.
- Art. 25: Separation between information and opinion.

Legislative Decree 208/2021 (TUSMA)

- Art. 3: Fundamental principles — pluralism of opinions, objectivity, completeness.
- Art. 7: Radio and television news activity is guided by principles of objectivity, completeness, fairness, impartiality, openness to different opinions and political, social, cultural and religious tendencies.

Law 28/2000 (Par Condicio)

- Art. 2: Equal access to information media during electoral campaigns.
- Art. 3: Equal treatment of all political subjects in information.
- Art. 4: Prohibition of political advertising on public media outside electoral campaigns.

RAI Code of Ethics (2017)

Impartiality, fact-checking, separation of news/commentary.

European reference framework

- ECHR Art. 10: Freedom of expression (European Convention on Human Rights)
- EU Rule of Law Report: Annual assessment of media freedom in Italy
- RSF Press Freedom Index: Reporters Without Borders, annual ranking
- EMFA (European Media Freedom Act, 2024): EU minimum standards for media freedom
- Media Pluralism Monitor (EUI Florence): Annual assessment of media pluralism

Structural context

"Lottizzazione" — the historical division of RAI channels according to criteria of party proportionality — continues to influence the structural independence of RAI to this day. The formal legal framework (Service Contract, TUSMA) is correct, but practical implementation is influenced by politics.

Supervisory authorities

- AGCOM (Authority for Communications Guarantees): Media regulation, sanctions
- Parliamentary RAI Supervisory Commission: Parliamentary oversight

Complaint procedure

1. RAI internal complaints office
2. AGCOM



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

3. Regional Administrative Court (TAR)



ANNEX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

Bibliography

- 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 – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 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). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- 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 Information | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | www.svfab.ch | kontakt@svfab.ch | *Methodological 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

Assessments and membership of SVFAB

On SVFAB.ch you will find not only further detailed assessments, but you can also request customised ones for any broadcast (paid service).

To make our work robust, we depend on the contributions of members and supporters.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 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 or kontakt@svfab.ch



Unbalanced information is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: the manipulation techniques are illustrated in detail here, starting from the selection of personnel and sources. 15 principles are then illustrated: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, decontextualisation and many others, with numerous examples. You also discover where we ourselves apply these techniques — which promotes not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book includes **playing cards**

Also available as an **audiobook**



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

Those who do not know this provide material. Good quotes cut badly. Correct statements in the wrong context. Sincere answers 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 them and want to know what to do. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three fundamental principles of sovereignty — anchor, reframe, delimit. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when something goes 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. To stop being subjected to it — and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, consultation, follow-up and in difficult moments



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. What we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry manual. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You do not just learn how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how to use it consciously and correctly.

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



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

With numerous exercises and concrete examples from politics, the media and everyday life — and a smile here and there.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



RAI receives more than 1.7 billion euros per year from the compulsory licence fee. Those who feel they have been treated unfairly can file a complaint. There is even a dedicated authority: AGCOM, the Authority for Communications Guarantees.

Except that: it is not entirely independent. It has limited sanctioning powers. And in most cases the outcome is uncertain.

This analysis lays bare the system — objectively, with precision, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, competences, costs, statistics, legal avenues. And the legal examination that demonstrates the structural shortcomings of public media oversight. The body that should protect citizens protects above all the system it is supposed to oversee.

Essential reading for anyone considering a complaint — and for all those who want to understand why genuine media oversight in Italy remains yet to be built.