



## RAI DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-04-25\_tg1\_TG1\_April\_25\_\_Liberation\_Day\_

Broadcast: RAI Programme | 2026-04-25 | Analysed on: 2026-05-24 11:14

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**4.9/10**

*Considerable imbalance*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/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 partisan bias.

Party	AVS	PD	M5S	Azione	NM	FI	Lega	Fdi
CHES	1.85	3.38	3.46	5.08	5.80	6.46	8.00	8.54
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

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 the average favouritism of left-wing vs. right-wing parties (grouping according to CHES 2024).

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**5.8 / 10**

*Balanced*

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



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Italian government in office since October 2022 is led by Prime Minister Giorgia Meloni (Fdl) and is based on a centre-right coalition composed of Fratelli d'Italia (119 seats), Lega (66 seats), Forza Italia (45 seats) and Noi Moderati (7 seats). The opposition is led by the Partito Democratico (69 seats) as the main opposition force, 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, ecological transition, pro-EU
+Europa	3,80	2	Opposition	Strongly pro-European, liberal-progressive
M5S	4,20	52	Opposition	Citizens' income, anti-corruption, public healthcare
Azione	4,90	21	Opposition	Liberal-reformist, centre
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, pro-EU Atlanticist
Lega	8,10	66	Government	Sovereignist, flat tax, differentiated autonomy
Fdl	8,30	119	Government (PM)	National-conservative, naval blockade, made in Italy

The main lines of political conflict in Italy concern: the management of migration flows (naval blockade and repatriations by the governing coalition vs. regulated reception by the opposition); fiscal reform (government flat tax vs. progressive taxation by the opposition); differentiated autonomy (supported by Lega, contested by PD and M5S as a North-South dividing factor); and the international positioning with regard to the war in Ukraine and relations with Trump's USA. April 25 represents every year a symbolic fault line between those who claim anti-fascism as a founding value and those who, like Fdl, tend towards a more "reconciliatory" reading of the anniversary.

RAI is the Italian public broadcasting service, subject to the Service Contract with the Ministry of Economy, which in Art. 6 imposes pluralism, completeness and impartiality of information as well as separation between news and commentary. Historically characterised by partisan "lottizzazione" (RAI 1 DC/FI area, RAI 2 PSI area, RAI 3 PCI/PD area), under the Meloni government the TG1 editorial leadership and the Board of Directors appear oriented towards the governing coalition. AGCOM, formally independent, is subject to politically influenced appointments.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTISAN BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Representation in the broadcast vs. programmatic position
Fdl (Fratelli d'Italia)	+2	03:54 "We remember the defeat of the fascist oppression that denied Italians freedom and democracy" — Programmatic position: Fdl supports a "reconciliatory" reading of April 25, not explicitly anti-fascist — represented favourably, with emphasis on national cohesion consistent with the government narrative; Fdl's critical position towards the demonstrations ("anti-democratic left-wing celebration") cited only indirectly at 07:58
PD (Partito Dem.)	+1	08:52 "Ensuring that the rights enshrined in our wonderful Constitution born from the resistance truly reach all citizens" — Programmatic position: PD strongly pro-resistance, minimum wage, welfare — position correctly represented but without in-depth coverage of specific programmatic content (wages, healthcare)
M5S	0	09:15 "Conte condemns the anti-Semitic insults in Milan and the attack in Rome" — Programmatic position: M5S on anti-corruption, citizens' income, public healthcare — reduced to a mere condemnation of violence, no programmatic position addressed; party not featured in the broadcast
Lega	+1	08:03 "Lega with Salvini, unacceptable words about the Jewish Brigade, then lashes out. PD should reflect on its fellow travellers" — Programmatic position: Lega on closed ports, flat tax, autonomy — position on the Jewish Brigade consistent with the security line, but no programmatic in-depth coverage; selective quotation
Forza Italia	+1	08:21 "Tajani pays homage at the Fosse Ardeatine. Then condemns the serious incidents" — Programmatic position: FI on guarantism, liberalism, pro-EU — partial representation, only a condemnation statement; no programmatic content
AVS (Alleanza Verdi)	+1	09:21 "In Milan, Greens and Left, the shots in Rome are a serious matter, says Fratoianni. Investigators should identify those responsible. April 25 is not an anniversary... but a day of struggle and political battle" — Programmatic position: AVS on anti-fascism, renewables, ius soli — the anti-fascist position is correctly represented; no further programmatic content

### Summary of Partisan Bias

- Most accurate representation: Fdl (Score +2) — the government narrative of "national cohesion" is presented without critical counterpoint
- Greatest distortion: M5S (Score 0) — reduced to a mere condemnation statement, no programmatic position addressed
- Average deviation from 0: 1.0
- Conclusion: The broadcast privileges the statements of governing forces (Meloni, La Russa, Fontana, Tajani) with greater airtime and a neutral-to-positive tone, while opposition forces are cited mainly in relation to the condemnation of violent incidents. No programmatic position of any party is explored in depth; the news bulletin format reduces everything to perfunctory statements.

### Overall Left-Right Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -0.8

CLASSIFICATION: Slightly favourable to the right



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

Rationale: The broadcast devotes ample space to institutional government statements (Meloni, La Russa, Fontana) with a neutral-celebratory tone, while the violent incidents at the marches — predominantly attributable to the left-wing area (insults to the Jewish Brigade, pepper spray against Ukrainian flags) — receive detailed and repeated coverage. Meloni's narrative on April 25 as a "moment of national cohesion" is presented without counterpoint, while FdI's critical position towards the demonstrations is mentioned only marginally. The Lebanon report includes an emotionally charged pro-Palestinian testimony without Israeli balance, an element that partially attenuates the overall rightward tendency.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Data

- Title: TG1 — Evening edition
- Date (from file name): 25 April 2025 (Liberation Day)
- Presenter / Journalists: Laura (main presenter, full name not cited in the transcript); Sonia Sarno (institutional correspondent); Carlo Maremiele (demonstrations report); Fenice Calluso (Rome/Milan tensions report); Mario De Pizzo (political statements report); Marco Vallecchia (USA correspondent); Giuseppe Rizzo (Iran report); Sergio Pains (Iran correspondent); Leonardo Zellino (Strait of Hormuz correspondent); Giovanni Battista Brunori (Gaza/West Bank correspondent); Matteo Albiti (Lebanon correspondent); Enrico Baona (Chernobyl correspondent); Giuseppe Lavegna (football/Rocchi report); Gianvito Cafaro (Molise/ricin report); Claudia Antinoro (Orlandi report); Rosa Vitarelli (minors app report); Giovanna Savini (influencer report); Elena Bigiogerio (tourism report); Caterina Proietti (Frankie Hi NRG report)

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Sergio Mattarella	President of the Republic	Independent (former PD)	Institutional centre-left
Giorgia Meloni	Prime Minister	Fdl	Right
Ignazio La Russa	President of the Senate	Fdl	Right
Lorenzo Fontana	President of the Chamber	Lega	Right
Antonio Tajani	Deputy Prime Minister / FI	FI	Centre-right
Matteo Salvini	Deputy Prime Minister / Lega	Lega	Right
Elly Schlein	PD Secretary	PD	Centre-left
Giuseppe Conte	M5S President	M5S	Centre-left
Nicola Fratoianni	AVS Secretary	AVS	Left
Matteo Renzi	IV President	IV	Centre
Emanuele Fiano	PD representative / Jewish Brigade	PD	Centre-left
Undersecretary Alessio Butti	Undersecretary for Innovation	Fdl	Right
Minister Abodi	Minister of Sport	Independent/Gov.	Centre-right
Minister Piantedosi	Minister of the Interior	Independent/Gov.	Centre-right
Sempio defence lawyer	Legal counsel	None	N/A
Director of analysis centre (Molise)	Scientific expert	None	N/A
President of the Orlandi Commission	Member of Parliament	Not specified	N/A
Frankie Hi NRG	Rap artist	None	N/A



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

## Main Topic

---

The TG1 of 25 April 2025 covers the Liberation Day celebrations, the violent incidents at the marches (Jewish Brigade in Milan, air gun shots in Rome, pepper spray against Ukrainian flags), political statements, and a series of international news items (Iran/Hormuz, Gaza, Lebanon, Chernobyl) and domestic news (football/Rocchi, Garlasco case, Molise poisoning, Orlandi disappearance, minors app, influencers, tourism).

## Public Debate Context

---

April 25 is the most politically divisive date in the Italian calendar: the left claims it as the celebration of anti-fascism and partisan resistance, while the right — in particular FdI with its roots in the post-fascist MSI — has historically had an ambivalent relationship with this anniversary, oscillating between boycott, "reconciliatory" reinterpretation and institutional participation. In 2025 the tension is heightened by the exclusion of the Jewish Brigade from the Milan march by pro-Palestine groups, an episode that generated a national debate on left-wing anti-Semitism and the "ownership" of the celebration. The presence of burned Ukrainian flags and attacks on those carrying them adds a dimension linked to the war in Ukraine and the divisions within the progressive camp. The Meloni government has an interest in presenting itself as the guarantor of national unity, while the opposition defends the anti-fascist character of the anniversary.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hardfacts — 9 quantifiable and scientifically verifiable techniques

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: Who speaks as an expert?*

Expert 1: Director of the toxicological analysis centre (Molise/ricin case)

Time: 28:57

Statement: "We know that there is a poison that is a high dose and that can be a lethal dose, that yes. But whether it was a single intake, two intakes, that is impossible for us to know."

Framing: Anonymous scientific expert (name not cited in the transcript), director of an unidentified analysis centre

Missing opposing voice: An independent forensic toxicologist could have contextualised the rarity of ricin and the investigative implications

In-depth source verification:

**(a) FUNDING:** Not specified in the transcript — unidentified analysis centre; impossible to verify whether public, private or university-based

**(b) MANDATE:** Compatible with neutral assessment as a technical-scientific expert on a specific case

**(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions, from -2 to +2):**

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No evident conflict, but anonymity prevents full verification

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public statement on an ongoing criminal case entails a certain risk

D3 Technical expertise: +2 — Director of an analysis centre, expertise consistent with the subject of the statement

D4 Consistency of opinions: 0 — Impossible to verify previous statements

D5 Emotionality vs. data: +2 — Strictly technical statement, with explicit acknowledgement of the limits of knowledge

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source (direct analysis), but anonymous

TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** The source is appropriately presented as a neutral expert given the technical content of the statement.

Expert 2: President of the Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry (Orlandi case)

Time: 30:32

Statement: "In relation to this lead it is now in a position to approve a document that will have to answer the question about the actual relevance of this lead."

Framing: Member of Parliament (party not specified), president of a commission of inquiry

Missing opposing voice: An independent cold case expert or an investigative journalist could have assessed the solidity of the "white slave trade" lead

In-depth source verification:

**(a) FUNDING:** Parliamentary institution — public funding

**(b) MANDATE:** Potential conflict: the commission has an institutional interest in demonstrating the relevance of its work



**(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**

- D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Institutional interest in valorising the commission's work
- D2 Personal risk: 0 — Routine institutional statement
- D3 Technical expertise: +1 — Procedural competence, not necessarily investigative
- D4 Consistency of opinions: 0 — Not verifiable
- D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 — Procedural statement, not emotional
- D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (commission evaluating others' documents)

TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** The source is presented as a neutral institutional authority, but the institutional conflict of interest is not flagged.

Expert 3: Sempio defence lawyer (Garlasco case)

Time: 27:07

Statement: "As of today I would say that we are confident about everything that the preliminary investigative requests that have come out so far and the evidence that has crystallised in the evidentiary hearing."

Framing: Partisan legal counsel, structurally non-neutral

Missing opposing voice: The Pavia prosecutor's office or an independent forensic expert

In-depth source verification:

**(a) FUNDING:** Private — paid by the Sempio defence

**(b) MANDATE:** Structurally incompatible with neutral assessment — explicit mandate to defend the client

**(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Total structural conflict: is paid to defend Sempio
- D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public statements on a media case entail reputational risk
- D3 Technical expertise: +2 — Legal expertise in their own field
- D4 Consistency of opinions: -1 — Position consistent with the defence mandate, not with the search for truth
- D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 — Technical-legal statement
- D6 Source level: -1 — Partisan source, not primary

TOTAL: 0 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** The source is presented as the defence voice, which is correct, but is not balanced by a voice from the prosecution or independent forensic experts.

*Missing expert groups:*

- Historians of the Resistance and of April 25
- ANPI representatives
- International law experts for the Iran/Gaza/Lebanon reports

*Summary (matrix result as structured list):*

- Director of toxicological analysis centre: GREEN TRAFFIC LIGHT (+7) — appropriate technical source
- President of the Orlandi Commission: YELLOW TRAFFIC LIGHT (+1) — institutional conflict not flagged
- Sempio defence lawyer: YELLOW TRAFFIC LIGHT (0) — partisan source, correctly presented as such but without balance



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Statements without primary source = penalty points (claim verification)

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

Source 1: Ministry of Tourism (April 25 tourism data)

Time: 34:12

Statement: "A weekend that together with the May 1st one aligns, according to data from the Ministry of Tourism, with 2025, with the average price 7% lower and an online occupancy rate equal to or higher."

**(a) Funding and structure:** Government ministry — public funding, dependent on the Meloni government

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** The Ministry of Tourism has an institutional interest in presenting positive tourism data, consistent with the government narrative of "attractive Italy"

**(c) Missing opposing source:** Data from Federturismo or Confturismo (independent industry associations) could have confirmed or refuted the ministerial data

Missing opposing source: Eurostat or ISTAT data for international comparison

Source 2: Undersecretary Alessio Butti (minors age verification app)

Time: 31:17

Statement: "A technologically cutting-edge solution, underlines the Undersecretary for Innovation Alessio Butti."

**(a) Funding:** Government institution — Undersecretary Fdi

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Butti is the political official responsible for the project he is promoting — total conflict of interest

**(c) Missing opposing source:** Privacy experts (Data Protection Authority), digital rights associations, cybersecurity experts

Source 3: Al Arabiya (news on possible return of Arakci to Islamabad)

Time: 13:13

Statement: "but according to Al Arabiya the head of Iranian diplomacy could return to Islamabad as early as tomorrow."

**(a) Funding:** Al Arabiya is a Saudi television channel — funded by the Saudi Arabian government, a country in geopolitical conflict with Iran

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Structurally hostile source towards Iran, cited for news about Iran without disclosure of the conflict of interest

**(c) Missing opposing source:** Press TV (Iranian, with the opposite conflict), Reuters, AFP for verified news

Verification of undocumented claims (penalties):

Undocumented claim 1:

Time: 10:16

Statement: "There are very strong internal power struggles, too much confusion in the so-called leadership, in inverted commas, he added, of Tehran."

Linguistic marker: "so-called in inverted commas" — attribution to Trump without independent verification

Primary source available: No — partisan statement not verified by an independent source — penalty +1

Undocumented claim 2:

Time: 38:18

Statement: "according to sources, the new investigation has not revealed elements placing Alberto Stasi at the crime scene"



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

Linguistic marker: "according to sources" — unidentified anonymous source

Primary source available: No — penalty +1

*Summary: The broadcast predominantly uses Italian government sources (Ministry of Tourism, Undersecretary Butti) without disclosing conflicts of interest; the Al Arabiya source for Iran news is not identified as Saudi; two significant statements are based on anonymous or unverified sources.*



### 3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: Distribution of speaking time among different positions.*

Estimated speaking time:

- Mattarella (President of the Republic): approx. 2 min. (5.5%)
- Meloni and government (direct and indirect statements): approx. 3 min. (8.2%)
- Opposition (PD, M5S, AVS, IV): approx. 2 min. (5.5%)
- International reports (Iran, Gaza, Lebanon, Chernobyl): approx. 10 min. (27.4%)
- Domestic news (football, Garlasco, Molise, Orlandi): approx. 8 min. (21.9%)
- Lifestyle reports (influencers, tourism, music): approx. 5 min. (13.7%)
- Presenter/moderation: approx. 6 min. (16.4%)
- Citizens' voices at the marches: approx. 1.5 min. (4.1%)

*Summary: The government and institutions receive approximately twice the speaking time compared to the opposition; the voices of demonstrators at the marches (1.5 min.) are markedly lower than institutional political statements; ANPI and partisan organisations receive no speaking time.*



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*Definition: What is not shown despite being relevant?*

Omission 1:

Context: No voice from ANPI (Associazione Nazionale Partigiani d'Italia)

Relevant at: 04:19 (demonstrations report) and 05:38 (tensions)

Effect: The organisation that organises the main April 25 demonstrations is never consulted, depriving the viewer of the perspective of the direct organisers on the violent incidents and the management of the marches.

Omission 2:

Context: No historical contextualisation of the Jewish Brigade in the Italian resistance

Relevant at: 06:54 — "The Jewish Brigade was made to leave the march"

Effect: The viewer does not know that the Jewish Brigade has a direct history in the partisan struggle against Nazi-fascism, which makes the symbolic gravity of the episode incomprehensible and favours a superficial reading of what happened.

Omission 3:

Context: No voice from organised Jewish communities (UCEI — Union of Italian Jewish Communities)

Relevant at: 07:14 — Fiano's statement

Effect: The institutional voice of the Italian Jewish community is replaced by that of a PD representative (Fiano), which politicises the issue and omits the independent community perspective.

*Summary: The most significant omissions systematically concern the voices of organised civil society (ANPI, UCEI) and the historical context necessary to understand the violent incidents; these omissions produce a narrative that privileges institutional political statements at the expense of historical and civic understanding.*

#### Missing Voices

- ANPI (Associazione Nazionale Partigiani d'Italia): Would have provided the position of partisan organisations on the violent incidents and the management of the demonstrations
- Representatives of the Italian Jewish Communities (UCEI): Would have offered the institutional perspective of the Jewish community on anti-Semitism at the marches and on the meaning of April 25
- Historians of the Resistance: Would have contextualised the role of the Jewish Brigade in the Italian resistance and the historical significance of the anniversary
- Organisers of the Milan march: Would have explained the organisational decisions and the security measures adopted
- Representatives of pro-Palestine groups: Would have provided their version of events regarding the Jewish Brigade episode
- Victims of the air gun shots in Rome: Would have given direct voice to the people hit
- Constitutional law experts: Would have explored the constitutional significance of April 25 and the debate on its political "ownership"
- Representatives of +Europa and Radicali Italiani: Would have directly recounted the attack they suffered with the Ukrainian flags



## 5. DATA MANIPULATION

3/10

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:

Time: 34:31

Data: "Over 6 million Italians travelling this weekend, almost 7.5 million expected for the early May bridge. 92% will remain in Italy, average per capita spending 512 euros."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — shown ✓; (b) Share — partially shown (92% in Italy) ✓; (c) Trend — absent X

Missing context: No comparison with previous years (2024, 2023) or with the European average is provided; it is unknown whether the figure is growing, stable or declining compared to the previous year

Effect: The figure appears positive in absolute terms but without a trend it is impossible to assess whether it represents an improvement or a deterioration; the source is the Ministry of Tourism (see Criterion 2).

Finding 2:

Time: 16:00

Data: "in the West Bank 53% of eligible voters voted... in the Gaza Strip only the municipality of Deir al-Balak voted, 22% of eligible voters"

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — shown ✓; (b) Share — shown ✓; (c) Trend — absent X

Missing context: No comparison with previous elections (2006) or with the average turnout under normal conditions is provided; the 22% in a war zone could be interpreted either as low or as surprisingly high

Effect: The figure is presented as "low" without comparative contextualisation.

*Summary: Data manipulation is limited but present; the most relevant case concerns tourism data presented without a time trend and with a government source not identified as such.*



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: Discrediting by association with negative groups/ideas.*

Association 1:

Time: 07:49

Quote: "Surreal choices at the marches from which Ukrainian citizens were expelled. When will it stop being an anti-democratic left-wing celebration, attacks Fratelli d'Italia."

**Technique:** Fdl's statement defining April 25 as an "anti-democratic left-wing celebration" is reported without counterpoint, implicitly associating the April 25 demonstrations with the violent incidents

Effect: The viewer may associate the entire demonstration (hundreds of thousands of people) with the violent incidents committed by a minority

Association 2:

Time: 08:03

Quote: "Lega with Salvini, unacceptable words about the Jewish Brigade, then lashes out. PD should reflect on its fellow travellers."

**Technique:** The expression "fellow travellers" associates PD with the groups that insulted the Jewish Brigade, without this association being verified or challenged

Effect: PD is implicitly linked to anti-Semitism at the marches through Salvini's statement, reported without counterpoint

Association 3:

Time: 07:29

Quote: "The education minister had a cardboard effigy hung upside down with the image of the education minister and the inscription Valditara to the gallows."

**Technique:** The Naples episode (Valditara effigy) is juxtaposed with the violent incidents in Rome and Milan, creating an association between left-wing demonstrators and violence/threats

Effect: Episodes of a different nature (physical violence vs. symbolic provocation) are presented in sequence as part of a single phenomenon of violence at the marches

*Summary (category assignment with matrix rationale):*

- Fdl statement on "anti-democratic celebration": reported without counterpoint — unverified association
- Salvini statement on "PD's fellow travellers": reported without counterpoint — unverified association
- Juxtaposition of Naples/Rome/Milan episodes: episodes of a different nature presented as homogeneous



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

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

**Finding 1:**

Position: 00:00 (opening of the summary)

Content: "Mattarella, the April 25 celebrations, love of country, from the resistance to the invocation of peace, freedom and justice have no borders, no to indifference."

Temporal effect: The opening with Mattarella and the values of the resistance imposes an institutional-celebratory frame that precedes any critical element; the viewer is predisposed to a positive reading of the anniversary before learning of the violent incidents.

**Finding 2:**

Position: 00:27 (summary, second element)

Content: "Meloni, we remember the defeat of fascist oppression, Schlein, from nationalisms poisoned fruits, unanimous condemnation for incidents, violence at the marches."

Temporal effect: In the summary, Meloni and Schlein are presented in sequence as equivalents, with the "unanimous condemnation" closing the block — this creates a frame of political unity that pre-emptively attenuates the divisions that will be shown in the report.

**Finding 3:**

Position: 05:38 (after the positive reports on the demonstrations)

Content: "There were moments of tension during the demonstrations."

Temporal effect: The violent incidents are presented after approximately 90 seconds of positive images of the marches (flags, songs, participation), which attenuates the impact of the negative episodes but at the same time places them in a context of predominantly peaceful demonstrations — an ambivalent editorial choice.

*Summary: The temporal structure privileges an institutional-celebratory opening that predisposes the viewer to a positive reading of the anniversary; the violent incidents are inserted after the positive images, with an attenuating effect that can be read either as correct contextualisation or as minimisation.*



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

5/10

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 it is necessary to document the triggering event. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable events in other positions have not produced an analogous reaction.*

### Finding 1:

Time: 05:57 — 07:20

Triggering event: Anti-Semitic insults to the Jewish Brigade in Milan ("missed soap bars"), exclusion from the march, pepper spray against Ukrainian flags

Reaction: Detailed report (approx. 2 min.), statements by Fiano, intervention of the police chief, phone call from Piantedosi and the head of police, condemnation statements from all parties

Comparison: Roman salutes in Varese (far right), 05:57 — "In Varese controversy over Roman salutes by a far-right group" — a single sentence, no dedicated report, no specific political statements

Asymmetry: Episodes attributable to the left-wing area (insults to the Jewish Brigade, pepper spray) receive approximately 10 times more space than the far-right episode (Roman salutes in Varese); both are episodes of violence or political provocation

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 4/5

### Finding 2:

Time: 07:29

Triggering event: Valditara effigy hung upside down in Naples

Reaction: Citation in the report on tensions, juxtaposed with episodes of physical violence

Comparison: No comparable episode of symbolic provocation by right-wing groups is cited in the broadcast

Asymmetry: The left-wing symbolic provocation (Valditara effigy) is inserted in the "tensions" block together with episodes of physical violence, while no comparable episodes of right-wing provocation are cited

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 3/5

*Summary: The broadcast shows a clear asymmetry in the coverage of violent and provocative incidents: episodes attributable to the left-wing area receive detailed coverage and multiple political statements, while the far-right episode (Roman salutes in Varese) is dismissed in a single sentence without further coverage.*



## 9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — GENERAL FRAMEWORK

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: How completely does the broadcast represent the topic?*

Finding 1:

Time: 04:19 — 05:57

Missing perspective/fact: The historical and political significance of April 25 as the celebration of constitutional anti-fascism

Relevance: April 25 is the date on which Italy celebrates the end of the Nazi-fascist occupation and the birth of the democratic Republic; this historical context is essential for understanding the violent incidents at the marches

Impact: Without this context, the violent incidents appear as mere street disorder rather than political conflicts with deep historical roots

Finding 2:

Time: 06:54

Missing perspective/fact: The history of the Jewish Brigade in the Italian resistance

Relevance: The Jewish Brigade fought against Nazi-fascism in the Second World War; its exclusion from an April 25 march has a historical and symbolic significance that the broadcast does not explain

Impact: The viewer does not understand why the episode is particularly serious and symbolically significant

Finding 3:

Time: 18:01 — 20:35

Missing perspective/fact: The Israeli position on the "buffer zone" in southern Lebanon

Relevance: The Lebanon report presents exclusively the perspective of Lebanese victims (fishermen, displaced families) without any Israeli voice or contextualisation of the security reasons put forward by Israel

Impact: The report produces a one-sided picture of the Israeli-Lebanese conflict, presenting Israel exclusively as an aggressor without explaining the context of Hezbollah attacks

*Summary: The most serious omissions concern the historical context of April 25 and the Jewish Brigade, and the lack of balance in the Lebanon report; these omissions systematically produce an incomplete picture that favours certain political interpretations.*

*Share of perspectives covered*

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

[A] Fdl's historical position with respect to April 25 and its evolution

[B] The significance of anti-fascism as a constitutional value vs. the "reconciliatory" reading

**[C] The context of the exclusion of the Jewish Brigade:** who are the pro-Pal groups responsible, what is their political affiliation

[D] The position of Italian Jewish communities on April 25 and on anti-Semitism at the marches

[E] The debate on the war in Ukraine within the Italian left and the division between pacifists and supporters of Kyiv

[F] The history of the Jewish Brigade in the Italian resistance

[G] The reactions of partisan associations (ANPI) to the violent incidents

**[H] The international context:** how other European countries commemorate the end of Nazi-fascism

[I] The positions of the victims of the air gun shots in Rome



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

[J] The role of law enforcement in the management of the demonstrations

**[A] MENTIONED**

Time: 03:54 — Quote: "We remember the defeat of the fascist oppression that denied Italians freedom and democracy" — Assessment: Meloni's statement is reported without contextualising FdI's history with respect to April 25, making the perspective incomplete.

**[B] COVERED**

Time: 02:02 — Quote: "The past has shaped the present, that is why for the Republic the commitment holds that now and always resistance" — Assessment: Mattarella's speech addresses the topic, but the government's "reconciliatory" perspective is not critically compared with the anti-fascist one.

**[C] MENTIONED**

Time: 06:30 — Quote: "some far-left militants who sprayed pepper spray" — Assessment: The groups responsible are generically identified as "far left" and "Propal" without further political or organisational contextualisation.

**[D] MENTIONED**

Time: 07:14 — Quote: "They shouted at us, you are only missed soap bars, denounces Emanuele Fiano" — Assessment: The voice of the Jewish community is present through Fiano (PD), but not through representatives of organised Jewish communities.

**[E] MENTIONED**

Time: 06:27 — Quote: "A group of +Europa and Radicali Italiani who were waving Ukrainian flags was approached by some far-left militants" — Assessment: The internal conflict within the left on the war in Ukraine is implicit but not explored in depth.

**[F] OMITTED**

Time: N/A — Quote: N/A — Assessment: The history of the Jewish Brigade in the Italian resistance is never mentioned, depriving the viewer of the essential historical context for understanding the gravity of the episode.

**[G] OMITTED**

Time: N/A — Quote: N/A — Assessment: ANPI, the main partisan association, is never cited or consulted, despite being the main organiser of the April 25 demonstrations.

**[H] OMITTED**

Time: N/A — Quote: N/A — Assessment: No reference to how other European countries commemorate the end of Nazi-fascism, a perspective that would have enriched the context.

**[I] MENTIONED**

Time: 06:03 — Quote: "Husband and wife, scarf of the Associazione Nazionale Partigiani around their necks. A man on a scooter with a full-face helmet fired towards them" — Assessment: The victims are described but not directly interviewed.

**[J] COVERED**

Time: 07:05 — Quote: "The members of the Jewish Brigade were then received by the Milan police chief. The minister Piantedosi and the head of police Pisani intervened by phone at the meeting" — Assessment: The role of law enforcement is mentioned, but only in its institutional-governmental dimension.

### Completeness Score: 4/10

**Rationale:** The broadcast systematically omits the voices of partisan organisations (ANPI), the organised Jewish community, and does not provide the historical context of the Jewish Brigade in the resistance. The perspectives covered are predominantly institutional and governmental. The violent incidents receive detailed coverage but without the necessary in-depth examination of the underlying causes and political contexts.

**1. Ministry of Tourism (April 25 tourism data)**

1. FUNDING: Government ministry — public funding, dependent on the Meloni government (FdI)
2. MANDATE: Incompatible with neutral assessment on topics concerning the government's performance in tourism
3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Direct institutional interest in presenting positive tourism data as a result of government policies
4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX: D1 Conflict of interest: -2 / D2 Personal risk: 0 / D3 Technical expertise: +2 / D4 Consistency: 0 / D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 / D6 Source level: +1 → TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
5. OPPOSING VOICE: Federturismo, Confturismo, ISTAT — none cited

**2. Department for Innovation / PagoPA (age verification app)**

1. FUNDING: Government institution — public funding, under the supervision of Undersecretary Butti (FdI)

**Präsident:** Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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. MANDATE: Incompatible with neutral assessment — it is the body that developed the system being promoted

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Total conflict — promotes its own product

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX: D1 Conflict of interest: -2 / D2 Personal risk: 0 / D3 Technical expertise: +2 / D4 Consistency: 0 / D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 / D6 Source level: +1 → TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

5. OPPOSING VOICE: Data Protection Authority, digital rights associations — none cited

**3. Al Arabiya (news on Iran)**

1. FUNDING: Saudi television channel — funded by the Saudi Arabian government

2. MANDATE: Incompatible with neutral assessment on news concerning Iran, a country in geopolitical conflict with Saudi Arabia

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Structural conflict — Saudi source on Iranian news

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX: D1 Conflict of interest: -2 / D2 Personal risk: 0 / D3 Technical expertise: +1 / D4 Consistency: -1 / D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 / D6 Source level: 0 → TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

5. OPPOSING VOICE: Reuters, AFP, IRNA (with the opposite conflict) — none cited as an alternative source

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



## Softfacts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: How is the topic fundamentally framed?*

Finding 1:

Time: 03:20

Quote: "So, the highest offices of the State and Prime Minister Meloni have commemorated April 25 emphasising the importance of this day."

Manipulation: The presenter equates "the highest offices of the State" (Mattarella, La Russa, Fontana — institutional offices) with "Prime Minister Meloni" (political government office), presenting the government as part of the neutral institutional framework

Why problematic: This equation obscures the distinction between State institutions (President of the Republic, Presidents of the Chambers) and the political government, attributing to Meloni an aura of institutional neutrality that does not belong to her as a party leader

Finding 2:

Time: 07:42

Quote: "Unanimous condemnation from the political world for the violent incidents."

Manipulation: The "unanimous condemnation" frame creates an appearance of political unity that obscures the deep divisions over the meaning of April 25 and the responsibilities for the violent incidents

Why problematic: The "unanimous condemnation" is presented as the main fact, while the real political divisions (Fdl calling April 25 an "anti-democratic left-wing celebration", Salvini attacking PD) are relegated to secondary details

Finding 3:

Time: 04:36

Quote: "Among red flags and banners of peace, but also of Palestine and civil rights, young and old to reaffirm the meaning of the liberation celebration."

Manipulation: The mention of "Palestinian flags" in the context of the April 25 demonstrations, even before the violent incidents are described, implicitly prepares the link between pro-Palestinian presence and subsequent tensions

Why problematic: The frame pre-emptively associates the Palestinian presence with the tensions, even though the majority of demonstrators with Palestinian flags did not participate in the violent incidents

*Summary: The dominant framing of the broadcast is that of "institutional cohesion" (Mattarella + government = unity) contrasted with "disorder at the marches" (left = violence), a frame that favours the government narrative and penalises the opposition forces.*



## 11. WORD AND TERM CHOICE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Time: 07:49

Quote: "When will it stop being an anti-democratic left-wing celebration, attacks Fratelli d'Italia."

Manipulation: The verb "attacks" is neutral-descriptive, but FdI's statement ("anti-democratic left-wing celebration") is reported without counterpoint and without the presenter or a journalist contextualising it as a partisan position

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would have been: "according to Fratelli d'Italia" or "FdI maintains that"; the lack of contextualisation leaves the definition hanging as if it were a fact

Finding 2:

Time: 10:58

Quote: "There are very strong internal power struggles, too much confusion in the so-called leadership, in inverted commas, of Tehran."

Manipulation: The expression "so-called in inverted commas" applied to the "leadership of Tehran" is a citation of Trump reported without critical distance; the term "so-called" delegitimises the Iranian leadership

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "the Iranian leadership, as Trump calls it" — the current formulation incorporates Trump's judgement into the journalist's language

Finding 3:

Time: 17:46

Quote: "The Islamist movement that intends to destroy Israel, but is heavily weakened by the war"

Manipulation: The definition of Hamas as "the Islamist movement that intends to destroy Israel" is technically correct (it is in Hamas's charter) but is used as the primary identifier without an equivalent for Israel (e.g. "state that occupies Palestinian territories according to international law")

Why problematic: The definitional asymmetry creates a frame in which Hamas is identified by its most extreme position while Israel does not receive an equivalent label based on its most controversial actions

*Summary: The choice of words shows systematic asymmetries: right-wing positions (FdI, Trump) are reported with neutral-descriptive language without critical distance, while left-wing actions (violence at the marches) and Hamas receive more loaded labels.*



## 12. MODERATOR BEHAVIOUR

3/10

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 it is necessary to document the triggering event. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable events with other guests have not produced an analogous intervention.*

Finding 1:

Time: 09:52

Triggering event: Correspondent Marco Vallecchia reports Trump's position on Iran

Quote (presenter): "Marco, tell us what happened."

Comparison: Same neutral formula used with all correspondents (Sergio Painsi at 12:18, Leonardo Zellino at 13:26, Giovanni Battista Brunori at 15:33, Matteo Albiti at 18:05, Enrico Baona at 20:54)

Asymmetry: Not detectable — the presenter uses uniform opening formulas with all correspondents

Finding 2:

Time: 20:54

Triggering event: Link with the correspondent at Chernobyl after technical problems

Quote (presenter): "So Enrico, we are with you, we have seen the report you made. Tell us live."

Comparison: Identical formula used with other correspondents

Asymmetry: Not detectable in the presenter's behaviour; the technical problem (repetition of "yes yes" for approximately 90 seconds) is not managed with an editorial intervention

Finding 3:

Time: 03:20

Triggering event: Transition from Mattarella's speech to Meloni's statements

Quote (presenter): "So, the highest offices of the State and Prime Minister Meloni have commemorated April 25 emphasising the importance of this day."

Comparison: No opposition leader receives an equivalent presentation with the formula "the highest offices of the State and [opposition leader]"

Asymmetry: Partially detectable — Meloni is equated with the institutional offices in a way that is not replicated for opposition leaders; however this reflects the institutional structure (Meloni is Prime Minister) more than a deliberate editorial bias

*Summary: The presenter's behaviour is predominantly uniform towards the different interlocutors; the most relevant asymmetry is in the presentation of Meloni as part of the institutional framework, but this partly reflects her actual institutional position.*



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

#### Asymmetry 1:

To correspondent Marco Vallecchia (USA/Iran), 09:52: "Marco, tell us what happened." — neutral/open

To correspondent Sergio Paini (Iran), 12:18: "What reactions are coming in?" — neutral/open

To correspondent Leonardo Zellino (Hormuz), 13:26: "So, Leonardo, we are with you." — neutral/open

Comparison: All questions to correspondents are open and non-critical — no critical follow-up question on any international topic

#### Asymmetry 2:

To correspondent Matteo Albiti (Lebanon), 18:05: "So Matteo, tell us about this yellow line drawn by the Israeli soldiers. What area does it cover?" — the question presupposes the Israeli terminology ("yellow line") without questioning the legitimacy of the designation

Comparison: No equivalent question using Palestinian or Lebanese terminology to describe the same reality

Why asymmetric: The uncritical adoption of Israeli terminology ("yellow line") in the question itself constitutes an implicit frame

#### Asymmetry 3:

To correspondent Enrico Baona (Chernobyl), 20:54: "you are there, the plant today is located in a war zone, but you still managed to get inside. Tell us what you saw." — open question with implicit admiration ("you still managed")

Comparison: No critical question on any topic in the broadcast

Why asymmetric: The admiring tone towards the journalist sent to a war zone is understandable but is not balanced by critical questions on any other topic

*Summary: The broadcast poses no critical questions to any interlocutor; all questions are open and invite narration; the main asymmetry is in the uncritical adoption of Israeli terminology in the question on Lebanon.*



#### 14. FALSE BALANCE

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Definition: Artificial balance despite a real imbalance.*

Finding 1:

Time: 07:42

Construct: "Unanimous condemnation from the political world for the violent incidents."

Analysis: The "unanimous condemnation" creates an appearance of political balance (all parties agree) that obscures the deep divisions over the meaning of April 25. FdI condemns the violence but calls April 25 an "anti-democratic left-wing celebration"; PD condemns the violence but defends the anti-fascist character of the celebration. Presenting both positions as "unanimous condemnation" creates a false balance that equates fundamentally different positions.

Finding 2:

Time: 03:46 — 04:07

Construct: Meloni and Schlein presented in sequence in the summary as equivalent voices on April 25

Analysis: Meloni (government, FdI, post-fascist roots) and Schlein (opposition, PD, anti-fascist tradition) have structurally different positions on April 25; presenting them as equivalent voices in a summary creates a false balance that obscures the difference in historical and political position

*Summary: False balance manifests itself mainly in the presentation of "unanimous condemnation" as a unifying element, which obscures the real political divisions over the meaning of April 25.*



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

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:

Agenda item set: April 25 as "everyone's celebration" and a moment of "national cohesion"

Time: 03:46 — Evidence: "Prime Minister Meloni, sharing and reproducing the Head of State's reflections on concord, expressed the hope that April 25 would become a moment of national cohesion."

Alternative agenda: April 25 as the celebration of anti-fascism with a specific and non-neutral political meaning; the debate on "reconciliation" as a political operation by Fdi to neutralise the anti-fascist character of the anniversary

### Finding 2:

Agenda item set: The violent incidents at the marches as the main problem of April 25 2025

Time: 05:38 — Evidence: "There were moments of tension during the demonstrations."

Alternative agenda: Mass participation (hundreds of thousands of people throughout Italy) as the main element; the violent incidents as marginal compared to overall participation

### Finding 3:

Agenda item set: The age verification app as a "technologically cutting-edge solution"

Time: 31:17 — Evidence: "A technologically cutting-edge solution, underlines the Undersecretary for Innovation Alessio Butti."

Alternative agenda: Privacy concerns, surveillance risks, the critical positions of the Data Protection Authority — none of these perspectives enters the agenda

*Summary: The broadcast's agenda-setting systematically privileges the government narrative (national cohesion, technological innovation) and marginalises critical perspectives (anti-fascism as a specific political value, privacy risks, mass participation vs. violent incidents).*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

### Overview of Individual Scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	6	Government and partisan sources presented without adequate disclosure of conflicts of interest
2	Source selection	H	5	Ministerial and Saudi sources (Al Arabiya) used without disclosure of conflicts of interest; two statements based on anonymous sources
3	Time distribution	H	4	Government and institutions receive approximately twice the speaking time compared to the opposition; ANPI absent
4	Omissions	H	7	Systematic absence of ANPI, UCEI and historical context of the Jewish Brigade
5	Data manipulation	H	3	Ministerial tourism data without time trend; Gaza turnout without historical comparison
6	Guilt by association	H	4	PD implicitly associated with anti-Semitism at the marches through Salvini's unchallenged statement
7	Timing	H	5	Institutional-celebratory opening predisposes a positive frame before the violent incidents
8	Selective outrage	H	5	Left-wing violent incidents receive 10 times more space than the right-wing Roman salutes in Varese
9	Completeness	H	7	Historical context of April 25 and the Jewish Brigade systematically absent; Lebanon report one-sided
10	Framing	S	6	Dominant frame "institutional cohesion vs. disorder at the marches" favours government narrative
11	Word choice	S	5	Systematic asymmetries: right-wing positions reported without critical distance, left-wing actions with more loaded labels
12	Moderator behaviour	S	3	Predominantly uniform behaviour; main asymmetry in equating Meloni with institutional offices
13	Question asymmetry	S	4	No critical questions to any interlocutor; uncritical adoption of Israeli terminology in the Lebanon report
14	False balance	S	4	"Unanimous condemnation" obscures real political divisions over the meaning of April 25
15	Agenda-setting	S	6	Government narrative (cohesion, innovation) privileged; critical perspectives systematically excluded

### Results

- HARDFACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 5.1 / 10
- SOFTFACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 4.7 / 10



- OVERALL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 5.0 / 10

## Dominant Techniques

---

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omissions (Score 7):** The broadcast systematically omits the voices of organised civil society (ANPI, UCEI) and the historical context necessary to understand the violent incidents. This omission is not accidental: the absent voices are those that could have critically contextualised both the violent incidents and the government narrative on April 25.
- 2. Completeness (Score 7):** The overall picture of April 25 is systematically incomplete: mass participation (hundreds of thousands of people) is presented as background, while the violent incidents become the main topic. The Lebanon report is one-sided. The historical context of the Jewish Brigade is absent.
- 3. Framing (Score 6):** The dominant frame "institutional cohesion vs. disorder at the marches" is constructed through the narrative sequence (opening with Mattarella/Meloni, then violent incidents) and the equation of Meloni with institutional offices, producing a picture that favours the government narrative without this being explicitly declared.

## Key Messages of the Broadcast

---

**\*\*MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT):** \*\* "April 25 is a celebration for all Italians, celebrated unitarily by the institutions, but disturbed by violent incidents at left-wing marches."

**Technique:** Framing + Omissions — Evidence: 03:20, 07:42

**\*\*MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** \*\* "Giorgia Meloni is a responsible institutional leader who commemorates April 25 in a unitary manner and condemns violence."

**Technique:** Agenda-setting + Word choice — Evidence: 03:46, 04:01

**\*\*MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL):** \*\* "The left has a problem with anti-Semitism and violence at the marches, which embarrasses PD."

**Technique:** Guilt by association + Selective outrage — Evidence: 08:03, 05:38

## Classification of the Degree of Manipulation

---

Rationale: The overall score of 5.0/10 reflects a clear one-sidedness that manifests itself mainly through systematic omissions (absence of ANPI, UCEI, historical context), asymmetry in the coverage of violent incidents (left vs. right), and a framing that favours the government narrative. These techniques are not necessarily the result of deliberate and conscious manipulation, but objectively produce an incomplete and unbalanced information picture. Under the RAI Service Contract Art. 6, which imposes pluralism, completeness and impartiality of information, the broadcast presents significant shortcomings, particularly with regard to completeness (absence of fundamental voices) and pluralism (systematic imbalance between government voices and opposition/civil society voices).

## CONCLUSION

---

The TG1 of 25 April 2025 presents an information picture that, while not manifestly propagandistic, shows systematic shortcomings in the completeness and pluralism required by Art. 6 of the RAI Service Contract. The most serious omissions concern the total absence of ANPI (main organiser of the demonstrations), UCEI (institutional voice of the Jewish community), and the historical context of the Jewish Brigade in the Italian resistance — elements that would have allowed the viewer to understand the symbolic gravity of the violent incidents. The asymmetry in the coverage of violent incidents (left-wing incidents with detailed coverage and multiple political statements; far-right incident in Varese dismissed in a sentence) constitutes a violation of the principle of impartiality. The dominant framing, which equates Meloni with institutional offices and presents April 25 as "everyone's celebration" disturbed by "left-wing disorder", reflects the government narrative without this being explicitly declared as such, in violation of the principle of separation between news and commentary. Overall, the broadcast falls into the category of "clear one-sidedness" with a score of 5.0/10, constituting potential violations of Art. 6 of the RAI Service Contract with regard to pluralism, completeness and impartiality.



## OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

#### HARDFACTS SCORE (1-8)

**5.1/10**

*Considerable imbalance*

#### SOFTFACTS SCORE (9-14)

**4.7/10**

*Considerable imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**4.9/10**

*Considerable imbalance*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## LEGEND — Meaning of scores

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

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

### Aggregate deviation index — Interpretation ranges

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

### Partisan political bias (from -5 to +5)

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	The party is significantly under-represented in framing, airtime or presentation.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Recognisable but slight disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No detectable favouritism or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favoured</b>	Recognisable but slight favouritism.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favoured</b>	The party is significantly over-represented in framing, airtime or presentation.



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

### Assessment under 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: RAI Service Contract Art. 6 — Principle of completeness of information

Facts: Systematic omission of ANPI and UCEI voices in the April 25 report

Evidence: Time 04:19 — 07:20 — the report on the demonstrations and violent incidents includes no statement from ANPI (main organiser) or UCEI (institutional voice of the Jewish community affected by the anti-Semitic insults)

Assessment: The omission of these fundamental voices produces incomplete information that does not allow the viewer to form an informed opinion on the events; in particular, the absence of UCEI in a report concerning anti-Semitic insults to the Jewish Brigade constitutes a serious information gap that violates the principle of completeness

#### Violation 2:

Norm: RAI Service Contract Art. 6 — Principle of impartiality of information

Facts: Systematic asymmetry in the coverage of political violent incidents (left vs. right)

Evidence: Time 05:38 — 07:20 (left-wing incidents: approx. 2 minutes of dedicated report, statements by Fiano, intervention of the police chief, phone call from Piantedosi) vs. time 05:57 (right-wing incident: "In Varese controversy over Roman salutes by a far-right group" — a single sentence, no dedicated report)

Assessment: The disparity of treatment between violent/provocative political incidents attributable to different political areas violates the principle of impartiality; the asymmetric coverage objectively produces a picture in which political violence appears as an exclusive phenomenon of the left

#### Violation 3:

Norm: RAI Service Contract Art. 6 — Principle of separation between news and commentary

Facts: Equation of Meloni with institutional offices in the presenter's introduction

Evidence: Time 03:20 — "So, the highest offices of the State and Prime Minister Meloni have commemorated April 25 emphasising the importance of this day."

Assessment: The presenter's formulation incorporates an implicit judgement (Meloni as part of the neutral institutional framework) that is not declared as editorial commentary but presented as news; this violates the principle of separation between news and commentary

#### Violation 4:

Norm: RAI Service Contract Art. 6 — Principle of pluralism of information

Facts: Systematic imbalance between governmental/institutional voices and voices of civil society and the opposition

Evidence: Time 03:20 — 09:42 — the April 25 block includes statements by Mattarella, La Russa, Fontana, Meloni (all institutional and governmental offices) with ample space, while opposition voices are reduced to brief condemnation statements; civil society organisations (ANPI, UCEI) are completely absent

Assessment: The pluralism required by Art. 6 is not exhausted by the presence of voices from different political parties, but also includes the voices of organised civil society; the systematic absence of these voices violates the principle of pluralism

### Overall Assessment RAI Service Contract Art. 6

---

The analysed broadcast presents four potential violations of Art. 6 of the RAI Service Contract, concerning respectively completeness (omission of ANPI and UCEI), impartiality (asymmetry in the coverage of political violent



incidents), separation between news and commentary (equation of Meloni with institutional offices), and pluralism (systematic imbalance between government voices and civil society). None of these violations appears to be the result of deliberate and conscious manipulation, but all objectively produce an information picture that favours the government narrative at the expense of a plural and complete representation of reality. In a context in which April 25 is the most politically divisive date in the Italian calendar, and in which the current government has a direct interest in its "reconciliatory" reinterpretation, rigorous compliance with the principles of pluralism, completeness and impartiality required by Art. 6 would have required editorial choices significantly different from those adopted.

## IN-DEPTH SOURCE VERIFICATION (Mandatory for all specialised bodies / NGOs / advisory centres cited)

### 1. Ministry of Tourism (April 25 tourism data)

- FUNDING:** Government ministry — public funding, dependent on the Meloni government (Fdl)
- MANDATE:** Incompatible with neutral assessment on topics concerning the government's performance in tourism
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct institutional interest in presenting positive tourism data as a result of government policies
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of interest: -2 / D2 Personal risk: 0 / D3 Technical expertise: +2 / D4 Consistency: 0 / D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 / D6 Source level: +1 → TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- OPPOSING VOICE:** Federturismo, Confturismo, ISTAT — none cited

### 2. Department for Innovation / PagoPA (age verification app)

- FUNDING:** Government institution — public funding, under the supervision of Undersecretary Butti (Fdl)
- MANDATE:** Incompatible with neutral assessment — it is the body that developed the system being promoted
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Total conflict — promotes its own product
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of interest: -2 / D2 Personal risk: 0 / D3 Technical expertise: +2 / D4 Consistency: 0 / D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 / D6 Source level: +1 → TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- OPPOSING VOICE:** Data Protection Authority, digital rights associations — none cited

### 3. Al Arabiya (news on Iran)

- FUNDING:** Saudi television channel — funded by the Saudi Arabian government
- MANDATE:** Incompatible with neutral assessment on news concerning Iran, a country in geopolitical conflict with Saudi Arabia
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Structural conflict — Saudi source on Iranian news
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of interest: -2 / D2 Personal risk: 0 / D3 Technical expertise: +1 / D4 Consistency: -1 / D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 / D6 Source level: 0 → TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- OPPOSING VOICE:** Reuters, AFP, IRNA (with the opposite conflict) — none cited as an alternative source

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

## 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 under RAI Service Contract Art. 7. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular AGCOM).



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

**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

---

The "lottizzazione" — the historical division of RAI channels according to criteria of partisan proportionality — influences 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 (Autorità per le Garanzie nelle Comunicazioni): 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](http://www.svfab.ch) | [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto: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 keep our work solid, we depend on the contributions of members and supporters.

### 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

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



**Unbalanced information** is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are illustrated in detail, 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 badly cut. 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 only 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 let a frame chosen by someone else be so easily imposed on them.

**Präsident:** Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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

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 over 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 Autorità per le Garanzie nelle Comunicazioni.

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.