Email response

Skinner, R.

Dear BBC Online Material Code team,

I am submitting the attached evidence review in response to Ofcom's consultation on the proposed BBC Online Material Code.

The paper examines a number of documented BBC accuracy and impartiality failures, alongside disputed cases and evidence that limits the conclusions which can properly be drawn. It does not allege political control of the BBC. Its concern is narrower: whether repeated errors, framing choices and differences in correction practice create a credible risk of politically asymmetric treatment, particularly in reporting concerning centre-right figures and arguments.

I would ask Ofcom to consider whether the final Code and accompanying guidance should require:

- a visible correction and version history for materially amended online reports;
- correction prominence proportionate to the prominence and reach of the original error;
- clear disclosure of relevant contributor interests;
- additional editorial safeguards during election and by-election periods;
- independent, politically balanced sampling of complaints, corrections and framing; and
- stronger governance for BBC Verify and other output presented as specialist verification.

The attached review separates confirmed findings from matters that remain arguable or require further evidence. I hope it is useful to the consultation team.

Please treat this email and attachment as a consultation response. If you require the material to be submitted through the response form as well, I would be grateful if you could let me know.

Kind regards,

Rob Skinner.

EVIDENCE REVIEW

BBC Accuracy and Impartiality

Documented errors, disputed cases and the question of consistent political treatment

PURPOSE To examine whether documented BBC errors and editorial choices reveal a recurring political pattern, while giving proper weight to evidence that weakens or rebuts that view.

Prepared 26 July 2026

Summary

There is sufficient evidence to justify a serious, structured investigation into whether parts of BBC News and factual output apply adverse framing more readily to populist, conservative or centre-right figures than to establishment centre-left positions. The present evidence does not yet prove that the BBC is institutionally controlled by Labour, nor that every mistake is ideologically motivated. It does establish several significant failures whose direction was adverse to Donald Trump, Nigel Farage or positions associated with the political right, and it shows that senior internal advisers identified possible systemic causes rather than isolated slips.

FINDING The strongest supportable proposition is a risk of asymmetric treatment, not a proven Labour conspiracy. The BBC has repeatedly published or broadcast material that disadvantaged right-of-centre subjects and later required correction, apology, withdrawal or regulatory action. A wider comparison is still needed before claiming institution-wide ideological bias.

Three matters carry particularly high evidential weight: the misleading splice of Donald Trump's 6 January speech; the BBC's admitted impartiality failure in commentary on Nigel Farage; and the withdrawn BBC Verify motor-insurance investigation. The Hull ethnicity error is also confirmed, although the attackers' possible beliefs and conduct prevent the correction from disproving every allegation of racial motivation.

Today's report concerning donations through Richard Tice's company should not presently be described as a proven factual breach. The Metropolitan Police has publicly confirmed an active investigation. However, it was published during the formal Clacton by-election campaign, only 18 days before polling day, in a contest being re-fought by Reform leader Nigel Farage. That makes timing, prominence and attribution legitimate impartiality questions. Any review should ask why an investigation opened in February 2025 became breaking news during the campaign, whether the BBC's presentation could materially affect voters, and whether equivalent investigations involving other parties receive comparable election-period treatment.

Examples reviewed

Example	Position	Standard	Possible effect	Weight
Trump Panorama speech splice	Confirmed	Accuracy / misleading edit	Adverse to right	High
Farage 'customary inflammatory' remark	Confirmed	Due impartiality	Adverse to right	High
Verify motor-insurance ethnicity claim	Confirmed	Accuracy / causation	Centre-left frame	High

Example	Position	Standard	Possible effect	Weight
Hull car occupants' ethnicity	Confirmed error	Accuracy	Anti-right frame	High
Farm IHT / Dan Neidle disclosure	Strong concern	Contributor interests	Pro-government	Med.
Farm impact estimates	Disputed	Accuracy / uncertainty	Pro-government	Med.
Tice donations / Clacton timing	Arguable	Election-period framing	Adverse to right	Med.
Gaza documentary disclosure	Confirmed breach	Accuracy / credentials	Anti-Israel risk	High

Scope

- It tests a hypothesis: that certain BBC editorial failures are not randomly distributed but tend to reinforce establishment or centre-left interpretations.
- It distinguishes the Labour Party, the broader centre-left, metropolitan professional culture and institutional risk aversion. These overlap but are not interchangeable.
- It does not infer bias merely because a right-wing politician receives hostile but accurate scrutiny.
- It treats corrections, apologies, withdrawals, Ofcom findings, complete recordings and official registers as stronger evidence than commentary about motives.
- It retains negative findings. A suspected example that proves accurate is recorded as such, rather than discarded.

1. The question being examined

The hypothesis

When reporting politically contentious matters, BBC News and BBC Verify may be more likely to adopt, amplify or inadequately challenge assumptions associated with the establishment centre-left, while applying more suspicious framing, loaded language or evidential demands to centre-right and populist-right actors.

Operational definitions

Centre-left framing: A policy or cultural interpretation broadly favouring state intervention, redistribution, progressive social analysis, international institutionalism or establishment Labour/Liberal Democrat assumptions.

Centre-right subject: A politician, organisation or proposition associated with lower taxation, national sovereignty, controlled immigration, social conservatism, market economics or scepticism toward progressive institutions.

Directional error: An error whose practical effect assists one political interpretation or disadvantages an opposing subject, whether or not intent is proved.

Impartiality breach: Failure to maintain due impartiality as required by the BBC Guidelines or Ofcom Code. Due impartiality does not mean mathematical equality in every item.

Accuracy breach: A material statement, edit, omission or presentation that misleads the audience or fails the applicable accuracy standard.

2. Standards used

Relevant standards

- BBC accuracy: output must be well sourced, based on sound evidence and presented in clear, precise language; material should not mislead.
- Due impartiality: controversial subjects must receive appropriate breadth and weight, taking account of context and the nature of the output.
- Contributor transparency: audiences should normally be given relevant credentials or affiliations needed to judge a significant contributor's status.
- Editing: factual sequences should not be inter-cut where juxtaposition creates a materially misleading impression.
- Corrections: serious factual errors should be corrected clearly, promptly and with prominence appropriate to the original harm.

Source: BBC Editorial Guidelines – accuracy section

Source: BBC Editorial Guidelines – impartiality section

Evidence grading

A — Confirmed: BBC admission, upheld complaint, Ofcom breach, official correction, or incontrovertible primary recording.

B — Strongly supported: Primary records establish the essential facts, but no formal breach finding exists.

C — Arguable: A reasonable standards concern requiring comparator evidence or fuller context.

D — Unsubstantiated/rebutted: The available record does not establish a breach, or important contrary evidence defeats the allegation.

3. The examples in detail

1. Donald Trump: Panorama's spliced 6 January speech

Assessment: Confirmed serious editorial failure. Potential political effect considered: adverse to a right-of-centre subject.

What happened

- Panorama joined two passages delivered approximately 39 minutes apart, creating the apparent sentence: 'We're gonna walk down to the Capitol ... and we fight. We fight like hell'.
- The intervening words included Trump's statement that supporters would march 'peacefully and patriotically' to make their voices heard.
- The edited speech was followed by footage of Proud Boys marching, although that group had set off before Trump began speaking.
- BBC chair Samir Shah later accepted that the edit gave the impression of a direct call for violent action and apologised for an error of judgment.
- A parliamentary committee cited the BBC rule against inter-cutting material where juxtaposition creates a materially misleading impression.

Why it matters. This is the clearest example in the review. The problem is not that the BBC criticised Trump; it is that the editing materially altered the apparent sequence and meaning of his words. The effect was plainly adverse to Trump and reinforced the most damaging interpretation of his conduct.

Important context. Trump's wider conduct and the violence at the Capitol remain legitimate subjects of severe scrutiny. Correcting this edit does not determine the whole question of his responsibility. It establishes only that this BBC presentation was misleading.

Source: House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee oral evidence, 24 November 2025

Source: Prescott memorandum published in parliamentary papers

Source: Ofcom record of complaints concerning Trump: A Second Chance?

2. Nigel Farage: presenter commentary on 'customary inflammatory language'

Assessment: Confirmed BBC standards failure. Potential political effect considered: adverse to a right-of-centre subject.

What happened

- During live coverage of a Reform UK speech in May 2024, BBC presenter Geeta Guru-Murthy described Farage's language as 'customary inflammatory language'.
- The BBC subsequently stated that the wording did not meet its editorial standards on impartiality and apologised.

Why it matters. The phrase was an evaluative character judgment delivered in the BBC's own voice rather than attributed analysis. The BBC's admission makes this a strong comparator for examining whether similarly pejorative shorthand is applied to centre-left figures.

Important context. One presenter's improvised remark does not establish the political outlook of the whole BBC. The correction was relatively prompt and explicit.

Source: Contemporary report of BBC apology

3. BBC Verify: the withdrawn motor-insurance 'ethnicity penalty'

Assessment: Confirmed serious editorial failure. Potential political effect considered: reinforced a progressive discrimination frame.

What happened

- BBC Verify reported that motorists in ethnically diverse areas paid an 'ethnicity penalty'.

- The BBC later withdrew the article, acknowledging that the analysis had not established why premiums were higher and had failed to distinguish correlation from causation.
- BBC chair Samir Shah told Parliament that the item was treated as a serious editorial breach.
- Parliamentary evidence records further probability/economics training and new personnel in the data-science team.

Why it matters. The report converted an observed association into a racially explanatory frame without establishing causation. That is a fundamental analytical error for a specialist verification unit. Its ideological relevance lies in the readiness to name an 'ethnicity penalty' before alternative causal mechanisms had been established.

Important context. The BBC identified the failure itself, removed the item and instituted training and staffing changes. Those actions are material safeguards and must be credited. The case supports criticism of the original work, not an allegation that the BBC knowingly fabricated data.

Source: Parliamentary evidence on withdrawal and remedial action

Source: Independent audit describing the BBC withdrawal

4. Hull disorder: incorrect ethnicity of attacked car occupants

Assessment: Confirmed factual error. Potential political effect considered: reinforced an anti-right/racial-conflict frame.

What happened

- BBC Verify initially reported that an angry white mob attacked a car containing men of Asian heritage.
- Humberside Police subsequently told the BBC that the occupants were Eastern European.
- The BBC amended the article and later changed the headline.

Why it matters. Ethnicity was material to the racial framing of the incident. Publishing the claim during widespread disorder following the Southport murders created a heightened duty of verification. The correction demonstrates that the central demographic assertion had not been adequately established before publication.

Important context. The corrected ethnicity does not by itself disprove racist intent. If racial slurs were used, or attackers believed the occupants to be Asian, racism could remain relevant. The defensible criticism is premature factual certainty, not that all racial interpretation was necessarily false.

Source: Archived reporting and BBC correction quoted in UnHerd investigation

5. Farm inheritance tax: Dan Neidle's political connection

Assessment: Strong disclosure concern. Potential political effect considered: potentially favourable to labour government policy.

What happened

- BBC Verify described Dan Neidle/Tax Policy Associates as independent when using his analysis in the farm inheritance-tax debate.
- The official Register of Members' Financial Interests records a £2,000 donation from Daniel Neidle for Labour MP Luke Akehurst's 2024 election campaigning.

- Neidle is also a highly experienced former head of tax at Clifford Chance and has criticised policies across party lines.

Why it matters. A recent donation to a Labour candidate was relevant context when the contributor's analysis was used to support or validate a contested Labour tax measure. 'Independent' can legitimately mean institutionally independent of government, but without disclosure audiences could reasonably understand it as politically detached.

Important context. The record proves a donation, not that Neidle was acting under Labour's direction or that his tax analysis was wrong. Calling him simply a 'Labour activist' overstates the primary evidence. The correct allegation is insufficient disclosure of a potentially relevant political connection.

Source: House of Commons Register of Members' Financial Interests: Luke Akehurst

Source: House of Lords Library review of farm-IHT estimates

6. Farm inheritance tax: presentation of disputed impact estimates

Assessment: Strong concern, not formally adjudicated. Potential political effect considered: potentially favourable to labour government policy.

What happened

- Treasury estimates, historic APR/BPR claim data, Defra farm data and industry modelling measured materially different populations.
- The House of Lords Library presented the number of affected farms as a genuine methodological dispute, not a settled binary fact.
- Different ownership structures, transferable allowances and the distinction between estates, farms and claims materially affect estimates.

Why it matters. A verification item should explain that rival figures answer different questions. Treating the Treasury estimate as the factual baseline while dismissing industry estimates risks converting an unsettled modelling dispute into an authoritative verdict. Any confirmed acres/hectares mistake should be documented using the exact archived wording before being pleaded as a breach.

Important context. The Treasury figure was not invented and may be appropriate for estimating annual estates based on historic claims. Industry figures may overstate exposure by treating asset values as equivalent to immediate tax liabilities. This case requires line-by-line comparison of article versions before receiving Grade A status.

Source: House of Lords Library: Budget 2024, inheritance tax and family farms

Source: HM Treasury explanation of APR/BPR changes

7. Richard Tice company donations: July 2026 breaking-news report

Assessment: Arguable election-period impartiality concern. Potential political effect considered: potentially adverse to reform uk.

What happened

- The Metropolitan Police says an investigation began in February 2025 following an Electoral Commission referral concerning donations before the 2024 election.

- The Met says alleged offences under section 61 PPERA are being investigated, early CPS advice has been sought, two people have been interviewed under caution and no arrests have been made.
- Section 61 concerns evasion of donation restrictions, including arrangements intended to conceal the identity of the true donor.
- Richard Tice said the BBC report was the first he had heard of the investigation and questioned why police appeared to brief journalists before interested parties.
- The Clacton parliamentary by-election was formally under way: the Notice of Election was published on 13 July, candidates were confirmed on 17 July and polling day was fixed for 13 August 2026.
- The BBC story broke on 26 July, 18 days before polling day, while Reform leader Nigel Farage was campaigning to regain the vacant Clacton seat.

Why it matters. The existence of an investigation is supported by an on-record police statement, so the strongest complaint is not that the BBC invented it. The concern is the BBC's exercise of editorial power during a live election. Publishing a damaging, allegation-led story about Reform's deputy leader and party finances 18 days before Farage faced voters could foreseeably affect the contest. Because the inquiry had existed since February 2025, the BBC should be asked what new event made publication urgent on 26 July; whether it considered the Clacton campaign and heightened election-period impartiality obligations; why Tice apparently learned of the inquiry from journalists; and what equivalent prominence it has given to unresolved Labour or Conservative funding inquiries during election periods. None of those facts proves deliberate interference, but together they create a reasonable perception risk which the BBC should answer with a documented editorial chronology.

Important context. Journalists do not lose the right—or duty—to report verified public-interest information during elections. Suppressing a genuine police investigation because voting is imminent could itself favour Reform. Prior recording or acceptance of a donation also does not clear every possible section 61 offence: administrative permissibility and a police inquiry into concealment of the true source are legally distinct. A breach finding therefore requires evidence that the BBC engineered the timing, used materially misleading framing, withheld significant exculpatory context, or applied a demonstrably different standard to comparable parties.

Source: ITV report quoting the Metropolitan Police statement

Source: Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000, section 61

Source: Tendring District Council: Clacton by-election date and timetable

Source: Tendring District Council: candidates confirmed, 17 July 2026

8. Gaza: How to Survive a Warzone – undisclosed Hamas-administration connection

Assessment: Confirmed Ofcom breach. Potential political effect considered: potentially adverse to israel; not directly labour/right.

What happened

- The documentary did not disclose that its 13-year-old narrator's father was a deputy agriculture minister in the Hamas-run administration.
- The BBC's own review found a breach of its accuracy guideline concerning misleading audiences.
- Ofcom found the omission materially misleading under Rule 2.2 and directed the BBC to broadcast a statement of findings.

- Ofcom did not uphold the broader allegations of due-impartiality breach, fabrication or mistranslation.

Why it matters. This demonstrates inadequate contributor due diligence and disclosure in a highly contested political setting. It is relevant to BBC governance and the reliability of institutional safeguards. It should not be counted as direct evidence of pro-Labour treatment, but it may contribute to a broader hypothesis about progressive or activist narrative selection.

Important context. Ofcom expressly found that other complaints, including due impartiality and translation allegations, did not warrant breach findings. The report must preserve those negative conclusions.

Source: Ofcom breach decision, 17 October 2025

Source: Full Ofcom decision

4. Does the current evidence prove a centre-left pattern?

What supports the hypothesis

- Directionality: the Trump, Farage, insurance, Hull and possibly farm-tax cases all moved in a direction comfortable to centre-left or progressive assumptions.
- Severity: the Trump case involved a materially altered impression, not merely tone; the insurance item involved a basic causation error inside a specialist verification unit.
- Internal evidence: a former BBC editorial adviser told Parliament that apparently separate failures seemed to have systemic causes and were becoming worse.
- Governance delay: the Trump edit was known internally but was allowed to rest partly because no formal complaint had been made. It was reconsidered only after public exposure.
- Regulatory asymmetry: until the new 2026 regime, Ofcom could generally issue only non-binding opinions on written BBC online material, leaving many Verify articles beyond enforceable sanctions.

What prevents a final finding

- The present set was assembled from known controversies, not a random or complete sample of BBC political output. Selection bias is therefore unavoidable.
- There is not yet a matched sample showing how the BBC treated equivalent Labour, Conservative and Reform controversies.
- An error can have ideological direction without ideological intent. Deadline pressure, weak data skills, group assumptions or poor compliance may produce the same result.
- One former adviser rejected the label 'institutionally biased' and another told Parliament that the BBC did take impartiality seriously and had implemented actions.
- Some apparent anti-Reform examples, including the current Tice story, may be substantially accurate even if their framing deserves scrutiny.

PROVISIONAL CONCLUSION The evidence supports concern about a recurring centre-left directional tendency in several serious failures. It does not yet prove that BBC output overall is institutionally Labour-aligned. A credible final claim requires matched comparison, transparent inclusion rules and measurement of correction prominence.

5. How the pattern should be tested

A second-stage review should sample comparable stories rather than accumulate only adverse examples. The following method would produce evidence capable of surviving external challenge.

1. Fix the period in advance—for example 1 January 2024 to 31 July 2026—and list every BBC Verify item involving Labour, Conservative and Reform politicians.
2. Code headlines before reading the body: allegation-first, neutral, exculpatory, personality-focused or policy-focused.
3. Record whether the headline names the politician, party, company or merely the institution under investigation.
4. Count unqualified evaluative terms such as inflammatory, far-right, hard-left, controversial, debunked, baseless or misleading.
5. Record evidential status at publication: allegation, inquiry, charge, official finding, acquittal, correction or closed case.
6. Measure right-of-reply placement and word count, not merely whether a quotation appeared somewhere.
7. Track contributor affiliations and whether comparable political or financial connections were disclosed.
8. Track later corrections: wording, delay, headline change, push notification and whether the correction reached the original platform.
9. Use two independent coders who do not know the desired conclusion; publish disagreements and adjudication rules.
10. Compare rates by subject rather than raw totals: adverse errors per 100 relevant items involving each political bloc.

Suggested coding sheet

Field	Allowed values	Field	Allowed values	Field	Allowed values
Subject	Lab/Con/Ref/ Other	Stage	Claim/ inquiry/finding	Tone	Neutral/ adverse/ favourable
Headline	Named/ unnamed	Reply	None/late/early	Source	Primary/ secondary/ anonymous
Interest	Disclosed/ omitted/N/A	Correction	None/minor/ material	Prominence	Equal/lower/ higher
Outcome	Accurate/ error/open	Direction	Left/right/ neutral	Confidence	A/B/C/D

6. Safeguards, sanctions and the 2026 opportunity

The BBC's existing safeguards include editorial guidelines, line management, specialist compliance, the Executive Complaints Unit, corrections and—in broadcast or on-demand cases—Ofcom enforcement. The record shows these mechanisms can work, but often after publication and sometimes only after external exposure.

- After the insurance failure, parliamentary evidence records additional training in probability/economics and changes to the data-science team.
- After the Gaza documentary, the BBC removed the programme, conducted a full review and accepted an accuracy breach; Ofcom imposed a direction to broadcast its findings.
- The Trump controversy exposed a governance weakness: an issue could be debated internally yet not receive formal correction because the public had not used the complaints machinery.
- Historically, Ofcom lacked enforcement powers over ordinary BBC online material and could issue only a non-binding opinion.
- On 2 July 2026 Ofcom proposed an enforceable Online Standards Code covering BBC websites, apps and social accounts, plus enhanced external scrutiny of complaints. Consultation closes 27 August 2026.

Source: Ofcom: strengthening regulation of BBC online material

Source: Ofcom procedures and existing BBC enforcement framework

Recommended safeguards

- Mandatory disclosure check for material political donations, campaign roles and advocacy affiliations of expert contributors.
- Two-source or official-source confirmation before ethnicity, religion or other protected characteristics become part of a breaking-news frame.
- A causation review for data stories: no causal label unless causal inference is supported; otherwise state correlation and plausible alternatives.
- A visible article-version log recording original headline, every material amendment, time of change and reason.
- Correction equivalence: material corrections should receive comparable homepage, broadcast and push-notification prominence to the original error.
- Matched impartiality audits by political subject, reporting not just airtime but tone, presumption, contributor labelling and evidential thresholds.
- Automatic independent review when a specialist verification unit materially corrects or withdraws more than a defined threshold of output.
- A complaints trigger based on editorial seriousness, not merely volume: internal discovery of a material breach should proceed even if nobody complains.

7. What should happen next

Immediate route

- Preserve the original item: URL, headline, timestamp, screenshots, broadcast recording and exact wording.

- Complain first to the BBC and identify the precise guideline, factual proposition and requested remedy.
- Avoid alleging motive unless evidence proves it. State the directional effect and comparator question.
- Request a substantive remedy: correction, headline amendment, disclosed affiliation, rebroadcast statement or published methodological review.
- After the BBC's final response, refer eligible broadcast/on-demand matters to Ofcom. For online matters, use the route applying when the new Code enters force.

Proposed core submission

DRAFT PROPOSITION Ofcom should adopt enforceable accuracy, impartiality, contributor-transparency and correction-prominence requirements for BBC online material. A specialist verification brand magnifies audience reliance and therefore requires an auditable version history, explicit conflict disclosures and independent review of material corrections. The enclosed cases show that existing self-correction has not always prevented serious, directionally consistent errors from reaching large audiences.

8. Further information needed

The following material would materially strengthen or disprove the hypothesis and should be sought by complaint, FOI where applicable, parliamentary correspondence or public-source archiving:

- Every version and timestamp of the BBC Verify Hull article, including headline and correction distribution.
- The withdrawn motor-insurance article, underlying dataset, statistical review and the recorded serious-breach finding.
- Every version of the BBC farm-tax article, enabling exact identification of any acres/hectares error.
- BBC guidance or policy on declaring political donations and affiliations of expert contributors.
- The full David Grossman review of US election coverage and the BBC management response.
- The internal action plan referenced by BBC board members in the November 2025 parliamentary hearing.
- BBC coverage comparators for police or Electoral Commission inquiries involving Labour, Conservative and Reform donations.
- Homepage and push-notification analytics for original errors versus corrections.
- BBC Verify's annual number of published items, material corrections, withdrawals and upheld complaints, using a consistent definition.

9. Sources

1. BBC Editorial Guidelines – Accuracy — Primary rule.

2. BBC Editorial Guidelines – Impartiality — Primary rule.

3. CMS Committee oral evidence, 24 Nov 2025 — Primary parliamentary evidence.

4. Prescott memorandum in parliamentary papers — Primary/officially published document.

5. Ofcom Trump complaints FOI — Primary regulator record.

6. Ofcom Gaza breach decision — Primary regulator finding.

7. Full Ofcom Gaza decision — Primary regulator finding.

8. Ofcom online-regulation consultation — Primary regulatory proposal.

9. Akehurst Register of Interests — Primary official register.

10. House of Lords Library farm-IHT briefing — Authoritative neutral synthesis.

11. PPERA 2000 section 61 — Primary legislation.

12. ITV report quoting Met on Tice-company inquiry — Contemporary report with official statement.

13. Tendring District Council: Clacton by-election timetable — Primary election timetable.

14. Tendring District Council: Clacton candidates confirmed — Primary election record.

15. UnHerd investigation of BBC Verify corrections — Secondary investigation; verify against originals.

10. Conclusion

The evidence justifies sustained scrutiny of BBC editorial culture and the possibility of asymmetric treatment. It does not justify presenting every critical report about Reform, Farage or Trump as false, nor collapsing the BBC into the Labour Party. The coherent argument is narrower and stronger: several serious, acknowledged failures have moved in a common political direction; internal oversight recognised possible systemic causes; and the historical inability of Ofcom to enforce standards against ordinary BBC online journalism left insufficient external deterrence.

The next decisive step is not another collection of anecdotes. It is a transparent matched review. If comparable Labour controversies are framed more cautiously, contributor interests are disclosed more selectively, or corrections to anti-right claims occur at a higher rate or lower prominence, the hypothesis will gain empirical support. If the same failures occur evenly across parties, the evidence will instead point to general newsroom weakness. Either result would be useful because the purpose of this paper is to establish what can be proved.