

Rampage News Editorial Handbook

Article I. Mission

Rampage News exists to identify, verify, and publish consequential truth under conditions of conflict, distortion, censorship, and institutional failure. Editorial priority belongs to matters involving life, liberty, bodily integrity, due process, systemic corruption, war, financial destabilization, state or cartel violence, and structural threats to constitutional order.

Rampage News does not define success as speed alone. The governing standard is disciplined accuracy under pressure, with transparent methods, explicit uncertainty, and auditable reasoning.

Article II. Editorial Priorities

Coverage priority shall be assigned in the following order:

1. Civilian harm, atrocity risk, disappearances, detention, torture, displacement, and threats to bodily integrity.
2. War, proxy war, insurgency, internal armed conflict, and state or non-state coercive violence.
3. Censorship, propaganda operations, suppression of speech, manipulation of information flows, and attacks on journalists or witnesses.
4. Financial crimes, systemic fraud, sovereign instability, sanctions effects, corruption networks, and infrastructure failure affecting public welfare.
5. Constitutional crisis, governance breakdown, judicial capture, emergency powers abuse, and structural legitimacy disputes.
6. Secondary political stories only when they illuminate larger systems of power, verification, or rights.

Symbolic partisan conflict, personality theater, and low-stakes outrage do not outrank high-consequence events.

Article III. Declared Biases

Rampage News rejects the fiction of view-from-nowhere neutrality. The publication is openly biased toward:

1. Preservation of innocent life.
2. Protection of bodily integrity and civil liberty.
3. Due process, lawful procedure, and constitutional constraint.
4. Verifiability over virality.
5. Transparency of power, incentives, and coercive structures.
6. Correction of omission, especially where neglected regions or populations are underreported.
7. Serious treatment of non-Western crises and peripheral jurisdictions.

These biases are normative commitments and must be declared through method, not hidden through posture.

Article IV. Forms of Bias

Editors and writers shall evaluate at least the following forms of bias in each major piece:

1. Selection bias: what is covered, ignored, delayed, or deprioritized.
2. Framing bias: the narrative architecture, causal language, and emotional weighting of the piece.
3. Source bias: overreliance on governments, partisan outlets, NGOs, corporate statements, or single-ecosystem reporting.
4. Measurement bias: what is counted, excluded, aggregated, or normalized.
5. Procedural bias: hidden defaults in alerts, triage, escalation, and publishing workflow.
6. Geographic bias: disproportionate emphasis on major capitals, Western institutions, or English-language source environments.
7. Temporal bias: premature certainty, stale framing, or failure to update changed facts.

Bias cannot always be eliminated. It must be surfaced, constrained, and made corrigible.

Article V. Standards of Evidence

No major claim shall rest comfortably on a single interested source when meaningful independent verification is possible. The preferred hierarchy of confidence is:

1. Primary documents, official filings, court records, statutes, treaties, satellite evidence, authenticated media, on-chain records, and direct witness material.
2. Multiple independent reporting chains with no obvious shared sourcing dependency.
3. Expert or institutional interpretation grounded in verifiable records.
4. Claims that remain plausible but unconfirmed, which must be labeled accordingly.

When certainty is unavailable, the article shall state what is known, what is likely, what is disputed, and what remains unknowable at the present time.

Article VI. Source Discipline

Writers shall distinguish between:

- Primary evidence.
- Secondary reporting.
- Analysis.
- Opinion.
- Advocacy.
- Narrative contamination or probable information operations.

No source receives automatic trust because it is official, prestigious, aligned, oppositional, or emotionally compelling. Governments, armed groups, corporations, NGOs, influencers, and legacy media are all subject to the same verification burden.

Anonymous sourcing shall be used sparingly and only when the public interest clearly outweighs the credibility cost. Anonymous claims shall not be used to launder conjecture.

Article VII. Framing Rules

Headlines, decks, and ledes must describe rather than inflame. Loaded labels shall be avoided unless they are necessary, well-defined, and supported by the facts.

Writers shall avoid adopting the vocabulary of any combatant, party apparatus, or ideological media ecosystem without scrutiny. Terms such as genocide, coup, terrorist, massacre, insurrection, liberation, misinformation, extremism, and self-defense require evidentiary grounding and contextual precision.

The article must not create false symmetry where power, evidence, or harm is materially unequal. Fairness does not require flattening reality.

Article VIII. Verification Workflow

Every major article should pass through the following sequence:

1. Claim identification: isolate the central factual assertions.
2. Source mapping: list the origin and dependency chain of each major claim.
3. Corroboration: test each claim against independent records or rival reporting ecosystems.
4. Adversarial review: ask how the claim could be false, manipulated, incomplete, or strategically framed.
5. Uncertainty labeling: assign levels such as verified, strongly supported, plausible, contested, or unverified.
6. Publication review: ensure the framing matches the evidence and the confidence level.
7. Update protocol: revise visibly when new evidence materially changes the picture.

Verification is a recurring discipline, not a pre-publication ritual alone.

Article IX. Cross-Media Bias Review

Cross-media bias analysis is an internal method for comparing how multiple outlets, institutions, and geopolitical blocs describe the same event. Its purpose is not aesthetic balance. Its purpose is to detect omission, asymmetry, euphemism, narrative coordination, and strategically distributed uncertainty.

A cross-media review should examine:

1. Which facts are common across outlets.
2. Which facts appear only within one political or geographic information sphere.
3. How headline language changes perceived legitimacy, blame, or urgency.
4. Whether civilians, legal process, and power asymmetries are centered or erased.

5. Whether identical facts are framed as tragedy, necessity, scandal, retaliation, or non-event.

This review is best used on stories with high stakes, high narrative conflict, and high public consequence.

Article X. Story Triage

Before commissioning or publishing, the editor shall ask:

1. Does this story affect life, liberty, safety, property, due process, systemic stability, or public legitimacy?
2. Is this story undercovered relative to its consequence?
3. Does Rampage News have a verification advantage on this story?
4. Is the story merely politically noisy, or structurally important?
5. Will publication clarify reality, or only amplify an already saturated spectacle?

A story may be interesting and still fail triage.

Article XI. Methods and Limitations

Major pieces should contain a concise methods or limitations note whenever source conditions are materially constrained. Readers should be told when access is blocked, records are incomplete, witnesses are anonymous, imagery is inconclusive, or claims depend on hostile or self-interested parties.

Rampage News does not treat transparency about limits as weakness. Concealed uncertainty is a greater editorial failure than visible incompleteness.

Article XII. Corrections and Updates

Corrections shall be prompt, explicit, and archived where practical. Material errors affecting the central meaning of a story require a clear correction notice.

Silent revision is disfavored in consequential reporting. When the evidence changes, the record should show that it changed.

Article XIII. Style and Tone

Writing shall be precise, restrained, and information-dense. Moral seriousness is appropriate; melodrama is not.

Writers shall prefer concrete nouns, direct verbs, and legal or institutional specificity where available. Speculation must never be smuggled in through rhythm, insinuation, or headline architecture.

The goal is not blandness. The goal is disciplined force.

Article XIV. Red Lines

Rampage News shall not knowingly publish:

1. Fabricated claims.
2. Manipulated evidence presented as authentic.
3. False certainty where key facts remain disputed.
4. Sensational framing that outruns the record.
5. Dehumanizing language toward civilian populations.
6. Narrative laundering for intelligence fronts, cartel propaganda, state propaganda, or synthetic virality campaigns.
7. Empty both-sides framing used to evade moral or evidentiary judgment.

Article XV. Editorial Test

A Rampage article is ready when it can withstand the following questions:

1. What is the central claim?
2. How is it known?
3. Who benefits from this framing?
4. What remains uncertain?
5. What competing explanation was tested and rejected?
6. Why does this matter beyond spectacle?
7. Would a legally trained, technically literate, adversarial reader find the reasoning disciplined?

If these questions cannot be answered cleanly, the piece is not ready.