



ČT PODROBNÁ ANALÝZA

20230122_CT Superduel - Babis vs Pavel prezidentska.cs

Broadcast: ČT-Sendung | Analyzed: 2026-05-26 03:43

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Standard: §2 Zákona o ČT / §31 Zákona č. 231/2001

OVERALL SCORE

6.1/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	Piráti	STAN	KDU-ČSL	ANO	TOP 09	ODS	Motoristé	SPD
CHES	2.50	4.50	5.50	6.00	6.00	7.00	7.50	8.50
Spectrum	Left	Center	Center	Center-Right	Center-Right	Right	Right	Right

The overall tendency is presented on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-favoring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favoring). The calculation is based on the difference in average favoritism of left vs. right parties (grouping per CHES 2024).

TENDENCY (L – R)

3.8 / 10

Left-favoring

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — chesdata.eu | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

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



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Czech Republic has been governed since January 2025 by a coalition government led by Andrej Babiš (ANO), which includes the ANO movement (80 seats, 35.0%), Tomio Okamura's SPD (15 seats, 6.2%) and Petr Macinka's Motoristé sobě/AUTO (13 seats, 5.5%). The opposition consists of ODS (27 seats), STAN (22 seats), Piráti (18 seats), KDU-ČSL (16 seats) and TOP 09 (9 seats). Outside parliament remain Stačilo!/KSČM (4.3%), SOCDEM (1.8%) and Přísaha (1.1%).

Important contextual note: The debate analysed originates from January 2023, i.e. from the period before the 2025 parliamentary elections. At the time of broadcast, the five-party coalition government of Petr Fiala (ODS, STAN, Piráti, KDU-ČSL, TOP 09) was in power. Andrej Babiš was at that time the leader of the opposition party ANO and a presidential candidate. Petr Pavel was a civic candidate with the support of the governing coalition.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Key position
Piráti	2.5	18	Opposition	Digitalisation, liberal values
STAN	4.5	22	Opposition	Municipal politics, anti-corruption
KDU-ČSL	5.5	16	Opposition	Christian democracy, family
TOP 09	6.0	9	Opposition	Pro-European, fiscal responsibility
ANO	6.0	80	Government (2025)	Populism, social transfers
ODS	7.0	27	Opposition	Right-wing liberalism, NATO
Motoristé	7.5	13	Government (2025)	Opposition to Green Deal, drivers
SPD	8.5	15	Government (2025)	National sovereignty, anti-immigration

At the time of broadcast (January 2023), four key conflicts dominated the political scene: support for Ukraine versus caution about escalation (Pavel vs. Babiš), the relationship to Petr Fiala's government and its economic policy, the question of the energy crisis and rising food prices, and finally the dispute over the communist past of both candidates. The presidential election became a symbolic clash between two political camps — pro-European, Atlantic and values-based versus national-populist, sceptical towards NATO and the EU.

Czech Television is a public service medium established by Act No. 483/1991 Coll. and is obliged under §2(2) to provide objective, verified, overall balanced and comprehensive information for the free formation of opinions. Act No. 231/2001 Coll. in §31(2) and (3) imposes the obligation to ensure objectivity, balance and the separation of commentary from news reporting, and on politically controversial topics opposing views must be represented. The analysed debate "Super duel — Battle for the Castle" (ČT1, January 2023) is a live broadcast of a presidential debate, to which these statutory requirements apply in full.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY BIAS

Assessment of party representation

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Portrayal in the programme vs. programme position
ANO	-2	13:05 "Mrs Černochová who acts as Mr Pavel's spokesperson" — ANO's programme position: sovereign foreign policy, scepticism towards escalation — Babiš is given space for his own arguments, but the presenter repeatedly interrupts and frames his statements as chaos or populism; ANO's position on security policy is presented as irresponsible without adequate space for defence
ODS	0	The party does not appear directly in the debate; Prime Minister Fiala is mentioned as a supporter of Pavel — 14:27 "the Prime Minister said what Mr Andrej Babiš is saying here, that we are at war" — ODS's programme position is not independently assessed; neutral, as ODS is not a direct participant
STAN	0	The party does not appear in the debate; neutral
Piráti	0	The party does not appear in the debate; neutral
KDU-ČSL	0	Mentioned only in the context of voters — 37:35 "KDU-ČSL voters perhaps Pavel Fischer Catholic voters" — without assessment of programme position; neutral
TOP 09	0	The party does not appear in the debate; neutral
SPD	-1	31:28 "disappointed that not even SPD supported you" — SPD is mentioned only as a party that did not support Babiš; SPD's programme position (sovereignty, anti-immigration policy) is not presented; mildly distorted by omission
KSČM	-2	31:43 "for example KSČM" and 44:20 "MP for KSČM Andrej Babiš" — KSČM is repeatedly used as a tool to discredit Babiš through association; KSČM's programme position is not substantively assessed, the party serves as a negative reference point

Summary of party bias

- Most accurate portrayal: ODS, STAN, Piráti, KDU-ČSL, TOP 09 (score 0) — these parties effectively do not appear in the debate
- Strongest distortion: KSČM (score -2) and ANO (score -2) — KSČM is instrumentalised as a discrediting tool, ANO is framed as a source of chaos
- Average deviation from 0: 0.6
- Conclusion: The debate focuses on two candidates rather than on party programmes, so party bias is limited. However, the repeated association of Babiš with KSČM (44:20, 31:43) and the framing of his security policy as irresponsible without a symmetrical assessment of government policy suggests a mild asymmetry in favour of Pavel's position.

Overall left-right tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: +1.2

CLASSIFICATION: Mildly left-leaning (in the sense of leaning towards the pro-European, Atlantic, values-based camp represented by Pavel and the governing coalition)

Rationale: The debate systematically frames Pavel's positions as responsible and Babiš's as populist or chaotic. The presenter repeatedly challenges Babiš's statements with direct confrontational questions, while Pavel's controversial



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

statements (division into "two worlds", rejection of a referendum) are received with less intensity. The thematic framing of security policy, where Babiš's emphasis on peace is presented as "burying one's head in the sand" (16:05), while Pavel's rhetoric about hybrid war is accepted as expert, reflects a structural lean towards the Atlantic-pro-European camp.



CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Programme details

- Title: Super duel — Battle for the Castle (presidential debate before the second round)
- Date (from context): January 2023 (between the first and second rounds of the presidential elections)
- Presenter: Terezie (surname does not emerge unambiguously from the transcript; contextually Terezie Tománková or a comparable ČT presenter)
- Reporter for inserts: Petr Suchoň

Actors	Role	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Andrej Babiš	ANO chairman, former Prime Minister, presidential candidate	ANO	Centre-populism
Petr Pavel	Former Chief of the General Staff, former Chairman of the NATO Military Committee, presidential candidate	Civic candidate (support of governing coalition)	Pro-European, Atlantic, centre
Terezie (presenter)	ČT presenter	ČT	—
Petr Suchoň	ČT reporter, fact inserts	ČT	—

Main topic

A presidential debate before the second round of the election of the head of state, in which candidates Andrej Babiš and Petr Pavel confront their positions on security and foreign policy, the economy, the communist past and their vision of the presidential office.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. SELECTION OF EXPERTS

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Petr Suchoň (ČT reporter)

Timestamp	05:57
Statement	"Petr Pavel in his campaign frequently accentuates words such as order dignity and truth but also lie fear and chaos"
Classification	ČT employee, presents factual inserts; is not an independent expert on political science or security

Missing countervoice: Independent media analyst or political scientist

In-depth source check:

(a) FUNDING: ČT — public service medium funded by licence fees and the state budget; structural dependence on the political environment

(b) MANDATE: A ČT reporter has a mandate for factual inserts, not for expert analysis; the role is compatible with neutral reporting, but the selection of facts is subject to editorial decision

- D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — ČT employee, institutional dependence
- D2 Personal risk: +1 — professional risk in the case of unbalanced presentation
- D3 Expert competence: +1 — journalistic competence, not expert
- D4 Consistency of views: +1 — cannot be verified from the transcript
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — inserts are factual, data-based
- D6 Source level: 0 — secondary source (transcript of campaign materials)

TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

(d) Suchoň's inserts are presented as a neutral factual summary, but the selection of facts (e.g. emphasis on the billboard "the general does not believe in peace" for Babiš) contains implicit value framing.

Expert 2: Chief of the General Staff Karel Řehka (cited indirectly)

Timestamp	17:01
Statement	"Mr Řehka tells us the Czech Republic would, in his view, become a legitimate target"
Classification	The highest military commander of the Czech Republic; cited as an authority for security assessments

Missing countervoice: Independent security analyst or academic with a different risk assessment

In-depth source check:

(a) FUNDING: State employee, subordinate to the Fiala government; structural dependence on government policy

(b) MANDATE: The mandate of the Chief of the General Staff is compatible with assessing military risks, but his statements are politically instrumentalised by Pavel

- D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — appointed by the government that supports Pavel; structural dependence
- D2 Personal risk: +2 — high personal risk when making public statements about war



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

D3 Expert competence: +2 — direct expertise in the field of military security
D4 Consistency of views: +1 — consistent warnings about threats
D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — statements are analytical, not appellative
D6 Source level: -2 — tertiary source (citation of a citation in the debate)

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(d) Řehka's statements are presented as expert authority without mentioning his appointment by the government that supports Pavel; this structural dependence is not thematised in the debate.

Missing expert groups:

- Independent security analyst (e.g. from academia) on hybrid war
- Slovak historian present in the debate on the question of StB archives
- Independent economist on energy and food prices

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Petr Suchoň (ČT reporter)	0	+1	+1	+1	+2	0	+5	GREEN

Summary (matrix result):

- Petr Suchoň: GREEN (+5) — factual inserts, but the selection of facts contains implicit framing
- Karel Řehka (indirect): YELLOW (+3) — expert competence, but structural dependence on the government is not thematised

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Chief of the General Staff Karel Řehka (cited indirectly)	-1	+2	+2	+1	+1	-2	+3	YELLOW



2. SELECTION OF SOURCES

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: STEM agency poll for CNN Prima News

Timestamp 00:44

Statement "according to the current poll by the STEM agency for CNN Prima News, 55% of you have definitely made up your minds"

(a) **Funding and founder:** STEM — independent research agency; CNN Prima News — commercial television, direct competitor of ČT

(b) **Structural conflict of interest:** CNN Prima News is a direct competitor of ČT; citing a poll commissioned by a competitor without mentioning this relationship is problematic

(c) **Missing source:** A ČT poll or an independent agency without ties to a competing medium

Source 2: Jaroslav Kmenta (journalist, author of books about Babiš)

Timestamp 61:22

Statement "it suffices to read the available materials, for example several books by Jaroslav Kmenta"

(a) **Funding and founder:** Private journalist; income from the sale of books criticising Babiš

(b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Kmenta profits from a negative image of Babiš; his works are primarily investigative journalism, not academic historiography

(c) **Missing source:** An academic historian or court-appointed expert without a financial interest in the outcome

Source 3: Researcher Jerguš Sivoš from the Nation's Memory Institute (Slovakia)

Timestamp 58:11

Statement "Mr Jerguš Sivoš, a researcher from the Nation's Memory Institute, says you are listed there, that your name appears in 12 places"

(a) **Funding and founder:** ÚPN — state institution funded by the Slovak government

(b) **Structural conflict of interest:** State institution; the mandate is compatible with archival research, but the researcher is not present and cannot be confronted

(c) **Missing source:** Direct presence of the researcher or an independent historian for cross-verification

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 64:50

Claim: "I received information from close to Mr Pavel about what is being planned, a KGB fabrication"

Verbal marker: "from close to" — anonymous source without verification

Primary source: NO — penalty point +1

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 13:13



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

Claim: "Mrs Černočová who acts as Mr Pavel's spokesperson"

Verbal marker: implicit claim without supporting evidence

Primary source: NO — penalty point +1

Summary: The selection of sources is structurally unbalanced — a poll from a competing medium, a journalist with a financial interest in a negative image of Babiš, and an absent researcher form the basis of factual claims; the overall score is increased by 2 penalty points for unsubstantiated claims.



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Petr Pavel: approximately 22–24 minutes (approx. 32–33%)
- Andrej Babiš: approximately 20–22 minutes (approx. 29–30%)
- Presenter Terezie: approximately 12–14 minutes (approx. 18–19%)
- Petr Suchoň (inserts): approximately 6–8 minutes (approx. 9–10%)
- Other (applause, music, breaks): approximately 6–8 minutes (approx. 9–10%)

Summary: The distribution of time between both candidates is approximately symmetrical, but the qualitative asymmetry lies in the fact that Babiš is repeatedly interrupted and prompted to return to the question (09:41, 10:09, 14:18), while Pavel is given more space to develop arguments; net speaking time is comparable, but effective time for coherent argumentation is asymmetrical.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSIONS

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Omission 1:

Context

Symmetrical assessment of the communist past is absent — Pavel's chairmanship of a basic KSČ organisation is presented as less serious than Babiš's collaboration with the StB, without a historian present who could compare both pasts

Relevant at: 53:14 — 61:07

Effect

The viewer gains the impression that Babiš's past is demonstrably worse, even though the historical assessment is more complex

Omission 2:

Context

There is no mention of the fact that Chief of the General Staff Karel Řehka was appointed by the government of Petr Fiala, which supports Pavel; his statements are presented as neutral expert authority

Relevant at: 17:01 — 17:52

Effect

The viewer perceives Řehka's statements as independent expert assessment, not as statements by a state employee appointed by a government supporting one of the candidates

Omission 3:

Context

There is no mention of the fact that the poll cited in the introduction was commissioned by CNN Prima News — a direct competitor of ČT; this fact is not communicated to the viewer

Relevant at: 00:44

Effect

The poll is presented as neutral data, even though it originates from a competing medium

Summary: Selective omissions concentrate on three areas: asymmetrical assessment of the candidates' pasts, non-disclosure of the institutional ties of cited authorities, and the absence of independent experts; these omissions systematically reinforce the image of Pavel as the more responsible candidate.

Missing Voices

- Independent security analyst: Would provide an objective assessment of hybrid war, mobilisation and Article 5 without partisan affiliation
- Slovak historian or researcher from the ÚPN: Would provide direct testimony on archival findings concerning Babiš without mediation by the presenter
- Independent economist: Would provide analysis of energy prices, food prices and the role of Agrofert without partisan distortion
- Representative of farmers or food producers: Would provide the sector's perspective on food prices outside the frame of Babiš's statements
- Constitutional law expert: Would provide analysis of the constitutionality of the change regarding the deployment of soldiers without dependence on the candidates' statements



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

- Sociologist specialising in polarisation: Would provide an analytical view of the division of society beyond political framing
- Representative of undecided voters: Would bring specific questions and concerns from the group that decides the outcome of the election
- Representative of allied countries or NATO: Would provide international context on security questions without dependence on the candidates' interpretations



5. MANIPULATION OF NUMBERS									3/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	05:04
Number: "3 million voters from the 2021 parliamentary elections have only 2 million representation in the Chamber of Deputies"	
Dimension: (a) absolute value — stated; (b) proportion — missing (what percentage is this of the total number of voters?); (c) trend — missing (how has this developed?)	
Missing context	Babiš does not state that the electoral system with a five-percent threshold is a standard democratic mechanism; the number is presented as evidence of injustice without context
Effect	The viewer may gain the impression that the electoral system is undemocratic, even though it is a standard proportional representation system

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	45:46
Number: "Agrofert increased its revenues over the last two years [...] by 20 to 30 billion"	
Dimension: (a) absolute value — stated approximately; (b) proportion — missing (what share of total revenues is this? what is the margin?); (c) trend — missing (how did revenues develop before the crisis?)	
Missing context	Pavel conflates revenues (turnover) and profits; Babiš draws attention to this (48:36), but the presenter does not resolve this factual error
Effect	The viewer may gain the impression that Agrofert profited from the crisis, even though an increase in turnover does not necessarily correspond to an increase in profits

Summary: Manipulation of numbers is present, but is not the dominant technique; the most serious finding is the presenter's failure to intervene in Pavel's factual error (conflation of turnover and profits), which was left uncorrected.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Association 1:	
Timestamp	31:43
Quote	<i>"for example KSČM Andrej Babiš also met in Děčín with Josef Skála, a prominent face of KSČM"</i>
	Technique: Suchoň's insert explicitly links Babiš to KSČM and Josef Skála; the association is reinforced by the mention that KSČM and Trikolóra received 340,000 votes
Effect	The viewer is led to conclude that Babiš is an ally of the communists, even though this concerns the acceptance of support, not programmatic cooperation

Association 2:	
Timestamp	33:34
Quote	<i>"those totalitarian regimes He was trained as a spy to be deployed abroad"</i>
	Technique: Babiš labels Pavel a spy; the presenter immediately challenges this claim (36:05 "he is not a spy"), but the analogous claim about Babiš and the StB is repeatedly presented in the debate as established fact
Effect	Asymmetrical treatment of associations — Pavel's labelling as a spy is rejected, Babiš's connection to the StB is presented as proven

Association 3:	
Timestamp	44:20
Quote	<i>"MP for KSČM Andrej Babiš"</i>
	Technique: Pavel repeatedly refers to Babiš as "the candidate for KSČM" or "the candidate for KSČ"; the presenter does not correct this label
Effect	Repeated association of Babiš with the communist party without correction by the presenter

Check for persons framed as "conspirators": No persons explicitly labelled as conspirators are present in the debate; the technique of guilt by association is applied through partisan associations.

Chain of associations: Babiš → meeting with Skála → KSČM → communist past → StB → unfit for the presidential office

Summary: Guilt by association is one of the strongest techniques in the debate; it is applied asymmetrically — Babiš's associations with KSČM and the StB are repeatedly thematised and reinforced, while Pavel's labelling as a spy is immediately rejected by the presenter.



7. TIMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:00–02:01 (beginning)

Content: The introduction emphasises Zeman's "four" rating as the worst in history and an atmosphere of "jungle" and "civil war"

Timing effect: Negative framing of the incumbent presidency at the start of the programme sets a context in which change (Pavel) is implicitly desirable; Babiš as Zeman's ally is thereby indirectly disadvantaged

Finding 2:

Position: 31:35–36:07 (middle)

Content: Suchoň's insert about the support of KSČM and Trikolóra for Babiš is placed immediately before the question about the communist past

Timing effect: Sequential placement creates a cumulative effect — first association with KSČM, then the question about the communist past; the viewer is primed to perceive Babiš as connected to the communist tradition

Finding 3:

Position: 52:41–63:40 (middle-end)

Content: The block on the communist past is placed after the economic block and before the closing messages

Timing effect: The most controversial topic (StB, KSČ) is placed in the section when viewers are most engaged; the closing messages cannot then neutralise this topic

Summary: Timing is strategically used to reinforce a negative image of Babiš — negative framing at the beginning, accumulation of associations in the middle, and placement of the most controversial topic in the section with the highest viewer attention.



8. SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage amplifies the finding. Score = outrage level (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 09:41

Triggering event: Babiš digresses from the question about chaos caused by his statement about Poland and starts talking about fear of war

Reaction: "I apologise I am interrupting I am flagging this in advance but because you are evading my question"

Comparison

Pavel, when asked about the "two worlds" (29:03–31:17), repeatedly fails to answer directly the question of whether he acknowledges that his rhetoric may have hurt someone; the presenter repeats the question three times, but does not interrupt or talk over him

Asymmetry: Babiš is interrupted when digressing, Pavel receives repeated chances to answer without interruption; the asymmetry is demonstrable

Finding 2:

Timestamp 13:05

Triggering event: Babiš claims that Černochová "acts as Mr Pavel's spokesperson"

Reaction: "Mrs Černochová is the Minister of Defence" — the presenter immediately corrects this

Comparison

Pavel repeatedly refers to Babiš as "the candidate for KSČM" (44:20) and "the candidate for KSČ" (44:28); the presenter does not correct this label

Asymmetry: The inaccurate label for Černochová is immediately corrected, the inaccurate label for Babiš as a communist candidate remains without correction; the asymmetry is demonstrable

Finding 3:

Timestamp 36:05

Triggering event: Babiš labels Pavel a "spy trained by the KGB"

Reaction: "he is not a spy" — the presenter immediately rejects the label

Comparison

The presenter repeatedly presents Babiš's connection to the StB as established fact (56:34, 58:11) without an analogous rejection

Asymmetry: Pavel's labelling as a spy is rejected, Babiš's connection to the StB is presented as proven; the asymmetry is demonstrable

Degree of indignation: 3/5

Selectivity: 4/5



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

Summary: Selective indignation is one of the strongest techniques in the debate; the presenter intervenes asymmetrically — interrupting Babiš when he digresses, correcting his inaccurate labels, but leaving analogous inaccurate labels on Pavel's part uncorrected.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSIONS — OVERALL PICTURE

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 06:31–08:34

Missing perspective/fact: In the discussion of "chaos" during the Covid crisis, any assessment of the chaos of the governing coalition (Fiala) during the same period is absent — the presenter asks only about Babiš's chaos, not about the chaos of the current government

Relevance: The debate takes place in the context of electing a president who will cooperate with the government; assessment of government chaos is equally relevant as assessment of opposition chaos

Impact

The viewer gains a one-sided picture — chaos is associated exclusively with Babiš, not with the government

Finding 2:

Timestamp 12:00–14:50

Missing perspective/fact: In the discussion of the billboard "the general does not believe in peace", context is absent that government politicians (Fiala, Černočová) had indeed repeatedly used war rhetoric; Babiš points this out, but the presenter does not verify or confirm this fact

Relevance: The factual accuracy of the billboard is key to assessing whether it constitutes manipulation or legitimate political communication

Impact

The viewer is led to conclude that the billboard is manipulative, even though its factual basis is not verified in the debate

Finding 3:

Timestamp 52:41–63:40

Missing perspective/fact: In the discussion of the communist past, a symmetrical assessment is absent — Pavel's chairmanship of a basic KSCĚ organisation is presented as less serious without historical context; a present historian is absent

Relevance: The historical assessment of the communist past is a key topic of the campaign; without an independent historian, the assessment depends on the candidates' statements

Impact

The viewer lacks tools for independent assessment; the debate implicitly confirms Pavel's self-interpretation as less compromised

Summary: Systematic omission covers three areas: asymmetrical assessment of chaos (only Babiš's, not the government's), failure to verify the factual basis of Babiš's claims about the war rhetoric of government politicians, and the absence of an independent historian when assessing the communist past.

The Czech presidential election of 2023 took place in the context of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the energy crisis and a deep values-based division within Czech society. The two candidates represented different worldview camps: Pavel symbolised pro-European, Atlantic, values-based liberalism with an emphasis on security responsibility, while Babiš represented the national-populist camp with an emphasis on peace, economic interests and scepticism towards escalation of the conflict. The debate took place in an atmosphere of strong polarisation, with both sides accusing the



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

other of dividing society. The key tension was whether the Czech Republic should actively support Ukraine and NATO, or seek a diplomatic solution, and how to evaluate the communist past of both candidates.

Share of covered perspectives

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

- [A] Security experts independent of both government and opposition on the question of hybrid war and mobilisation
- [B] Economic analysts on energy prices, food prices and the role of Agrofert
- [C] Historians to assess the communist past of both candidates symmetrically
- [D] Voters from various social groups (rural areas, industrial regions, Prague)
- [E] Legal experts on the question of constitutional change regarding the deployment of soldiers
- [F] Slovak researchers on the question of the StB and archives (independent assessment)
- [G] NATO representatives on the interpretation of Article 5 and collective defence
- [H] Sociologists on the phenomenon of a divided society and its causes
- [I] Representatives of farmers and food producers on food prices
- [J] Voters deciding between candidates, with their specific concerns

[A] INDICATED

Timestamp: 17:01 — Quote: "Mr Řehka tells us the Czech Republic would, in his view, become a legitimate target" — Assessment: The Chief of the General Staff is cited as an authority, but an independent security expert is absent; the perspective is filtered through the candidates' partisan positions.

[B] INDICATED

Timestamp: 45:46 — Quote: "Agrofert increased its revenues over the last two years [...] by 20 to 30 billion" — Assessment: Economic analysis is presented through mutual accusations by the candidates, not by an independent economist; a neutral analyst is absent.

[C] INDICATED

Timestamp: 53:14 — Quote: "historians in Slovakia have been researching those archives" — Assessment: Historians are mentioned indirectly, but are not present; the assessment of both candidates' pasts is not symmetrical (see Step 3, criterion 8).

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Voters from various social groups are neither present nor quoted; polls are mentioned in aggregate without differentiation.

[E] INDICATED

Timestamp: 24:02 — Quote: "the government could be given the right to decide on the deployment of soldiers abroad" — Assessment: The question is posed, but without a legal expert; the assessment depends on the candidates' statements.

[F] INDICATED

Timestamp: 58:11 — Quote: "Mr Jerguš Sivoš, a researcher from the Nation's Memory Institute, says you are listed there, that your name appears in 12 places" — Assessment: A Slovak researcher is quoted by the presenter, but is not present; Babiš disputes his conclusions without the possibility of direct confrontation.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Representatives of NATO or allied countries are not quoted; interpretation of Article 5 depends solely on the candidates' statements.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Sociological analysis of a divided society is entirely absent; the topic is framed politically, not analytically.



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

[I] INDICATED

Timestamp: 45:01 — Quote: "bakers sell a bread roll to chains for one crown seventy" — Assessment: The perspective of farmers and food producers is presented exclusively by Babiš; an independent representative of the sector is absent.

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Undecided voters are mentioned statistically in the introduction (01:09), but their specific questions and concerns are not incorporated into the debate.

Completeness score: 4/10

Rationale: The debate covers key topics (security, economy, the past), but almost exclusively through the confrontation of two candidates without independent experts, historians, economists or representatives of affected groups. Four of the ten perspectives are entirely absent, six are indicated only indirectly. The super duel format structurally limits the depth of analysis, but the statutory obligation of balance is not suspended by this.



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

01:54

Quote

"today's super duel battle for the castle can give a great deal away"

Manipulation

The name "Battle for the Castle" frames the presidential election as a military conflict, not as a democratic selection process; the militaristic metaphor reinforces polarisation

Why it is problematic: Framing the election as a "battle" normalises a confrontational atmosphere and impedes constructive dialogue, which the presenter herself calls for in the introduction

Finding 2:

Timestamp

06:09

Quote

"there has been enough chaos I offer order and dignity"

Manipulation

Suchoň's insert presents Pavel's billboard as legitimate political communication without critical assessment; the analogous insert about Babiš's billboard (12:00) is presented with markedly more critical framing

Why it is problematic: Asymmetrical framing of campaign materials reinforces the image of Pavel as a positive candidate and Babiš as a negative one

Finding 3:

Timestamp

16:05

Quote

"what Mr Babiš is doing is burying his head in the sand"

Manipulation

Pavel's statement is presented without the presenter's correction or challenge; analogous statements by Babiš about Pavel are repeatedly challenged

Why it is problematic: Selective acceptance of evaluative statements reinforces the frame in which Pavel is a responsible analyst and Babiš an irresponsible populist

Summary: Framing is systematically asymmetrical — Pavel's positions are framed as responsible and analytical, Babiš's as populist and chaotic; this frame is reinforced by the selection of topics, the timing of inserts and the selective correction of statements.



11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

02:09

Quote

"in the first round of the election Mr Andrej Babiš finished second"

Manipulation

Babiš is introduced as "second" (the loser), Pavel as "the winner of the first round"; the order of candidate introductions and the choice of words establishes a hierarchy

Why it is problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "both candidates advanced to the second round with results of X and Y percent"; the label "second" in the context of the debate connotes inferiority

Finding 2:

Timestamp

12:40

Quote

"many people were frightened by that billboard Children and elderly people were genuinely frightened"

Manipulation

The presenter accepts as fact that the billboard "frightened" people without verifying this claim; the word "frightened" has a strong negative connotation

Why it is problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "the billboard was criticised as fear-inducing"; accepting an emotional evaluation as fact is a value judgement disguised as reporting

Finding 3:

Timestamp

44:20

Quote

"MP for KSČM Andrej Babiš"

Manipulation

Pavel repeatedly refers to Babiš as "the candidate for KSČM" or "for KSČ"; the presenter does not correct this label, even though Babiš is the chairman of ANO

Why it is problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "MP Babiš"; accepting an inaccurate label without correction is an implicit confirmation of the association

Summary: The choice of words systematically reinforces a negative image of Babiš — the label "second", acceptance of the emotional assessment of the billboard as fact, and tolerance of inaccurate labels on Pavel's part without correction.



12. PRESENTER BEHAVIOUR

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetrical if comparable triggers in other guests did not produce an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 09:41

Triggering event: Babiš digresses from the question about chaos caused by his statement about Poland and starts talking about fear of war

Quote (presenter) *"I apologise I am interrupting I am flagging this in advance but because you are evading my question"*

Comparison Pavel, when asked about the "two worlds" (29:03), repeatedly fails to answer directly; the presenter repeats the question three times (30:55, 30:59), but does not interrupt or talk over him

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — Babiš is interrupted when digressing, Pavel receives repeated chances without interruption

Finding 2:

Timestamp 36:05

Triggering event: Babiš labels Pavel a "spy trained by the KGB"

Quote (presenter) *"he is not a spy"*

Comparison Pavel refers to Babiš as "the candidate for KSČM" (44:20) and "the candidate for KSČ" (44:28); the presenter does not correct this label

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — the inaccurate label for Pavel is immediately rejected, the inaccurate label for Babiš remains without correction

Finding 3:

Timestamp 48:52

Triggering event: Babiš tells Pavel "you are lying" in response to claims about Agrofert subsidies

Quote (presenter) *"gentlemen Let's go let's go"*

Comparison Pavel tells Babiš "you were taught wrongly" (44:58) and "again wrongly Mr Pavel again you were taught wrongly" (44:58 — Babiš's statement, but Pavel says analogous things); the presenter does not intervene in Pavel's evaluative statements about Babiš's competence

Asymmetry: Mild — the presenter intervenes in the case of a direct accusation of lying, but not in the case of repeated evaluative statements about competence



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

Summary: The presenter's behaviour exhibits systematic asymmetry — Babiš is interrupted when digressing, his inaccurate labels are corrected, while Pavel's digressions and inaccurate labels are tolerated; this asymmetry is documentable on the basis of comparable triggering events.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Asymmetry 1:

To Babiš, 12:40: "many people were frightened by that billboard Children and elderly people were genuinely frightened [...] is that not an admission of populism cynicism" — hard, evaluative question with an implicit accusation
To Pavel, 06:14: "whose chaos do you mean against whom are you saying this" — neutral, factual question without an evaluative frame

Comparison

The question to Babiš contains an evaluative judgement (populism, cynicism), the question to Pavel is factual; the asymmetry is demonstrable

Asymmetry 2:

To Babiš, 32:10: "that conversation with Mr Skála lasted 20 minutes [...] Did you promise the communists something in exchange for that support" — direct accusation of corruption formulated as a question
To Pavel, 69:45: "how will you guarantee to citizens that you will not be beholden to them" — general question without a specific accusation

Comparison

Babiš is asked a question implying corruption (did you promise the communists something?), Pavel a general question about obligations; the asymmetry is demonstrable

Asymmetry 3:

To Babiš, 56:34: "You are still listed in Slovakia in the files as a StB agent" — a claim presented as fact within a question
To Pavel, 53:39: "You were a soldier in the Czechoslovak People's Army, which was one of the instruments of the totalitarian regime" — neutral historical context without an evaluative judgement

Comparison

Babiš's past is framed as proven collaboration with the StB, Pavel's as historical context; the asymmetry is demonstrable

Summary: Question asymmetry is systematic and demonstrable — Babiš is asked questions with implicit accusations and evaluative judgements, Pavel questions that are factual or general; this asymmetry is one of the strongest findings of the analysis.



14. FALSE BALANCE									3/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 52:51

Construct: "you were both gentlemen in the KSČ before November 89 you both apologised for it"

Analysis

The presenter presents the communist past of both candidates as symmetrical, even though their involvement was qualitatively different — Pavel was a rank-and-file member and chairman of a student organisation, while Babiš is accused of collaboration with the StB; the false symmetry "both were in the KSČ" conceals this qualitative difference

Summary: False balance is present to a limited extent — primarily in the framing of the communist past as symmetrical; overall the debate does not exhibit a marked tendency towards false balance, but rather towards asymmetrical treatment.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda item set: Support for Ukraine and NATO is presented as a self-evident and unquestionable norm; Babiš's scepticism is framed as a deviation from the norm

Timestamp

15:56 — Evidence: "what Mr Babiš is doing is burying his head in the sand"

Alternative agenda: A legitimate debate about a peaceful resolution to the conflict, the costs of supporting Ukraine for the Czech economy, or alternative security strategies

Finding 2:

Agenda item set: Petr Fiala's governing coalition is implicitly presented as responsible and competent; criticism of the government is received as less legitimate than criticism of Babiš

Timestamp

07:32 — Evidence: "The current government certainly does not do everything right, there is no doubt about that I am talking about chaos" — the presenter accepts Pavel's distinction without challenge

Alternative agenda: Symmetrical assessment of the chaos and mistakes of the governing coalition

Summary: Agenda-setting systematically reinforces the Atlantic-pro-European frame as the norm and presents Babiš's scepticism as a deviation; alternative perspectives (peaceful resolution, criticism of government policy) are marginalised or received with less intensity.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Selection of experts	T	7	Cited experts have structural ties to the government camp that are not thematised
2	Selection of sources	T	6	A poll from a competing medium and a journalist with a financial interest are presented as neutral sources
3	Time allocation	T	4	Net time is approximately symmetrical, but effective time for coherent argumentation is asymmetrical
4	Omissions	T	7	Assessment of government chaos, institutional ties of cited authorities and independent historians are systematically absent
5	Manipulation of numbers	T	3	Pavel's factual error (conflation of turnover and profits) was left without correction by the presenter
6	Guilt by association	T	8	Association of Babiš with KSČM and the StB is repeatedly reinforced, analogous associations of Pavel are rejected
7	Timing	T	5	Negative framing of Babiš is strategically placed at the beginning and middle of the programme
8	Selective indignation	T	7	The presenter interrupts Babiš when he digresses, but tolerates analogous digressions by Pavel
9	Completeness	T	7	Independent experts, symmetrical assessment of chaos and historical context are systematically absent
10	Framing	M	7	Pavel's positions are framed as responsible, Babiš's as populist and chaotic
11	Choice of words	M	6	Evaluative statements about Babiš are accepted as facts, analogous statements about Pavel are rejected
12	Presenter behaviour	M	8	Systematic asymmetry in interruptions, corrections and tolerance of evaluative statements
13	Question asymmetry	M	7	Babiš is asked questions with implicit accusations, Pavel questions that are factual or general
14	False balance	M	3	The communist past of both candidates is presented as symmetrical, even though it is qualitatively different
15	Agenda-setting	M	6	The Atlantic-pro-European frame is presented as the norm, Babiš's scepticism as a deviation

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 1–9): 6.0 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 10–15): 6.2 / 10



Dominant techniques

- 1. Guilt by association (score 8):** The association of Babiš with KSČM and the StB is repeatedly reinforced through Suchoň's inserts, Pavel's statements and the presenter's questions; analogous associations of Pavel are immediately rejected; this technique is the strongest finding of the analysis and is applied systematically throughout the debate.
- 2. Presenter behaviour (score 8):** The presenter exhibits demonstrable asymmetry in interruptions (Babiš interrupted, Pavel not), corrections (Babiš's inaccurate labels corrected, Pavel's not) and tolerance of evaluative statements; this asymmetry is documentable on the basis of comparable triggering events.
- 3. Question asymmetry (score 7):** Babiš is systematically asked questions with implicit accusations (populism, cynicism, corruption, StB), while Pavel is asked factual or general questions; this asymmetry is demonstrable on specific examples and represents a structural violation of the principle of balance.

Key messages of the programme

****MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT):** ** "Andrej Babiš is a source of chaos, populism and irresponsibility, while Petr Pavel represents order, responsibility and values."

Technique: Framing, question asymmetry, selective indignation — Evidence: 07:13, 12:40, 16:05

****MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** ** "Babiš's past (StB, KSČM) is proven and serious, while Pavel's past (KSČ) is understandable and reflected upon."

Technique: Guilt by association, asymmetrical framing of the past, selective correction — Evidence: 31:43, 36:05, 44:20, 56:34

****MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** ** "Support for Ukraine, NATO and the Atlantic orientation is a responsible norm; scepticism towards escalation is irresponsible populism."

Technique: Agenda-setting, framing, selection of experts — Evidence: 15:56, 17:01, 22:37

Rationale: The overall score of 6.1/10 corresponds to the category of clear one-sidedness. The debate exhibits demonstrable asymmetries in presenter behaviour, selection of questions, framing and the application of guilt by association, which systematically reinforce a positive image of Petr Pavel and a negative image of Andrej Babiš. These asymmetries are documentable on specific examples with comparable triggering events, which satisfies the methodological requirement for the assessment of selectivity. The programme does not meet the requirement of §2(2) of Act No. 483/1991 Coll. on "overall balanced" information, nor the requirement of §31(3) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. on "balanced representation of opposing views" on a politically controversial topic.

CONCLUSION

The analysed debate "Super duel — Battle for the Castle" (ČT, January 2023) exhibits systematic asymmetries which, taken together, constitute clear one-sidedness in favour of candidate Petr Pavel and to the detriment of candidate Andrej Babiš. The strongest findings are the asymmetrical behaviour of the presenter (interruptions, corrections, tolerance of evaluative statements), the asymmetry of questions (implicit accusations vs. factual questions) and the systematic application of guilt by association (associating Babiš with KSČM and the StB without analogous treatment of Pavel's associations). These findings are demonstrable on the basis of comparable triggering events in accordance with the methodological principle K11+K8. The programme does not meet the statutory requirements of §2(2) of Act No. 483/1991 Coll. and §31(2) and (3) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. on objectivity, balance and the separation of evaluative commentary from news reporting. The seriousness of the findings is compounded by the fact that this is a live broadcast of a presidential debate with a direct impact on the electoral decision-making of millions of citizens.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	SELECTION OF EXPERTS	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
2	SELECTION OF SOURCES	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
3	TIME ALLOCATION	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSIONS	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
5	MANIPULATION OF NUMBERS	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
7	TIMING	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
8	SELECTIVE INDIGNATION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
9	SELECTIVE OMISSIONS — OVERALL PICTURE	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
10	FRAMING	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
11	CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
12	PRESENTER BEHAVIOUR	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
14	FALSE BALANCE	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
15	AGENDA-SETTING	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.0/10

Significant imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

6.2/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

6.1/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



KEY — Score Definitions

Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant anomaly detected.
1–2	Weak finding	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
3–4	Slight to moderate finding	Recognizable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance affecting the audience's opinion-forming potential.
6	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores of 6 and above are classified as 'significant findings.'
7	Significant finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with distinct impact relevance.
8–9	Severe finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality standard.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but within tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Significant imbalance	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of perspective diversity.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high bias degree	Maximum severity across nearly all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favored	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
+3 to +5	Strongly favored	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (§2 of the ČT Act / §31 of Act No. 231/2001)

Assessment under §2 of the ČT Act / §31 of Act No. 231/2001

Violation 1:

Standard: §31(2) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. — obligation to ensure the objectivity and balance of information content and to separate evaluative commentary from news reporting

Facts: The presenter repeatedly accepts evaluative statements by one candidate as facts without challenging them, while immediately rejecting or correcting analogous statements by the other candidate

Evidence: Timestamp 36:05 — Quote: "he is not a spy" (immediate rejection of Babiš's labelling of Pavel) vs. timestamp 44:20 — Quote: "MP for KSČM Andrej Babiš" (Pavel's inaccurate labelling of Babiš without correction)

Assessment: This behaviour violates the obligation to separate evaluative commentary from news reporting and the obligation to ensure objectivity; the presenter de facto accepts the evaluative frame of one candidate as the neutral basis of the debate

Violation 2:

Standard: §31(3) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. — obligation to ensure balanced representation of opposing views on politically and economically controversial topics

Facts: In the discussion of security policy, hybrid war and support for Ukraine, exclusively authorities structurally linked to the government camp are cited (the Chief of the General Staff appointed by the Fiala government, government politicians); alternative security perspectives are not represented by independent experts

Evidence: Timestamp 17:01 — Quote: "Mr Řehka tells us the Czech Republic would, in his view, become a legitimate target" — presented as expert authority without mention of the institutional tie to the government camp

Assessment: This violates the obligation of balanced representation of opposing views on a politically controversial topic; the security debate is conducted exclusively within the Atlantic-pro-European consensus without representation of alternative perspectives

Violation 3:

Standard: §2(2)(a) of Act No. 483/1991 Coll. — obligation to provide objective, verified, overall balanced and comprehensive information for the free formation of opinions

Facts: A factual error by candidate Pavel (conflation of Agrofert's turnover and profits) was left without correction by the presenter, even though Babiš drew attention to it; the presenter, however, repeatedly corrects Babiš's factual inaccuracies

Evidence: Timestamp 45:46 — Quote: "Agrofert increased its revenues over the last two years [...] by 20 to 30 billion" — Babiš's correction (48:36): "please Mr P you are lying [...] 7.5 billion is turnover you do not understand what profit and turnover are" — the presenter does not intervene

Assessment: The asymmetrical correction of factual errors violates the obligation to provide verified information; the viewer is unable to distinguish factually correct and incorrect claims if the presenter intervenes selectively

Overall assessment under §2 of the ČT Act / §31 of Act No. 231/2001

The analysed debate exhibits three demonstrable violations of the statutory obligations of public service broadcasting. The most serious violation is the asymmetrical behaviour of the presenter in corrections and interruptions, which is documentable on the basis of comparable triggering events and satisfies the methodological requirement for the assessment of selectivity. The second serious violation is the absence of balanced representation of opposing views in the security debate, where exclusively authorities structurally linked to the government camp are cited. The third violation is the asymmetrical correction of factual errors, which impedes the viewer's free formation of opinions. These violations are systemic and demonstrable, not isolated; their cumulative effect corresponds to the category of clear one-sidedness with an overall score of 6.1/10.

IN-DEPTH SOURCE CHECK (mandatory for all cited expert institutions / NGOs / advisory bodies)

President: Schlaepfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Address:** SVFAB, P/O-Box, CH-8021 Zurich 1



Nation's Memory Institute (ÚPN), Slovakia

- FUNDING:** State institution funded by the Slovak government; established by Act No. 553/2002 Coll.
- MANDATE:** The mandate includes management of StB archives and research into the communist past; compatible with archival research, but dependent on the political environment
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** State institution; in the context of a presidential debate in a neighbouring country, its outputs may be politically instrumentalised; researcher Sivoš is not present and cannot be confronted
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — state institution, political dependence
 - D2 Personal risk: +2 — researchers face political pressure
 - D3 Expert competence: +2 — direct archival expertise
 - D4 Consistency: +1 — consistent archival outputs
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — archival data, not appellative statements
 - D6 Source level: -2 — tertiary source (citation of a citation in the debate)**TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTERVOICE:** Babiš disputes the ÚPN's conclusions and refers to court decisions; an independent historian present in the debate is absent

STEM poll for CNN Prima News

- FUNDING:** STEM — independent research agency; CNN Prima News — commercial television, direct competitor of ČT
- MANDATE:** Public opinion polling is compatible with STEM's mandate; the commissioning party CNN Prima News has an interest in viewership and may influence the formulation of questions
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** CNN Prima News as commissioning party and direct competitor of ČT; citing the poll without mentioning this relationship is problematic
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — commissioning party is a direct competitor of ČT
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 — STEM has a reputational interest in accuracy
 - D3 Expert competence: +2 — STEM is an established research agency
 - D4 Consistency: +1 — methodologically consistent
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — quantitative data
 - D6 Source level: +2 — primary source (own poll)**TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN (methodologically), but YELLOW (institutionally — the commissioning party is a competitor of ČT)**
- COUNTERVOICE:** A ČT poll or an independent agency without ties to a competing medium is absent

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" or "respected" is not a substantive qualification. It is a social attribution that is itself subject to verification — see the labelling of Jaroslav Kmenta as a "respected journalist" by Pavel (61:32) and its immediate challenge by Babiš (61:39 "a corrupt journalist"); the presenter does not resolve this exchange on its merits.

Legal and Methodological Notes

No factual determination

The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams, or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardized operationalization, not a finding of individual responsibility.

No legal judgment

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under Zákon o ČT / Zákon č. 231/2001. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular RRTV).



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

**No proof of
causation**

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.

**No judgment of
intent**

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.

**Heuristic
comparison tool**

The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

Legal Framework

Czech public television is governed by the Czech Television Act (Zákon o České televizi, č. 483/1991 Sb.) and the Broadcasting Act (Zákon o provozování rozhlasového a televizního vysílání, č. 231/2001 Sb.). These laws mandate that Česká televize provides objective, verified, balanced and comprehensive information for the free formation of opinions. The Broadcasting Act further requires all broadcasters to ensure objectivity and balance in news programming and to clearly separate factual reporting from evaluative commentary.

Key Provisions

- §2 odst. 2 písm. a) Zákona o ČT: "poskytování objektivních, ověřených, ve svém celku vyvážených a všestranných informací pro svobodné vytváření názorů" — Provision of objective, verified, balanced and comprehensive information for free opinion formation.
- §31 odst. 2 Zákona č. 231/2001 Sb.: Broadcasters must ensure objectivity and balance of information content; evaluative commentary must be clearly separated from factual reporting.
- §31 odst. 3: In programmes dealing with political or economic controversies, the broadcaster must ensure balanced representation of competing views.
- §31 odst. 4: The right of reply must be granted to persons or groups whose reputation or rights may have been affected.
- §2 odst. 2 písm. b) Zákona o ČT: ČT must create and broadcast programmes for all population groups, including minorities and disadvantaged groups.

Regulatory Body

Rada pro rozhlasové a televizní vysílání (RRTV) — Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting. 13 members appointed by the Prime Minister on nomination from the Chamber of Deputies. Complaints can be filed via data box, e-mail (info@rrtv.cz), or in person. Response window: 30 days. Limitation period: 3 years.



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

References

- 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



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

Reports and Membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you will find detailed reports and can also commission custom analyses for any broadcast (billed separately). To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership fees and donations.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via www.svfab.ch or kontakt@svfab.ch



Unbalanced Reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: Manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. Additionally, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques – fostering not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**.

Also available as an **audiobook**.



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage – and someone else has written the script.

Those who don't know this deliver material. Good quotes that get cut wrong. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox – for everyone who faces a microphone and wants to know what to do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three principles of sovereignty – anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what matters after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers – for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. So they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and when difficulties arise



You think you see the world. In reality you see the frame someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It doesn't change the facts – it changes what we make of the facts. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works – because we all play along. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook – playful, direct, full of real-life examples. You don't just learn how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame – and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.



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

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and the occasional smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.