



## MTVA DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-11-25\_48-perc

Programme: MTVA-Sendung (M1/Kossuth Rádió) | 2025-11-25 | Analysed: 2026-05-24 22:12  
Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Mércé: Mttv. §83

### TOTAL SCORE

**7.9/10**

*Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on the Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) classifies parties on a left-right scale based on a survey of 609 political scientists (0 = far left, 10 = far right). We apply the Pew Research Center (2025) thresholds: <4.5 = Left, 4.5–5.5 = Centre, >5.5 = Right. This enables an objective classification of perceived party-political bias.

Party	DK	MSZP	Momentum	LMP	KDNP	Fidesz	Mi Hazánk
CHES	1.69	2.31	3.15	3.46	6.92	7.77	9.31
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Left	Right	Right	Right

The overall tendency appears on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-leaning, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-leaning). The calculation is based on the difference between the average advantage of left-wing and right-wing parties (grouped according to CHES 2024).

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**5.0 / 10**

**Balanced**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — [chesdata.eu](https://chesdata.eu) | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](https://doi.org/10.1017/XES.2022.1) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](https://www.pewresearch.org/)

This section provides political context and is not included in the total score.



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

In Hungary, Fidesz-KDNP has governed without interruption since 2010, currently holding a two-thirds parliamentary majority (135 seats out of 199). The most significant opposition force since 2024 is TISZA (the Respect and Freedom party led by Magyar Péter), which received 29.6% in the 2024 EP elections. The other opposition parties (DK, Momentum, Jobbik, LMP, MSZP, Mi Hazánk) are fragmented and weakened.

Party	CHES left-right	Seats	Government/Opposition	Base position
MSZP	3,00	(United Opp.)	Opposition	Left, social democratic
MKKP	3,50	0	Outside parliament	Left, satirical-libertarian
LMP	3,79	(United Opp.)	Opposition	Left, green-progressive
Momentum	4,17	(United Opp.)	Opposition	Centre-left, pro-EU
DK	4,28	(United Opp.)	Opposition	Centre-left
TISZA	6,17	— (new 2024)	Opposition (strongest)	Centre-right, anti-corruption
Jobbik	6,47	(United Opp.)	Opposition	Centre-right (moderated)
Fidesz-KDNP	8,61	135	Government (2/3)	Far right, authoritarian-nationalist
Mi Hazánk	9,29	6	Opposition	Far right

Hungarian political life is defined by four main fault lines: (1) the systemic conflict between Fidesz-KDNP and all opposition forces over the rule of law, media freedom and corruption; (2) the stance on the Russian–Ukrainian war, where the government advocates a peace narrative and most of the opposition advocates solidarity with Ukraine; (3) the quality of the relationship with the EU, where Fidesz is pro-sovereignty and the opposition is pro-European; (4) ahead of the 2026 parliamentary elections, the emergence of TISZA as a new, dominant opposition force is fundamentally reshaping the balance of power.

MTVA (M1, M2, M4, M5, Duna) operates as a de facto government media outlet: the public media law (Mtv.) formally requires balance, but the NMHH Media Council has been composed entirely of Fidesz delegates since 2010 and does not sanction structural violations. The KESMA foundation (approx. 500 media companies since 2018) has consolidated pro-government media; the independent press (Telex.hu, 444.hu, RTL Klub, ATV) operates in an increasingly restricted space. Hungary ranks 85th on the Reporters Without Borders press freedom index — the worst ranking in the EU.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Portrayal in the programme vs. party programme position
Fidesz-KDNP	-4	02:08 "the American government, and let us add, the Hungarian government has committed itself to ensuring that there is peace here" — Programme position: sovereignist, peace narrative — distorted: the government's NATO membership, votes on arms deliveries, and dual communication are not mentioned; it appears exclusively in a positive frame. Around 26:00 the host treats the Index article as "leaked material" and conveys the Fidesz narrative without criticism.
TISZA	-5	00:26 "we'll drag everyone in immediately" — Programme position: pragmatic, pro-European security policy, anti-corruption — actively distorted: the statement by Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz is taken out of context and repeatedly equated with Ukrainian forced conscription (15:34, 16:26, 16:31); TISZA's economic programme is discussed as an unverified "leaked document" (25:56); the party's candidates are framed as "left-wing globalists" (39:44).
DK	0	Not featured in the programme.
Momentum	0	Not featured in the programme.
Jobbik	0	Not featured in the programme.
Mi Hazánk	0	Not featured in the programme.
LMP	0	Not featured in the programme.
MSZP	0	Not featured in the programme.

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: Fidesz-KDNP (-4) — the government's positions are at least partially conveyed, though without criticism and selectively.
- Strongest distortion: TISZA (-5) — the party's programme positions are actively falsified, its security policy stance is equated with forced conscription, and its economic programme is attacked on the basis of an unverified document.
- Average deviation from 0: 4.5
- Conclusion: The programme is exclusively relevant from the perspective of Fidesz-KDNP and TISZA, and while it conveys the governing party's positions in a positive frame without criticism, it consistently and systematically portrays TISZA in a negative light — falsifying its programme positions, taking its statements out of context, and ideologically labelling its candidates.

### Overall left-right tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -4.2

CLASSIFICATION: Strongly right-leaning

Justification: The programme in its entirety reinforces the Fidesz-KDNP peace narrative and sovereignist frame, while portraying TISZA — the only substantive opposition force appearing in the programme — as pro-war, irresponsible and subservient to Brussels. The other parties across the left-right spectrum are entirely absent; the concept of "left-liberal elite" appears as a pejorative frame (21:07, 23:58).



## CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME DATA AND TOPIC FRAMES

### Programme data

- Title: 48 perc (M1, MTVA)
- Date: Not determinable from the filename; based on internal references, late 2024 / early 2025 (Croatian conscription introduced January 2026, Danish July registration, TISZA primary second round)
- Estimated length: approx. 49 minutes (estimate based on transcript)
- Host / Reporter: Töröcsik Zsolt (host); Kriák Krisztina (Zagreb correspondent); Nol Kati (Berlin correspondent); Attila (Copenhagen/Scandinavian correspondent — full name not mentioned)
- Invited guests:

Person	Role	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Horváth József	Director of the Sovereignty Protection Research Institute	Pro-government institution	Close to far right, Fidesz sympathiser
Filipp Dávid	Influencer, former volunteer reservist soldier	Not identified as a party member	Pro-government narrative
Márk-Zay Péter	Mayor of Hódmezővásárhely, 2022 opposition prime ministerial candidate	President of the Mindenki Magyarországa Mozgalom	Centre-left/centre-right, opposition

### Main topic

The programme consists of two parts: the first part discusses the question of the reintroduction of conscription in Europe exclusively within a pro-government frame, and the second part questions Márk-Zay Péter about the TISZA primary and economic programme.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard facts — countable and scientifically grounded

#### Hardfacts — 9 measurable and scientifically verifiable techniques

##### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

#### Expert 1: Horváth József — Director of the Sovereignty Protection Research Institute

Timestamp: 00:45

Statement: "an artificial fear has been successfully generated and constructed here in Europe"

Classification: Head of a pro-government institution; the Sovereignty Protection Research Institute was established by the Fidesz government in 2023, with the primary task of combating "foreign influence" — which in the government's narrative refers to the opposition and civil organisations.

Missing counter-opinion: An independent security analyst (e.g. from RAND Europe, IISS, or the Hungarian Institute for Strategic and Defence Research).

Source deep analysis:

**(a) FUNDING:** A state-funded institution established and directed by the Fidesz government. Structural conflict of interest: the institution's raison d'être is based on supporting the government's narrative.

**(b) MANDATE:** The institution's mandate (sovereignty protection = protection of the government narrative) is incompatible with neutral security analysis.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — State funding, pro-government mandate

D2 Personal risk: -2 — Risks nothing by reinforcing the government narrative

D3 Professional competence: 0 — Political science background, but security analysis not verified

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistently says the same thing

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -2 — "artificial fear", "brainwashing" — emotional, data-free

D6 Source level: -1 — Secondary, own interpretation

**TOTAL: -6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** The programme introduces him as "director", which implies a neutral expert status, even though the institution is structurally pro-government.

#### Expert 2: Filipp Dávid — influencer

Timestamp: 00:50

Statement: "I was a reservist soldier for five years... the volunteer reserve force is perfect for this"

Classification: Social media personality, former volunteer reservist; military or security professional qualifications not verified.

Missing counter-opinion: Military sociologist, defence policy expert.



Source deep analysis:

(a) **FUNDING:** Unknown; as an influencer, he may have income from pro-government media channels.

(b) **MANDATE:** No formal mandate; generalises from personal experience.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Reinforces pro-government narrative, possible financial interest

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Minimal risk

D3 Professional competence: -2 — Influencer, not a military or security expert

D4 Opinion consistency: 0 — Not verifiable

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -1 — Partly personal experience, partly speculation

D6 Source level: -2 — Personal opinion, tertiary

**TOTAL: -7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED**

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** The programme introduces him as "influencer", which at least formally indicates non-expert status, but treats him as an expert on the question of conscription.

*Missing expert groups:*

- Independent military strategic analyst
- Constitutional lawyer (legal status of conscription)
- Sociologist (attitudes of young people with empirical data)

Summary: Both invited guests speak from a structurally pro-government position; neither has verified, independent professional security competence. The source traffic light is red in both cases.

**Source credibility overview:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
expert: Horváth József — Director of the Sovereignty Protection Research Institute	-2	-2	0	+1	-2	-1	-6	RED
expert: Filipp Dávid — influencer	-1	-1	-2	0	-1	-2	-7	RED



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

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Total score: 8/10

Definition: What sources are cited? Are they varied and independent?

### Source 1: Statement by Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz (TISZA)

Timestamp: 00:26

Statement: "we'll drag everyone in if there's trouble"

**(a) Funding and operator:** A TISZA party politician — an opposition source, but cited in the programme exclusively in a negative frame.

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** The statement is cited out of context, repeatedly equated with forced conscription; the full original text is not heard.

**(c) Missing counter-source:** Ruszin-Szendi's own explanation, the text of TISZA's defence programme.

Rumour check (penalty points):

#### Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 25:56

Claim: "the party's economic programme has leaked" — based on Index

Signal word: "leaked"

Primary source present: NO — the host summarises the content of the Index article, the original document is not presented, its authenticity is not verified — +1 penalty point

#### Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 13:53

Claim: "Ursula von der Leyen said that Europe must be ready for war by 2030"

Signal word: No signal word, but the quote is imprecise and without context

Primary source present: NO — the original statement's text, date and context are not mentioned — +1 penalty point

#### Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 01:48

Claim: "what the French chief of staff said, that we must prepare for our children to die at the front"

Signal word: "said" — but source, date and context are absent

Primary source present: NO — +1 penalty point

Summary: The programme presents three unverified claims without primary sources as facts; the only source relating to TISZA (Ruszin-Szendi's statement) is cited out of context, repeatedly in a negative frame. Total: 3 penalty points.



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

Total score: 8/10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Horváth József (pro-government): approx. 8 minutes (16%)
- Filipp Dávid (pro-government): approx. 10 minutes (20%)
- Törőcsik Zsolt (host): approx. 12 minutes (25%)
- Correspondents (Kriák, Nol Kati, Attila — partly in a pro-government frame): approx. 7 minutes (14%)
- Márk-Zay Péter (opposition): approx. 13 minutes (27%)

Note: Márk-Zay Péter appears to receive significant time, but in the second part the host continuously interrupts him, the questions are aggressive, and the guest is forced into a defensive position. In the first part (conscriptio), not a single opposition voice is heard — the full 25 minutes conveys exclusively a pro-government narrative.

Summary: The first part (conscriptio) contains 100% pro-government voices; in the second part Márk-Zay Péter does speak, but due to the asymmetry of moderation his actual opportunity for substantive contribution is limited.



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: What is not presented, even though it would be relevant?

#### Omission 1:

Context: The full text and context of Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz's statement

Relevant: 00:26–00:35

Effect: The fragment "we'll drag everyone in" is taken out of context and repeatedly equated with forced conscription; the original meaning of the statement (explaining the legal status of conscription) is lost.

#### Omission 2:

Context: NATO Article 5 and Hungary's collective defence obligations

Relevant: 00:54–03:22 (the entire first segment)

Effect: The reintroduction of conscription can only be interpreted as "Brussels manipulation" if the obligations arising from NATO membership are not mentioned.

#### Omission 3:

Context: The text of TISZA's actual economic programme

Relevant: 25:56–34:02

Effect: The programme bases its anti-TISZA questions on a "leaked" document while not presenting the party's official programme — thus the viewer cannot judge whether the leaked material is authentic.

Summary: All three of the most important omissions concern TISZA, and all three reinforce the party's negative perception; the omissions are not random but structurally consistent.

#### Missing voices

- Independent military/security analyst: Would have determined the actual threat level and the real defence value of conscription.
- Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz (TISZA defence policy expert): Could have explained the full context and intent of his own statement.
- Constitutional lawyer: Could have clarified the legal status of the suspension of conscription and the conditions for its reintroduction.
- Sociologist/pollster: Could have substantiated with data the actual attitudes of young people towards military service.
- Croatian, Danish or German defence ministry representative: Could have presented the real reasons behind the decisions from a credible source.
- Ukrainian expert in the law of war: Could have clarified the difference between forced conscription and conscription under Ukrainian law.
- Hungarian Defence Forces representative: Could have presented the capacities and shortcomings of the current volunteer system.
- Human rights expert: Could have analysed the issues of conscientious objection and civilian service.



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

Complete numbers include: absolute value, ratio (%) and trend

Total score: 5/10

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 14:49

Number: "51 days of training, and then they're taken to the front... it ranges from a day and a half, actually up to a maximum of one week [survival rate]"

Dimensions: (a) absolute number given; (b) ratio not given; (c) trend not given

Missing context: The source of the "day-and-a-half survival rate" is not cited; this is an extremely extreme claim not supported by any reference. Ukrainian casualty statistics are indeed serious, but such a specific and unsourced figure is manipulative.

Effect: The listener gets the impression that Ukrainian conscripts die almost immediately — this makes TISZA's conscription statement appear life-threatening.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 09:37

Number: "The Danish army consists of 20,000 personnel, with 10,000 active and 11–12,000 reservists, but there is also a figure of 51,000 serving in a so-called paramilitary organisation"

Dimensions: (a) absolute numbers given; (b) ratio (defence spending as a percentage of GDP compared to NATO expectations) not given; (c) trend not given

Missing context: Danish defence capacity in NATO comparison, the effect of reintroducing conscription on actual defence capability.

Effect: The numbers are not interpretable in isolation; the absence of context makes the Danish decision appear unjustified.

Summary: The most problematic use of numbers is the Ukrainian "day-and-a-half survival rate" — this is an extraordinary claim without a source, presented by the programme as fact.



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

Total score: 8/10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups/ideas.

### Association 1:

Timestamp: 15:34

Quote: "what Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz says reminds me much more of this spirit [Ukrainian forced conscription]. 'We'll drag everyone in' means that we'll take you out, we'll grab you by the scruff of the neck, and take you to the front."

Technique: The statement of TISZA's defence policy expert is equated with Ukrainian forced conscription — a politician of a democratic party is associated with a war crime.

Effect: Portrays TISZA as a potential war criminal.

### Association 2:

Timestamp: 21:04

Quote: "they want to comply with Brussels, because we can see that the Western political left-liberal elite has fundamentally cast its vote in favour of conscription"

Technique: TISZA is identified with the "left-liberal elite" and "Brussels" — both of which carry strongly negative connotations in Fidesz communication.

Effect: Portrays TISZA as serving foreign interests.

### Association 3:

Timestamp: 16:51

Quote: "it is their firm intention that in this war, if Europe joins in, they will also join in, and with Hungarian human resources"

Technique: TISZA is accused of deliberately wanting to send Hungarian young people to war — association with intentional harm.

Effect: Portrays TISZA as a traitor to the nation.

Association chain: TISZA → Ruszin-Szendi's statement → Ukrainian forced conscription → death of Hungarian young people → Brussels/left-liberal elite → treason

Summary: The programme consistently and systematically identifies TISZA with Ukrainian forced conscription, the "left-liberal elite" and treason — all three associations are unverified and do not follow from the source material.



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

Total score: 7/10

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

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:26 (beginning)

Content: "we'll drag everyone in immediately" — Ruszin-Szendi's fragmentary quote

Timing effect: The quote presenting TISZA negatively is heard at the very beginning of the programme, without context — this sets the interpretive frame for the entire first part. Within the first 30 seconds, the viewer learns that TISZA is dangerous.

### Finding 2:

Position: 25:20 (beginning of second part)

Content: "today the party's economic programme has leaked" — the Index article

Timing effect: The second part with Márk-Zay Péter begins with the "leaked" document, not the original topic (TISZA primary). This immediately forces the guest into a defensive position, and the anti-TISZA narrative dominates the rest of the programme.

### Finding 3:

Position: 24:08 (end of first part)

Content: "This brings us to the end of the first part of 48 perc, we have discussed the reasons, chances and dangers of introducing conscription"

Timing effect: The closing summary frames conscription exclusively as a "danger" — this is a reinforcement of the one-sided frame at the end of the segment.

Summary: The strategic placement of key information is consistent: anti-TISZA messages are heard at the beginning of segments (frame-setting), and the closings reinforce the pro-government narrative.



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

**7/10**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Total score: 7/10

*Definition: Outrage at certain positions but not at similar ones.*

*Methodological principle: Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. A reaction can only be classified as selective if a similar triggering event did not produce an analogous reaction from other positions.*

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:26–00:35

Triggering event: Statement by Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz on the legal status of conscription

Reaction: "we'll drag everyone in" — the fragment is cited at the beginning of the programme without context; the entire first part discusses this statement in a negative frame

Comparison: Similarly strong statements by Orbán Viktor (e.g. "Soros plan", "migrant invasion") — not heard in the programme, not subjected to critical scrutiny

Asymmetry: Verified — the TISZA politician's statement receives detailed, negative analysis; similar rhetoric from the governing party does not.

Degree of outrage: 4/5

Selectivity: 4/5

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 21:04

Triggering event: Horváth József's claim that TISZA wants to comply with the "left-liberal elite"

Reaction: The host does not challenge it, does not ask for evidence, nods

Comparison: When Márk-Zay Péter makes similarly strong claims (e.g. 37:58: "Fidesz sent these threatening letters"), the host immediately asks for evidence

Asymmetry: Verified — the host accepts unverified claims from the pro-government guest; immediately challenges claims from the opposition guest.

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Summary: Selective outrage shows a consistent pattern: claims concerning TISZA receive detailed, negative analysis; similar claims concerning Fidesz are not subjected to critical scrutiny.



## 9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: How complete is the programme's thematic coverage?

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:54–24:08 (entire first part)

Missing viewpoint/fact: Not a single independent security expert speaks; the arguments in favour of reintroducing conscription (NATO obligations, actual threat level, defence capacity shortfall) are not heard.

Relevance: At least one voice professionally supporting the reintroduction would be indispensable for discussing the topic.

Effect: The viewer gets the impression that the reintroduction of conscription is purely political manipulation with no professional justification whatsoever.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 25:56–34:02

Missing viewpoint/fact: TISZA's official economic programme; verification of the authenticity of the "leaked" document.

Relevance: The programme bases a significant portion of its anti-TISZA questions on an unverified document.

Effect: The viewer gets the impression that TISZA is planning tax increases, even though this has not been proven.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 14:40–16:37

Missing viewpoint/fact: The legal and conceptual difference between conscription and forced conscription; the actual content of the Ukrainian mobilisation law.

Relevance: The programme deliberately conflates the two concepts in order to equate TISZA's statement with Ukrainian forced conscription.

Effect: The viewer cannot distinguish between democratic conscription and wartime forced conscription.

Summary: The programme's thematic coverage is extremely narrow and one-sided; the gaps are not random but structurally consistent with the pro-government narrative.

End of hard facts — Beginning of soft facts

### Soft facts — debatable, not merely countable

The reintroduction of conscription is a genuine political debate across Europe: Croatia, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Germany have taken or are taking steps in this direction to varying degrees. The debate divides public opinion into two main camps: one holds that Russian aggression (Ukraine, 2022) represents a real security threat that must be met by increasing defence capacities; the other holds that reintroducing conscription places a disproportionate burden on young people and serves political ends. In Hungary, the issue became topical because Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz, TISZA's defence policy expert, made a statement about the suspended — not abolished — legal status of conscription. The Fidesz government interprets and communicates this statement as a pro-war intention.



*Proportion of viewpoints covered*

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

- [A] Defence obligations of NATO member states and the logic of collective security
- [B] An independent security analysts' actual assessment of the Russian military threat
- [C] The actual effectiveness of reintroducing conscription (military expert opinion)
- [D] The full text and context of Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz's original statement
- [E] TISZA's actual defence programme and its details
- [F] The current capacity and shortcomings of the Hungarian volunteer reserve system
- [G] Attitudes of European young people towards conscription (sociological data)
- [H] The legal and conceptual difference between conscription and forced conscription
- [I] An independent security expert's opinion on Hungary's defence situation
- [J] The real political and military reasons behind the Danish, Croatian and German decisions

**[A] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The collective defence obligations of NATO member states (Article 5 of the Charter) are not mentioned once in the programme; the reintroduction of conscription is framed exclusively as "Brussels manipulation".

**[B] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Not a single independent security analyst speaks; the reality of the Russian threat is denied or relativised by every guest in the programme.

**[C] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 11:46 — Quote: "how can you train a soldier in two months in the 21st century, I'll tell you: you can't" — Assessment: It is raised, but exclusively in the direction of supporting the ineffectiveness of conscription, without a counter-opinion.

**[D] OMITTED**

Timestamp: 00:26 — Quote: "we'll drag everyone in immediately" — Assessment: The full text and context of the statement are not heard; only the fragment highlighted by the host is included.

**[E] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: TISZA's defence programme is not presented; the party's position is conveyed exclusively through the guests' interpretations.

**[F] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 12:29 — Quote: "the volunteer reserve force... is perfect for this" — Assessment: Filipp Dávid evaluates the Hungarian system positively, but capacity data and shortcomings are not mentioned.

**[G] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 12:22 — Quote: "Dávid, you've spoken to a lot of young people about this at home too" — Assessment: Filipp Dávid's personal experiences are included, but sociological data and representative surveys are not.

**[H] OMITTED**

Timestamp: 15:34 — Quote: "what Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz says reminds me much more of this spirit" — Assessment: The programme deliberately blurs the legal distinction between conscription and forced conscription.

**[I] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Not a single independent Hungarian or foreign security expert speaks.

**[J] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 03:46–10:54 — Quote: correspondents' reports — Assessment: The factual presentation of the three countries' decisions is partially carried out, but the correspondents also apply the "war hysteria" frame.

### Completeness score: 2/10

Justification: Out of ten relevant viewpoints, the programme addresses only two partially (C, F, G, J), and even these are discussed exclusively in the direction supporting the pro-government narrative. The most important gaps: independent security expert, TISZA's actual programme, the context of NATO obligations, and the conceptual distinction between conscription and forced conscription.



## Softfacts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. DEFINITION OF INTERPRETIVE FRAME

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: How does the programme fundamentally frame the topic?

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:57

Quote: "an artificial fear has been successfully generated and constructed here in Europe"

Manipulation: Frames the entire European defence debate as "artificial fear" — thereby pre-emptively discrediting any argument in favour of conscription.

Why problematic: The frame constructed for the viewer is that anyone who supports conscription is either manipulated or a manipulator — this excludes the possibility of rational debate.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 09:13

Quote: "it is clearly the result of war propaganda"

Manipulation: Frames the democratic decision of the Danish parliament as "war propaganda" — labels democratic decision-making as propaganda.

Why problematic: Applying the word "propaganda" to a democratic parliamentary decision relativises the concept of democracy.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 11:05

Quote: "thank you for telling us how individual countries are preparing for war"

Manipulation: The host, in summarising the correspondents' reports, says that the countries "are preparing for war" — whereas the correspondents reported on defence preparedness, not war preparations.

Why problematic: The "preparing for war" frame presents defence policy as aggressive intent.

Summary: The programme consistently applies the "artificial fear / war propaganda / Brussels manipulation" frame to every topic concerning conscription — this excludes the possibility of rational, fact-based debate.



11. LANGUAGE AND CONCEPTS								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Total score: 8/10

Definition: What language does the programme use? What connotations does it create?

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:35

Quote: "they are domesticating people into the mental state of what an armed conflict is like"

Manipulation: The word "domesticate" (to tame, to train) equates European defence policy with animal training.

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "they are preparing society for defence obligations".

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 23:14

Quote: "in Western Europe the brainwashing works"

Manipulation: Characterises Western European public awareness of defence as "brainwashing" — thereby portraying the citizens of democratic societies as manipulated masses incapable of thought.

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "defence awareness is growing in Western Europe".

### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 21:07

Quote: "the Western political left-liberal elite"

Manipulation: The compound "left-liberal elite" is one of the most frequent pejorative terms in Fidesz communication — it ideologically labels neutral political actors.

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "Western European governments and the European People's Party".

Summary: The programme's language consistently draws from the vocabulary of Fidesz communication; neutral political concepts are replaced with pejorative synonyms.



12. MODERATOR BEHAVIOUR									8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Total score: 8/10

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

Methodological principle: Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. An intervention can only be classified as asymmetric if a similar triggering event did not produce an analogous intervention with another guest.

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 37:50

Triggering event: Márk-Zay Péter claims that Fidesz may be behind the bomb threats

Quote (host): "We ask you to return to the TISZA primary"

Comparison: When Horváth József makes similarly unverified claims (e.g. 01:02: "it fundamentally serves one purpose") — the host does not ask for evidence and does not redirect to the topic

Asymmetry: Verified — the host interrupts the opposition guest's unverified claims and asks for evidence; accepts similar claims from the pro-government guest.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 30:53

Triggering event: Márk-Zay Péter says that M1 "keeps viewers in the dark"

Quote (host): "I would like to reject the claim that we are keeping our viewers in the dark, and I would also like to object on their behalf"

Comparison: At Horváth József's "brainwashing" remark (23:14) — the host does not reject it and does not defend the Western European media

Asymmetry: Verified — the host defends his own institution but not other media outlets.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 26:05

Triggering event: Márk-Zay Péter says the Index article is a Fidesz lie

Quote (host): "This was published by Index, this is material that leaked from the TISZA party"

Comparison: The host treats the Index article as authentic and does not accept Márk-Zay's rebuttal — even though he does not verify the credibility of Index either

Asymmetry: Verified — the host treats the pro-government source (Index article) as fact; does not accept the opposition guest's rebuttal.

Summary: Moderator behaviour is consistently asymmetric: with the opposition guest, the host asks for evidence, interrupts and redirects; with pro-government guests, these tools are not applied.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Total score: 8/10

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

### Asymmetry 1:

To Horváth József, 00:54: "How do you see it, why are people so afraid in Europe?" — soft, open, reinforcing the guest's narrative

To Márk-Zay Péter, 25:23: "Do you support the measures contained in this?" (referring to a "leaked", unverified document) — hard, trap-like, based on an unverified premise

Comparison: The pro-government guest is given the opportunity to elaborate on his narrative; the opposition guest is immediately confronted with an unverified document.

### Asymmetry 2:

To Filipp Dávid, 12:22: "What do they say? Would they enlist?" — soft, asking for personal experience

To Márk-Zay Péter, 31:25: "For example, if family tax credits were cut, and a 30 percent cut were made in the middle income bracket and 50 percent in the upper bracket. Would you agree with that?" — hard, hypothetical, confronting the guest with a programme that is not his own

Comparison: The pro-government guest is asked about personal experiences; the opposition guest is confronted with specific measures from an unverified document.

Summary: Questions are consistently softer for pro-government guests and harder for the opposition guest; questions directed at the opposition guest are frequently based on unverified premises.



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

Total score: 6/10

Definition: Artificial appearance of balance despite actual inequality.

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 24:21

Construction: "with Horváth József, director of the Sovereignty Protection Research Institute, and Filipp Dávid, influencer" — the programme presents two guests as if they represented two different viewpoints

Analysis: Both guests represent the same narrative (conscriptio = Brussels manipulation, TISZA = dangerous); the "two guests" format creates the appearance of balance, while in reality it is one-sided.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 25:08–49:17

Construction: In the second part, Márk-Zay Péter appears as an opposition guest — this creates the appearance of balance

Analysis: Due to the asymmetry of moderation, the hardness of the questions and the definition of topics (leaked document, TISZA criticism), Márk-Zay Péter does not in fact appear as an equal party but as a "defendant".

Summary: The programme appears formally balanced (two guests in the first part, one opposition guest in the second), but the actual content and moderation are consistently one-sided.



15. AGENDA-SETTING									9/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: What counts as normal/self-evident? What does not make it onto the agenda?

### Finding 1:

Item placed on agenda: Reintroduction of conscription = Brussels manipulation and war danger

Timestamp: 00:57 — Evidence: "an artificial fear has been successfully generated"

Alternative agenda: Reintroduction of conscription as a legitimate defence policy decision with professional arguments for and against.

### Finding 2:

Item placed on agenda: TISZA = pro-war, subservient to Brussels, potentially dangerous party

Timestamp: 14:08 — Evidence: "Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz, TISZA's policy expert, spoke about how we'll drag everyone in"

Alternative agenda: An objective presentation of TISZA's defence programme and the party's actual position.

### Finding 3:

Item placed on agenda: Hungary = island of peace in Europe, the government protects Hungarians

Timestamp: 02:08 — Evidence: "the American government, and let us add, the Hungarian government has committed itself to ensuring that there is peace here"

Alternative agenda: Hungary's obligations arising from NATO membership, the level of defence spending, the actual state of the Hungarian Defence Forces.

Summary: The programme's agenda entirely reflects the Fidesz government's communication frame; alternative viewpoints are not merely absent but are actively excluded.



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

### Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	9	Both guests are structurally pro-government; source traffic light: red.
2	Source selection	H	8	Three unverified claims presented as fact; the TISZA source taken out of context.
3	Time allocation	H	8	The first part is 100% pro-government; in the second part the opposition guest faces moderation asymmetry.
4	Omission	H	9	The three most important omissions (Ruszin-Szendi's context, NATO obligations, TISZA's programme) all concern TISZA.
5	Number manipulation	H	5	Un sourced "day-and-a-half survival rate" presented as fact.
6	Guilt by association	H	8	TISZA is identified with Ukrainian forced conscription, the "left-liberal elite" and treason.
7	Timing	H	7	Anti-TISZA messages are heard at the beginning of segments; closings reinforce the pro-government frame.
8	Selective outrage	H	7	TISZA's statements receive detailed negative analysis; similar rhetoric from Fidesz does not.
9	Completeness	H	9	Two out of ten relevant viewpoints are partially addressed; the gaps are structurally consistent.
10	Framing	S	9	"Artificial fear / war propaganda / Brussels manipulation" frame excludes rational debate.
11	Language and concepts	S	8	"Domesticate", "brainwashing", "left-liberal elite" — vocabulary of Fidesz communication.
12	Moderator behaviour	S	8	Consistent asymmetry: asks for evidence from and interrupts the opposition guest; does not do so with pro-government guests.
13	Question asymmetry	S	8	Soft, open questions for pro-government guests; hard, trap-like questions for the opposition guest.
14	False balance	S	6	Formally two guests in the first part, but both represent the same narrative.
15	Agenda-setting	S	9	The entire agenda reflects the Fidesz communication frame; alternative viewpoints actively excluded.

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 1–9): 7.8 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 10–15): 8.0 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average of all 15 criteria): 7.9 / 10



## Dominant techniques

---

- 1. Framing (9/10):** The entire programme is dominated by the "artificial fear / war propaganda / Brussels manipulation" frame, which pre-emptively excludes the validity of arguments in favour of reintroducing conscription. This frame is consistently present from the first sentence to the last, and underpins every other manipulation technique.
- 2. Agenda-setting (9/10):** The programme's agenda entirely reflects the Fidesz government's communication frame; it portrays TISZA as pro-war, conscription as Brussels manipulation, and Hungary as an island of peace. Alternative viewpoints are not merely absent but are actively excluded.
- 3. Omission (9/10):** The three most important omissions (the full context of Ruszin-Szendi's statement, NATO obligations, TISZA's actual programme) are structurally consistent: all three concern TISZA, and all three reinforce the party's negative perception.

## The programme's core messages

---

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "The reintroduction of conscription in Europe is not a defence necessity but Brussels's artificial fear-mongering, aimed at preparing European citizens for war."

Technique: Framing, agenda-setting — Evidence: 00:57, 01:07, 09:13

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "The statement by TISZA and Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz means that the party wants to send Hungarian young people to the Ukrainian front."

Technique: Guilt by association, omission — Evidence: 15:34, 16:31, 16:51

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL):** "Hungary is an island of peace; the Fidesz government protects Hungarians, while the opposition serves Brussels and the war lobby."

Technique: Agenda-setting, framing — Evidence: 02:08, 21:04, 22:54

## Classification of manipulation level

---

Justification: The programme's total score of 7.9/10 places it at the boundary of systematic and extreme imbalance. The programme systematically violates the requirements of balance, objectivity and diversity of opinion prescribed by Mttv. §83: in the first part, not a single opposition voice is heard; TISZA is presented in an actively distorted manner, with unverified claims and the guilt-by-association technique; the question of conscription is discussed exclusively within the Fidesz narrative frame. In the second part, the opposition guest formally speaks, but due to the asymmetry of moderation and the trap-like nature of the questions, substantive balance is not achieved.

## SUMMARY

---

The examined broadcast of 48 perc systematically violates the requirements of balance and objectivity prescribed by Mttv. §83. The first part (conscription) in its entirety reinforces the Fidesz government's peace narrative and sovereignist frame, while TISZA — the only opposition force involved — is discredited through quotes taken out of context, unverified claims and identification with Ukrainian forced conscription. In the second part, Márk-Zay Péter formally speaks, but due to the consistent asymmetry of moderation, the trap-like questions and the confrontations based on an unverified document, substantive balance is not achieved. The programme's expert selection, use of sources, language and agenda-setting are structurally consistent: every element reinforces the Fidesz communication frame, and every element serves the negative perception of TISZA. This constitutes a serious and systematic violation of Mttv. §83 (1) — which prescribes actuality, objectivity and balance in news and information programmes — and could serve as the basis for proceedings before the NMHH Media Council, although the likelihood of actual sanctioning is low given the Media Council's composition of Fidesz delegates.



## OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	9/10	<i>Systematic imbalance</i>
2	SOURCE SELECTION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
3	TIME ALLOCATION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	9/10	<i>Systematic imbalance</i>
5	NUMBER MANIPULATION	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
7	TIMING	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE	9/10	<i>Systematic imbalance</i>
10	DEFINITION OF INTERPRETIVE FRAME	9/10	<i>Systematic imbalance</i>
11	LANGUAGE AND CONCEPTS	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
12	MODERATOR BEHAVIOUR	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
14	FALSE BALANCE	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
15	AGENDA-SETTING	9/10	<i>Systematic imbalance</i>

#### HARDFACTS SCORE (1-8)

**8.0/10**

*Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation*

#### SOFTFACTS SCORE (9-14)

**8.0/10**

*Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation*

#### TOTAL SCORE

**8.0/10**

*Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## LEGEND — Meaning of scores

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

<b>0</b>	<b>No finding</b>	No relevant anomaly detectable.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor anomaly without material effect on balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Mild-moderate finding</b>	Recognisable tendency; low-to-moderate impact relevance.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with impact</b>	Relevant imbalance that influences the audience's opinion-forming potential.
<b>6</b>	<b>Significant finding (threshold)</b>	Scores of 6 or higher qualify as "significant findings".
<b>7</b>	<b>Significant finding</b>	Clear, well-documented imbalance with obvious impact relevance.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Serious finding</b>	Pronounced imbalance; multiple individual findings documented for this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum severity</b>	Systematic and pervasive imbalance for this criterion.

### Overall deviation index — Interpretation ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Imperceptible</b>	No material patterns detectable; the programme meets the balance requirement.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Mild imbalance</b>	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but still within the tolerance threshold.
<b>4.1 – 6.0</b>	<b>Significant imbalance</b>	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of viewpoint diversity.
<b>6.1 – 8.0</b>	<b>Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation</b>	Pronounced, cross-programme patterns; high impact relevance.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias</b>	Maximum pronouncedness in almost every criterion; systematically one-sided reporting.

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

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	The party is significantly underrepresented in framing, speaking time or portrayal.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Mildly disadvantaged</b>	Recognisable but mild disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No preference or disadvantage detectable.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Mildly advantaged</b>	Recognisable but mild preference.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly advantaged</b>	The party is significantly overrepresented in framing, speaking time or portrayal.



## CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Mttv. §83)

### Assessment under Mttv. §83

Mttv. §83 requires that news and information programmes provide current, objective and balanced information and reflect the diversity of opinions.

#### Violation 1:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — balance and diversity of opinion

Facts: In the first part (conscriptio, approx. 25 minutes), not a single opposition voice is heard; both guests argue from a structurally pro-government position; not a single professional argument in favour of reintroducing conscription is heard.

Evidence: 00:45–24:08 — "My guests are Horváth József, director of the Sovereignty Protection Research Institute, and Filipp Dávid, influencer" — the entire first part conveys exclusively the narrative of these two guests.

Assessment: The requirement of diversity of opinion prescribed by Mttv. §83 is entirely absent in the first part; the programme one-sidedly reinforces the government narrative.

#### Violation 2:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — objectivity

Facts: The programme conveys the statement of TISZA's defence policy expert out of context, repeatedly equating it with Ukrainian forced conscription; the full text and context of the statement are not heard; the party's actual defence programme is not presented.

Evidence: 00:26 — "we'll drag everyone in immediately"; 15:34 — "what Ruszin-Szendi Romulusz says reminds me much more of this spirit [Ukrainian forced conscription]"

Assessment: The deliberate distortion of TISZA's statement and its identification with Ukrainian forced conscription constitutes a serious violation of the objectivity requirement.

#### Violation 3:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — actuality and factual accuracy

Facts: The programme presents three unverified claims without primary sources as facts: (1) the "day-and-a-half survival rate" of Ukrainian conscripts; (2) Ursula von der Leyen's "Europe ready for war by 2030" statement without source or context; (3) TISZA's "leaked" economic programme without verification of authenticity.

Evidence: 14:49 — "it ranges from a day and a half, actually up to a maximum of one week [survival rate]"; 13:53 — "Ursula von der Leyen said that Europe must be ready for war by 2030"; 25:56 — "today the party's economic programme has leaked"

Assessment: Presenting unsourced, unverified claims as facts constitutes a violation of the actuality and factual accuracy requirement.

#### Violation 4:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — balance

Facts: In the second part, Márk-Zay Péter appears as an opposition guest, but due to the consistent asymmetry of moderation (interruptions, asking for evidence from the opposition guest but not from pro-government guests, trap-like questions based on an unverified document), substantive balance is not achieved.

Evidence: 37:50 — "We ask you to return to the TISZA primary" (interruption); 26:05 — treating the Index article as fact despite Márk-Zay's rebuttal; 31:25 — question about hypothetical tax measures based on an unverified document.

Assessment: Formal balance (inviting an opposition guest) does not substitute for substantive balance if moderation is consistently asymmetric.



## Overall assessment under Mttv. §83

The examined programme contains four separately established violations of Mttv. §83 (1): (1) the complete absence of diversity of opinion in the first part; (2) the deliberate distortion of TISZA's statement; (3) the presentation of unsourced claims as facts; (4) substantive one-sidedness behind a formal appearance of balance. The violations are not random but structurally consistent: every element reinforces the Fidesz government's communication frame, and every element serves the negative perception of TISZA. This constitutes a systematic and serious violation of Mttv. §83, which could serve as the basis for proceedings before the NMHH Media Council — although the likelihood of actual sanctioning is low given the Media Council's composition of Fidesz delegates.

## SOURCE DEEP ANALYSIS (Mandatory for every cited specialist institution / civil organisation / advisory organisation)

### Sovereignty Protection Research Institute

- FUNDING:** A state-funded institution established by the Fidesz government in 2023 with the aim of combating "foreign influence". Its funder is the Hungarian state; its supervisory body is the government.
- MANDATE:** The institution's mandate (sovereignty protection = protection of the government's narrative against foreign influence) is structurally incompatible with neutral security analysis.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** The institution's raison d'être and funding are based on supporting the government narrative; the institution has a structural interest in drawing pro-government conclusions.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — State funding, pro-government mandate
  - D2 Personal risk: -2 — Risks nothing by reinforcing the government narrative
  - D3 Professional competence: 0 — Political science background, but security analysis not verified
  - D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistently says the same thing
  - D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -2 — Data-free, emotional argumentation
  - D6 Source level: -1 — Secondary**TOTAL: -6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED**
- COUNTER-OPINION:** Independent security analysts (e.g. RAND Europe, IISS, Institute for Strategic and Defence Research) are not cited.

**IMPORTANT:** The title "director" is not a neutral professional qualification. This is the director of an institution created by the government to defend its own narrative — this in itself constitutes a structural bias that the programme does not indicate.

### Source credibility overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
violation:	-2	-2	0	+1	-2	-1	-6	<b>RED</b>

## Legal and methodological classification

<b>Not a finding of fact</b>	The results presented do not constitute a finding of fact regarding individual persons, editorial teams or programmes. They are the results of standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.
<b>Not a legal judgement</b>	The overall deviation index does not replace the legal assessment under Mttv. §83. Determining whether a given programme violates statutory requirements is exclusively the task of the competent authorities (in particular the Media Council).
<b>Not evidence of causality</b>	Statistical correlations must not be interpreted as evidence of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, the news situation, political controversy or format logic.



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

**Not an assessment  
of intent**

The analysis measures the observable structural characteristics of programmes. A score of 7 means that significant imbalance has been established — not that the editorial team did this intentionally. The methodology makes no statements about motives.

**Heuristic  
comparative tool**

The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of programmes, not for precise metric measurement of individual contributions. The threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as precise legal classification.



## ANNEX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

### Legal basis Hungary — MTVA

---

#### Laws

---

- Act CLXXXV of 2010 on Media Services and Mass Communication (Mttv.)
- Act CIV of 2010 on the Freedom of the Press (Smtv.)
- Fundamental Law of Hungary (2011)

#### Relevant articles

##### Mttv. (Media Act 2010)

---

- §83 (1): Public service obligation — current, objective and balanced information in news and information programmes.
- §83 (2): Information must reflect the diversity of opinions.
- §12: Protection of pluralism of opinion as a fundamental principle.
- §13: Prohibition of one-sided information in news programmes.

##### Smtv. (Press Freedom Act 2010)

---

- §4: Freedom of the press and freedom of expression.
- §10: Separation of news and opinion.
- §13: Right of correction.

#### Fundamental Law

---

- Article IX: Freedom of opinion and the press, media pluralism as a state obligation of protection.

#### European reference framework

---

- ECHR Article 10: Right to freedom of expression (European Convention on Human Rights)
- EU Rule of Law Report: Annual assessment, documenting systematic media freedom deficiencies since 2018
- RSF Press Freedom Index: Reporters Without Borders, annual ranking
- EMFA (European Media Freedom Act, 2024): EU-level minimum standards for media freedom

#### Special case — Structural non-enforcement

---

IMPORTANT: The Mttv. formally contains correct balance obligations. The criticism is not directed against the text of the law but against the structural non-enforcement by the government-aligned NMHH. MTVA is a broadcaster operating under de facto state-aligned management.

#### Supervisory authority

---

- NMHH (National Media and Infocommunications Authority): National media and communications authority. Structurally government-aligned in composition since 2010.

#### Complaint procedure

---

1. NMHH (formally, but structurally not independent)
2. Kúria (Supreme Court, in theory)



## ANNEX 2: ACADEMIC REFERENCES

### Literature

---

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

### SVFAB Working Papers

---

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

*David Schläpfer — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266*

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | [www.svfab.ch](http://www.svfab.ch) | [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch) |  
*Methodology report March 2026 | Converter 3.4 (2026-05-20)*



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

### Assessments and membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you not only get more detailed analyses, but you can also have them produced for any broadcast (this service is subject to a fee).

To ensure the sustainability of our work, we rely on memberships and donations.

#### Contact and further information:

[www.SVFAB.ch](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:Kontakt@SVFAB.ch)

**Bank details:** PostFinance – POFICHBE

**IBAN:** CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

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



Unbalanced reporting as a response to the Swiss halving initiative: This book describes manipulation techniques in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. It then outlines 15 principles: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, removal of context and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. It also reveals where we ourselves apply these techniques — fostering not only understanding but also empathy.

Optionally, playing cards are also available to accompany the book.

Also available as an audiobook.



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

Those who do not understand this provide material. Good quotes that were poorly edited. Correct statements placed in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolkit — for everyone who has a microphone in front of their face and wants to know what they can do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview actually is. The 7 most common pitfalls. The three principles of control — anchoring, framing and 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. To stop being talked over — and start shaping the conversation.

In A5 format. Easy to use. For preparation, as a reference, for follow-up and when things get difficult.



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



You think you see the world. In reality, you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the world's oldest and most elegant manipulation technique. It does not change the facts — it changes what we think about them. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate in it. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of real examples. You will not only learn how others frame you. You will learn how to frame yourself — and how to use it consciously and fairly.

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. They hear the news differently. They conduct conversations with greater confidence. And they are no longer so easily influenced by frames chosen by someone else.

With numerous exercises and concrete examples from politics, the media and everyday life — and a few chuckles along the way.

Stylish framing. Because the frame changes everything.