



MTVA DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-02-15_kommentar-klub

Programme: MTVA-Sendung (M1/Kossuth Rádió) | 2026-02-15 | Analysed: 2026-05-24 20:49
Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Mércé: Mttv. §83

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 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) **5.8 / 10** **Balanced**



← 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 is not included in the overall 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). On the opposition side, TISZA (the party led by Magyar Péter) obtained 29.6% at the 2024 EP elections, becoming the strongest opposition force. Other parliamentary opposition parties include: DK, Momentum, Jobbik, LMP, MSZP (who ran as the United Opposition in 2022), as well as Mi Hazánk (6 seats). The next parliamentary election is due in 2026.

Party	CHES left-right	Seats (2022)	Government/Opposition	Base position
MSZP	3,00	(Unit. Opp.)	Opposition	Left, social-democratic
MKKP	3,50	0	Extra-parliamentary	Left, satirical-libertarian
LMP	3,79	(Unit. Opp.)	Opposition	Left, green-progressive
Momentum	4,17	(Unit. Opp.)	Opposition	Centre-left, pro-EU, urban
DK	4,28	(Unit. Opp.)	Opposition	Centre-left
TISZA	6,17	— (new 2024)	Opposition (strongest)	Centre-right, anti-corruption
Jobbik	6,47	(Unit. 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

Hungary's political life is defined by four main fault lines. First, the question of EU sovereignty: Fidesz-KDNP openly opposes Brussels' federalist ambitions, while the opposition (especially TISZA, DK, Momentum) takes a pro-European stance. Second, the relationship to the war in Ukraine: the government advocates pro-Russian neutrality, while the opposition stands for Ukrainian solidarity. Third, the media system and the rule of law: the KESMA consolidation, Fidesz's control of the NMHH, and the shrinking space for independent press are a constant source of conflict. Fourth, ahead of the 2026 elections, the emergence of the electoral fraud narrative and the question of EU intervention have become the sharpest political controversies.

MTVA (M1, M2, M4, M5, Duna) operates as a de facto government media outlet: the NMHH Media Council has been staffed exclusively by persons close to Fidesz since 2010, and the KESMA foundation (since 2018) consolidates nearly 500 media companies in pro-government hands. The Mttv. §83 mandates current, objective and balanced information and the reflection of diversity of opinion for public service media — however, the structural fulfilment of this obligation is seriously questionable based on RSF's ranking of 85th place (worst EU member state).



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Representation of parties' programme positions in the broadcast

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Representation in broadcast vs. programme position
Fidesz-KDNP	+3	15:40 "the Hungarian position is the one that represents the stance consistent with the EU's founding documents" — Programme position: sovereignty, anti-EU federalism — accurate, but framed exclusively positively, without criticism
TISZA	-4	22:00 "from Magyar Péter to Hatházi Ákos, many politicians are saying, well in advance, that this election will be stolen" — Programme position: anti-corruption, rule of law, pro-EU — heavily distorted: TISZA is portrayed as a propagator of the electoral fraud narrative and as an instrument of foreign interference
DK	-3	31:34 "DK's Molnár Csaba says that the capabilities provided by the democracy shield should be used against Hungary" — Programme position: pro-EU, rule of law — quoted without context, in a hostile frame
Momentum	0	Not featured in the broadcast.
Jobbik	0	Not featured in the broadcast.
Mi Hazánk	0	Not featured in the broadcast.
LMP	0	Not featured in the broadcast.
MSZP	0	Not featured in the broadcast.

Score explanation:

- +5 = the party's programme positions are presented correctly and completely
- 0 = the party/topic does not appear in the broadcast
- -5 = the programme positions are actively distorted or falsely represented

Party bias summary

- Most accurate representation: Fidesz-KDNP (+3)
- Strongest distortion: TISZA (-4)
- Average deviation from 0: 1.4
- Conclusion: The broadcast presents Fidesz-KDNP's sovereignty policy exclusively as a positive stance consistent with the EU's founding documents, while portraying TISZA and DK as domestic instruments of foreign interference. This asymmetry of representation does not stem from an objective account of programme positions, but from deliberate narrative framing.

Left-right overall tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -4.2

CLASSIFICATION: Strongly right-leaning

Justification: The broadcast features exclusively staff from pro-government research institutes, portrays opposition parties (TISZA, DK) as servants of foreign interests, and frames Fidesz-KDNP policy as the only stance consistent with legitimate European values. Not a single left-wing, liberal or opposition perspective is given space, either through direct contribution or objective presentation.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST DATA AND TOPIC FRAMES

Broadcast data

- Title: Kommentár Klub
- Date: (cannot be determined precisely from the transcript; based on content, spring 2025, approximately two months before the 2026 Hungarian elections)
- Estimated length: approx. 51 minutes (based on the transcript)
- Host/Reporter: Unidentified host (name not mentioned)
- Guests:

Person	Function	Party/Institutional affiliation	Political spectrum
Horváth József	Director of the Sovereignty Protection Research Institute	Pro-government institution	Right
Nádor Koppány Zsombor	Research Director of the Szent István Intézet	Pro-government, Catholic-conservative institution	Right
Petri Bernadett	Researcher at the XXI. Század Intézet	Pro-government institution	Right
Szikra Levente	Senior analyst at the Alapjogokért Központ	Pro-government institution	Right
Kavecsánszki Ádám	Unidentified (contributor in report)	Unidentified	Right
Lentulai Krisztián	Facebook page owner (in report)	Unidentified	Right

Main topic

The broadcast claims that EU institutions, tech giants and domestic opposition parties are coordinating to interfere in the upcoming Hungarian elections by censoring conservative-right-wing content and deploying a mechanism called the "democracy shield".

Completeness score: 2/10

Justification: Of the ten relevant perspectives, two appear partially and eight are entirely absent. The broadcast does not give voice to a single opposition, independent or objectively EU-representing voice. Topics are discussed exclusively within the interpretive framework of the pro-government guests, which is incompatible with the requirements of balance and diversity of opinion prescribed by Mttv. §83.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Factual criteria — quantifiable and scientifically grounded

Hard facts — 9 measurable and scientifically verifiable techniques

1. EXPERT SELECTION

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Overall score: 9/10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

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

Timestamp: 05:35

Statement: "in the past few years this has shifted to a new level... Hungary is one of the most important targets for breaking this national governance"

Classification: Head of an institution established by government decree and funded by the state budget; the institution's founding and mandate are closely tied to the Fidesz-KDNP sovereignty discourse.

Missing countervoice: An independent constitutional lawyer or EU law expert who would have objectively analysed the EU competence issues.

Source deep-check:

(a) FUNDING: Hungarian state (institution established by government decree). Conflict of interest: the institution's mandate is to provide academic support for the government's sovereignty policy.

(b) MANDATE: Not compatible with neutral assessment on the question of EU–Hungary relations.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — State-funded, mandate is to support government policy

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Position depends on alignment with the government narrative

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Security policy background, but limited on EU law questions

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistently represents this position

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -1 — More emotional-apocalyptic elements, little data

D6 Source level: -1 — Secondary/tertiary (own interpretation, not primary source)

TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Framed as a neutral expert, while being the head of a structurally biased institution.

Expert 2: Szikra Levente — Senior analyst at the Alapjogokért Központ

Timestamp: 05:45

Statement: 21:38 "in the recent period, the electoral fraud narrative has appeared to an increasing degree in the left-liberal media... this advertising slot — the Alapjogokért Központ has conducted thorough research on this"

Classification: The Alapjogokért Központ is a pro-government think tank regularly cited in government communications.

Source deep-check:



(a) **FUNDING:** Private foundation with close pro-government ties; its funding is not fully transparent.

(b) **MANDATE:** Not compatible with neutral assessment on the question of electoral integrity.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Pro-government institution, refuting the electoral fraud narrative serves the government's interest

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Position depends on alignment with the government narrative

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Legal background

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent position

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -1 — The content of the "thorough research" is not presented

D6 Source level: -2 — Refers to own institute's research, which is not presented

TOTAL: -4 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW (borderline towards RED)

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Referenced as "thorough research", while the content, methodology and data of the research are not presented at all.

Expert 3: Nádor Koppány Zsombor — Research Director of the Szent István Intézet

Timestamp: 05:38

Statement: 13:11 "the founding fathers had a firm set of values, which it is less fashionable to remember today, that it was a fundamentally Christian-democratic value system"

Classification: Catholic-conservative institute whose mandate is to represent Christian-democratic values.

Source deep-check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Mixed ecclesiastical/state funding; the Szent István Intézet is affiliated with both the Catholic Church and the governmental sphere.

(b) **MANDATE:** Not compatible with neutral assessment on the question of EU values.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Institutional mandate is to represent Christian-democratic values

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Position depends on alignment with the institutional narrative

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Historical-political philosophy background

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent position

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: 0 — Mixed

D6 Source level: -1 — Secondary interpretation

TOTAL: -2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Framed as a neutral EU values analyst, while the institutional mandate clearly determines the position.

Missing expert groups:

- Independent EU lawyer (for objective analysis of the legal content of the EU democracy shield)
- Independent platform moderation researcher (for data-based analysis of content moderation)
- OSCE/ODIHR election observer (for objective assessment of the Hungarian electoral system)

Summary (matrix result):

- Horváth József: YELLOW (-3) — state-funded, mandate structurally biased
- Szikra Levente: YELLOW/RED (-4) — pro-government, does not document research
- Nádor Koppány Zsombor: YELLOW (-2) — ecclesiastical-governmental ties, institutional mandate
- Petri Bernadett: cannot be verified in detail from the transcript, but the XXI. Század Intézet is also pro-government

Source credibility overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Expert: Horváth József — Director of the Sovereignty Protection Research Institute	-2	-1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-3	YELLOW



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

Expert: Szikra Levente — Senior analyst at the Alapjogokért Központ	-2	-1	+1	+1	-1	-2	-4	YELLOW
Expert: Nádor Koppány Zsombor — Research Director of the Szent István Intézet	-2	-1	+1	+1	0	-1	-2	YELLOW



2. SOURCE SELECTION

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Overall score: 9/10

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

Source 1: Mark Zuckerberg's statement

Timestamp: 02:49

Statement: "Strong pressure was put on us to take down content that, frankly, was true."

- (a) **Funding and operator:** Meta Platforms Inc. — a private company whose business interest at the time of the statement was to maintain good relations with the Trump administration.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Zuckerberg's statement was made in a political context (criticism of the Biden administration) and was consistent with Meta's business interests; the broadcast does not indicate this.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Meta's moderation statistics showing removal rates for right-wing and left-wing content.

Source 2: Alapjogokért Központ research

Timestamp: 21:38

Statement: "this advertising slot — the Alapjogokért Központ has conducted thorough research on this"

- (a) **Funding:** Pro-government private foundation.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** The research examines the electoral fraud narrative — it is in the government's interest to refute this.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Independent election researchers, OSCE/ODIHR reports.

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 39:56

Claim: "it turns out that this is a CIA front organisation, for long decades, since the beginning of the Cold War"

Signal word: "it turns out" (treated as fact without evidence)

Primary source: not cited — penalty point

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 29:30

Claim: "in the Zelenskyy plan, the third point is that Viktor Orbán's power must be shaken, he must be brought down"

Signal word: "it's there" (the content of the document is not quoted or presented)

Primary source: not cited — penalty point

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 04:04

Claim: "Dávid Dóra... gives them a kind of syllabus on how to do it, where to click, and what way, if there are many of you, you can shut down that page"

Signal word: "obviously she doesn't dare go so far as to actually incite them" (speculative)



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

Primary source: not cited — penalty point

Summary: The broadcast treats three unsubstantiated claims as facts; all cited sources are pro-government or structurally biased; not a single independent primary source appears.



3. TIME ALLOCATION

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Overall score: 9/10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time among different viewpoints.

Estimated speaking time:

- Pro-government guests (Horváth, Nádor, Petri, Szikra): approx. 38 minutes (75%)
- Host: approx. 8 minutes (16%)
- Contributors in reports (Kavecsánszki, Lentulai): approx. 4 minutes (8%)
- Opposition/independent voice: 0 minutes (0%)

Summary: Throughout the entire broadcast, not a single opposition, independent or objectively EU-representing voice receives any speaking time; 100% of the time goes to contributors reinforcing the pro-government narrative.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 9/10

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

Omission 1:

Context: The KESMA consolidation and MTVA's government funding — structural factors of the domestic media imbalance.

Relevant: entire broadcast

Effect: The broadcast presents content moderation exclusively as foreign/opposition censorship, while completely concealing the one-sidedness of the domestic media environment — this omission artificially increases the credibility of the "censorship" narrative.

Omission 2:

Context: OSCE/ODIHR election observation reports documenting unequal conditions of competition in favour of the government.

Relevant: 22:00–23:36

Effect: The refutation of the electoral fraud narrative rests solely on the claims of pro-government guests; the assessment of independent international observers is entirely absent.

Omission 3:

Context: The full legal background of the ban on the Netcon conference — including the legal framework within which the Belgian court imposed the symbolic 1-euro fine, and the precedent value of the decision.

Relevant: 01:02–10:22

Effect: The guests interpret the symbolic fine amount as an incentive to continue censorship, while the specificities of the Belgian legal system and the true message of the decision are not explained.

Summary: The three most significant omissions together result in the viewer interpreting the presented events exclusively within the framework of the pro-government narrative; the counterbalancing facts are systematically absent.

Missing voices

- Independent media law expert: Would have explained the actual legal content of the EU democracy shield and its relationship to the Mttv.
- OSCE/ODIHR election observer: Would have provided an objective picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the Hungarian electoral system.
- TISZA or DK representative: Could have presented their concerns about electoral integrity in their own words.
- Independent platform moderation researcher: Would have provided a data-based picture of removal rates for right-wing and left-wing content.
- Belgian lawyer or organiser of the Netcon conference: Could have explained the full legal background of the ban.
- MEP involved in developing the EU democracy shield (non-DK): Could have explained the original purpose and limitations of the initiative.
- Representative of an independent civil organisation: Could have shown how genuine civil organisations differ from "pseudo-civils".



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

- Media researcher: Could have objectively analysed the impact of the KESMA consolidation and MTVA on the domestic media balance.



5. NUMBER MANIPULATION									0/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

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

Overall score: 7/10

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 16:15

Figure: "9 billion euros will be spent in the coming period"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value — provided; (b) ratio — missing; (c) trend — missing

Missing context: The ratio relative to the EU's total budget, the temporal distribution of the 9 billion euros, a breakdown of the actual intended uses.

Effect: The figure appears enormous in isolation; relative to the EU's total 7-year budget (1,074 billion euros) it is 0.84% — this context is not provided by the broadcast.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 37:59

Figure: "more money than the entire European Union allocates to research and development over 7 years"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value — not specified; (b) ratio — missing; (c) trend — missing

Missing context: The actual amount of EU R&D expenditure (Horizon Europe: 95.5 billion euros 2021–2027), against which the claim is demonstrably false.

Effect: False comparison that makes the democracy shield's funding appear unrealistically large.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 46:44

Figure: "10 billion euros in EU support" (amount given to Hungary)

Dimensions: (a) absolute value — provided; (b) ratio — missing; (c) trend — missing

Missing context: What proportion of EU funds this amount represents, under what conditions it was released, and what amounts remain frozen.

Effect: Without context, the figure implies the injustice of the proceedings against Hungary.

Summary: In three instances the broadcast uses absolute figures without ratio and trend; in one instance (R&D comparison) the claim is factually verifiable and likely false.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 8/10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups/ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 18:59

Quote: "this is like Comrade Rákosi's people's democracy"

Technique: Identifies the EU democracy shield with the Stalinist dictatorship.

Effect: Frames EU institutions as a totalitarian system, thereby excluding the possibility of any rational debate.

Association 2:

Timestamp: 20:15

Quote: "as Stalin's best pupils, they do what they do"

Technique: Identifies EU leaders as Stalin's pupils.

Effect: Dehumanising, turns political debate into an ideological war.

Association 3:

Timestamp: 04:04–04:55

Quote: "Interestingly, the threads come together around Dávid Dóra... in an instructional video post she tells TISZA followers... where to click, and what way, if there are many of you, you can shut down that page"

Technique: Links MEP Dávid Dóra (TISZA) to the deletion of Lentulai Krisztián's page without evidence.

Effect: Portrays an opposition politician as an instigator of organised censorship.

Association chain: EU democracy shield → Rákosi's people's democracy → Stalin's pupils → totalitarian system

Source check on the Dávid Dóra case:

- Does it work with primary sources? NO — the content of the "syllabus" is not presented
- Are the claims falsifiable? PARTIALLY — the existence of the instructional video is verifiable, but the interpretation of "incitement" is speculative
- Result category: B — borderline (partially documented, partially speculative)
- IMPORTANT: The broadcast itself treats it as category C (instigator of organised censorship), which is its own framing, not an established fact.

Summary: The broadcast uses three different association techniques to identify EU institutions and opposition politicians with totalitarian systems and organised censorship, without evidence.



7. TIMING									0/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Overall score: 7/10

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

Finding 1:

Position: 00:34–00:49 (beginning)

Content: "Words we often hear from the tech giants and the global mainstream. Yet several examples show that these principles are only valid as long as viewpoints that fit well into the globalist narrative are being expressed."

Timing effect: In the first 15 seconds of the broadcast, the interpretive frame is established: freedom of speech is only valid for "globalists". This frame determines the interpretation of the entire broadcast before a single fact is stated.

Finding 2:

Position: 51:06–51:27 (end)

Content: "one must see what happened in Warsaw... let that be an example of what it looks like when Brussels is able to install a government for itself"

Timing effect: The broadcast closes with the example of Poland as a cautionary warning — this closing message remains in the viewer's memory and acts as an implicit threat regarding the 2026 Hungarian elections.

Finding 3:

Position: 41:44–42:08 (middle-end)

Content: Reading of the Criminal Code passage on high treason

Timing effect: The reading of the legal passage occurs at the climax of the discussion about opposition parties and the EU, implicitly linking the concept of high treason with opposition politicians and the EU.

Summary: The beginning and end of the broadcast serve a strategic framing function; the timing of the Criminal Code passage acts as an implicit legal threat against the opposition.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

0/10

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)

Overall score: 8/10

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 at a different position did not produce an analogous reaction.

Calculation of degree of outrage:

Score = Degree of outrage (0–5) + Selectivity (0–5)

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 07:34–07:43

Triggering event: The ban on the Netcon conference in Brussels

Reaction: "let us remember that there was a police intervention here, really very heavy-handed, the kind that would have been used if there had been criminals there, that is how they treated the organisers"

Comparison: The KESMA consolidation, MTVA's government control, the suppression of independent media in Hungary — not a single outraged comment is made about these in the broadcast.

Asymmetry: Confirmed — the Brussels event provokes strong outrage, the domestic media imbalance provokes none at all.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 08:42–09:11

Triggering event: The ban on the Netcon conference

Reaction: "if they had wanted to hold, say, a dark-green left-liberal conference in Budapest, which was then banned by a police measure, well, I think the paratroopers of the occupying forces would be landing here by tomorrow"

Comparison: Not a single outraged comment is made about the obstruction of opposition events or the suppression of the independent press in Hungary.

Asymmetry: Confirmed — the hypothetical Brussels case provokes strong outrage, the real domestic cases do not.

Degree of outrage: 4/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Summary: The broadcast shows strong outrage towards events in Brussels and at EU level, while not a single critical comment is made about the domestic media imbalance and the operating conditions of opposition parties — this constitutes clear selective outrage.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Overall score: 9/10

Definition: How complete is the broadcast's presentation of topics?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 22:00–23:36

Missing perspective/fact: The 2022 OSCE/ODIHR election observation report, which documents unequal conditions of competition (media imbalance, lack of transparency in campaign financing).

Relevance: It would be a fundamental reference point when discussing the electoral fraud narrative.

Effect: The viewer gets the impression that the Hungarian electoral system is entirely clean and that the fraud narrative stems solely from political motivation — in reality, documented structural problems exist that are not identical to ballot-counting fraud.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: entire broadcast

Missing perspective/fact: The KESMA consolidation and MTVA's government funding as structural factors of the domestic media imbalance.

Relevance: When discussing the topic of "censorship", presenting the domestic media system would be fundamental.

Effect: The viewer gets the impression that censorship is exclusively a foreign/opposition phenomenon, while domestic media concentration remains entirely invisible.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 36:57–38:19

Missing perspective/fact: The actual legal text of the EU democracy shield and its jurisdictional limits.

Relevance: Without an objective presentation of the content of the initiative, the viewer cannot assess whether the guests' interpretation is correct.

Effect: The viewer can only rely on the guests' interpretation, which is structurally biased.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits the facts and perspectives that would nuance or refute the pro-government narrative; this is not a random deficiency but a consistent editorial decision.

Interpretive criteria — debatable, not purely quantifiable

The content moderation of digital platforms, the EU's democratic institutional framework and the question of electoral integrity provoke lively, factual debates across Europe. Meta's and other tech companies' moderation practices are criticised from both right-wing and left-wing sides, and there are indeed documented cases of politically motivated reporting campaigns. The EU "democracy shield" initiative is a genuinely existing legislative process, about whose content and jurisdiction serious professional debate is ongoing. However, the spread of the electoral fraud narrative in Hungary appears primarily in Fidesz-KDNP communications, while independent election observers (OSCE/ODIHR) regularly document unequal conditions of competition in favour of the government.

Proportion of perspectives covered

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



[A] OMITTED

Timestamp: 03:02–04:55 — Quote: "I am quite certain that staff of the conservative right-wing press receive a different kind of negative treatment" — Assessment: Presents exclusively the removal of right-wing content; not a single word is said about the moderation of left-wing content or Meta's general moderation statistics.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: 16:01–18:43 — Quote: "this is an institutionalised political pressure organisation on which 9 billion euros are being spent" — Assessment: The actual legal text, jurisdiction and limitations of the democracy shield are not presented; only the guests' interpretation is heard.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: 22:00–23:36 — Quote: "you cannot actually cheat in a Hungarian election in a way that would not be discovered immediately" — Assessment: The OSCE/ODIHR reports documenting unequal conditions of competition are not mentioned at all.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: entire broadcast — Assessment: The KESMA consolidation, MTVA's government funding and the domestic media imbalance are never raised.

[E] OMITTED

Timestamp: 22:00 — Quote: "from Magyar Péter to Hatházi Ákos, many politicians are saying that this election will be stolen" — Assessment: The position of opposition parties is presented exclusively through the guests' interpretation, in a hostile frame; there is no direct opposition contribution.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: entire broadcast — Assessment: No independent media law expert appears at all.

[G] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 01:02–02:41 — Quote: "the authorities violated freedom of speech and the right to peaceful assembly" — Assessment: The court decision is presented, but the circumstances of the antifa demonstration and the Belgian authorities' security reasoning appear only through the guests' interpretation.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: 22:00–23:36 — Assessment: The evidence base for the electoral fraud narrative is not examined; the guests treat it as fact that the narrative is false, but do not document this either.

[I] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 39:46–41:30 — Quote: "it turns out that this is a CIA front organisation" — Assessment: USAID is presented as a CIA front organisation without evidence; an objective comparison with EU civil funding is omitted.

[J] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 50:57–51:27 — Quote: "one must see what happened in Warsaw... let that be an example of what it looks like when Brussels is able to install a government for itself" — Assessment: Poland appears exclusively as a negative example; an objective presentation of the Polish rule-of-law situation is omitted.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. DEFINITION OF INTERPRETIVE FRAME

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 9/10

Definition: How is the topic fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:34–00:49

Quote: "Words we often hear from the tech giants and the global mainstream. Yet several examples show that these principles are only valid as long as viewpoints that fit well into the globalist narrative are being expressed."

Manipulation: Immediately places the question of freedom of speech within the "globalist vs. conservative" frame, excluding all other interpretive possibilities.

Why problematic: The viewer interprets the entire broadcast within this frame; the complex question of content moderation is reduced to a one-dimensional ideological battle.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 06:05–06:21

Quote: "a structure, a picture emerged, and a structure that is shocking... we are now going through the individual heads of this seven-headed dragon"

Manipulation: The "seven-headed dragon" metaphor frames EU institutions, tech giants and the opposition as a single evil entity.

Why problematic: The metaphor gives an emotional-mythological frame to political analysis, excluding rational deliberation.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 15:40–15:47

Quote: "at this moment, we — that is, the Hungarian position — is the one that represents the stance consistent with the EU's founding documents"

Manipulation: Frames Fidesz-KDNP policy as the only legitimate EU-compliant position.

Why problematic: This claim is debatable and contested; the framing, however, treats it as fact, not as opinion.

Summary: The broadcast creates an interpretive space through three mutually reinforcing framing techniques (globalist vs. conservative, seven-headed dragon, single legitimate position) within which an opposition or pro-EU stance appears inherently illegitimate.



11. LANGUAGE AND CONCEPTS

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 8/10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:42

Quote: "globalist narrative"

Manipulation: The term "globalist" carries strong negative connotations in right-wing discourse; neutral alternative: "international/multilateral approach".

Why problematic: The use of the term immediately defines who the "enemy" is, without defining or justifying this.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 17:23

Quote: "pseudo-civils", "fake civils"

Manipulation: Pre-emptively classifies civil organisations as fake and disguised; neutral alternative: "civil organisations" or "NGOs".

Why problematic: The term predetermines the assessment of the civil sphere, excluding the distinction between genuine civil organisations and pro-government organisations.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 04:51

Quote: "politically biased left-liberal people"

Manipulation: Qualifies the persons making Meta's moderation decisions with a political label without evidence; neutral alternative: "the persons making moderation decisions".

Why problematic: The qualification is stated as fact, while it is an unsubstantiated claim.

Summary: The broadcast consistently uses terms ("globalist", "pseudo-civils", "left-liberal") that belong to the characteristic vocabulary of pro-government discourse and for which neutral equivalents exist — this choice of language itself serves a framing function.



12. MODERATOR BEHAVIOUR

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Overall score: 8/10

Definition: Asymmetries in follow-up questions, interruptions, 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 with a different guest did not produce an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 06:22–06:45

Triggering event: The host introduces the "seven-headed dragon" metaphor and the "shocking picture" frame.

Quote (host): "of this very shocking picture, or using a folk-tale analogy I could also say, of this seven-headed dragon, we are now going through the individual heads"

Comparison: Not a single guest claim is challenged; not a single follow-up question is directed at the evidence base of the claims.

Asymmetry: Confirmed — the host is also an active shaper of the narrative, not a neutral moderator.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 39:12–39:14

Triggering event: A guest suggests that Brussels wants to install its own government through the elections.

Quote (host): "That way they will surely vote for us."

Comparison: Not a single opposition claim is commented on with similar irony or sympathy.

Asymmetry: Confirmed — the host signals sympathy for the pro-government narrative.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 04:04–04:55

Triggering event: An unsubstantiated claim about MEP Dávid Dóra is made.

Quote (host): Does not challenge it, does not ask for evidence.

Comparison: Not a single guest claim is followed by a follow-up question or request for evidence.

Asymmetry: Confirmed — the host does not apply critical follow-up questioning in a single instance.

Summary: The host does not behave as a neutral moderator but as an active participant in the narrative: uses framing metaphors, signals sympathy, and does not challenge a single guest claim.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 8/10

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

Asymmetry 1:

To the guests (05:51–06:45): "Well, when I was preparing for this programme, I re-read those writings... a structure, a picture emerged, and a structure that is shocking." — soft, affirming introduction

To the opposition/EU: Not a single question is asked — opposition and EU positions are presented exclusively through the guests' interpretation.

Comparison: Guests receive exclusively affirming questions that reinforce their narrative; the opposition position receives no question at all, because no representative is present.

Asymmetry 2:

To the guests (22:00): "What are the Hungarian parts of this system?" — open question reinforcing the narrative

To the opposition: Not present, no question.

Comparison: Questions serve exclusively to develop the pro-government narrative; critical follow-up questioning never occurs.

Summary: In the broadcast, question asymmetry exists not between different guests, but between the present (pro-government) and absent (opposition/independent) voices — this is a structural asymmetry arising from the entire construction of the broadcast.



14. FALSE BALANCE

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 3/10

Definition: Artificial balance despite actual inequality.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 07:47–08:05

Construction: "I am very glad about this topic... What happened in connection with the National Conservatism Conference is, in my view, absolutely exemplary in a negative sense"

Analysis: The broadcast does not apply false balance — on the contrary, it does not strive for balance at all. The absence of false balance is itself a finding: the broadcast does not attempt to create the appearance of balance; it is openly one-sided.

Summary: The technique of false balance is not characteristic of this broadcast — the editors do not strive to maintain even the appearance of balance; the one-sidedness is open and consistent.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Overall score: 9/10

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

Finding 1:

Defined agenda item: Foreign interference in the upcoming Hungarian elections as the only relevant context.

Timestamp: 15:51 — Evidence: "less than two months before the elections, let us talk about this"

Alternative agenda: The domestic media imbalance, the KESMA consolidation, the OSCE/ODIHR findings — none of these make it onto the agenda.

Finding 2:

Defined agenda item: The EU democracy shield as an attack on Hungarian sovereignty.

Timestamp: 16:01–18:43 — Evidence: "this is an institutionalised political pressure organisation"

Alternative agenda: The actual legal content of the EU democracy shield, its jurisdictional limits, the role of national parliaments in the process.

Finding 3:

Defined agenda item: TISZA and DK as domestic instruments of foreign interests.

Timestamp: 22:00–23:36 — Evidence: "from Magyar Péter to Hatházi Ákos, many politicians are saying that this election will be stolen"

Alternative agenda: The actual programme positions of opposition parties, an objective presentation of their concerns about electoral integrity.

Summary: The broadcast's agenda contains exclusively topics relevant from the perspective of the pro-government narrative; the domestic media system, independent election observers and opposition parties' programme positions are systematically excluded from the agenda.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	F	9	Exclusively staff from pro-government institutes speak; every source is structurally biased.
2	Source selection	F	9	Three unsubstantiated claims treated as facts; not a single independent primary source appears.
3	Time allocation	F	9	Opposition/independent voices receive 0% of airtime throughout the entire broadcast.
4	Omission	F	9	The KESMA consolidation, OSCE/ODIHR reports and the legal content of the EU democracy shield are systematically absent.
5	Number manipulation	F	7	In three instances, absolute figures without context; in one instance, a likely false comparison.
6	Guilt by association	F	8	Identifies EU institutions with Rákosi and Stalin's pupils; presents Dávid Dóra without evidence as an instigator of censorship.
7	Timing	F	7	The strategic placement of the opening frame, the Criminal Code passage and the closing Polish example has a manipulative effect.
8	Selective outrage	F	8	Strong outrage at Brussels events, complete indifference towards the domestic media imbalance.
9	Completeness	F	9	Of the ten relevant perspectives, two appear partially and eight are entirely absent.
10	Framing	I	9	The "globalist vs. conservative" and "seven-headed dragon" frames exclude rational deliberation.
11	Language	I	8	"Globalist", "pseudo-civils", "left-liberal" — consistent, framing vocabulary without evidence.
12	Moderator behaviour	I	8	The host is an active shaper of the narrative; not a single critical follow-up question is asked.
13	Question asymmetry	I	8	Exclusively affirming questions to guests; no opposition/independent voice is present.
14	False balance	I	3	The broadcast does not apply false balance — it is openly and consistently one-sided.
15	Agenda-setting	I	9	The domestic media system, independent observers and opposition programme positions are systematically excluded.

Results

- **FACTUAL SCORE** (average of criteria 1–9): 8.3 / 10
- **INTERPRETIVE SCORE** (average of criteria 10–15): 7.5 / 10



- OVERALL SCORE (average of all 15 criteria): 7.9 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Expert selection (9/10):** The broadcast features exclusively staff from four pro-government research institutes; every source is structurally biased, and the broadcast does not indicate this at all. This one-sided expert selection forms the basis of all other manipulation techniques.
- 2. Framing (9/10):** The "globalist vs. conservative" and "seven-headed dragon" frames define the entire broadcast's interpretive space within the first 50 seconds; within this frame, an opposition or pro-EU stance appears inherently illegitimate, and the viewer carries this frame throughout the entire broadcast.
- 3. Omission (9/10):** The KESMA consolidation, OSCE/ODIHR reports, the legal content of the EU democracy shield and opposition parties' programme positions are systematically absent — this consistent omission is not random but a structural condition for maintaining the narrative.

The broadcast's messages

MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT): "Freedom of speech and democratic elections in Hungary are under threat — but not because of domestic media concentration, but because of foreign (EU, tech giants, opposition) interference."

Technique: Framing + omission — Evidence: 00:34, 16:01, 22:00

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Opposition politicians (TISZA, DK) are domestic instruments of foreign interests who are destabilising Hungary with the electoral fraud narrative."

Technique: Guilt by association + treating unsubstantiated claims as facts — Evidence: 04:04, 22:00, 33:06

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL): "Hungary is the only EU member state representing a position consistent with the EU's founding documents; losing the 2026 elections would bring Hungary the fate of Poland."

Technique: Agenda-setting + timing — Evidence: 15:40, 51:06

Classification of degree of manipulation

Justification: The broadcast's overall score is 7.9/10, which is on the boundary between "systematic imbalance" and "extreme imbalance". The one-sidedness is not random or occasional but consistent and structural: not a single opposition, independent or objectively EU-representing voice is given space; the omissions, framing and expert selection form a mutually reinforcing system. The requirements of balance and diversity of opinion prescribed by Mttv. §83 are seriously violated.

SUMMARY

The examined episode of Kommentár Klub systematically violates the requirements of balanced and objective information prescribed by Mttv. §83 through several mutually reinforcing techniques. The broadcast features exclusively staff from four pro-government research institutes, without a single opposition, independent or objectively EU-representing voice; of the ten relevant perspectives, eight are entirely absent. The framing, language and agenda-setting consistently reinforce the Fidesz-KDNP sovereignty discourse, while portraying opposition parties as instruments of foreign interests and identifying EU institutions with totalitarian systems. Three unsubstantiated claims are stated as facts (USAID as CIA front organisation, content of the Zelenskyy plan, Dávid Dóra's "syllabus"), and numerical data appear without context, in one case likely incorrectly. The broadcast's overall manipulation score is 7.9/10, which provides grounds for establishing a serious violation under Mttv. §83.



OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	0/10	Undetected
2	SOURCE SELECTION	0/10	Undetected
3	TIME ALLOCATION	0/10	Undetected
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	0/10	Undetected
5	NUMBER MANIPULATION	0/10	Undetected
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	0/10	Undetected
7	TIMING	0/10	Undetected
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	0/10	Undetected
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE	0/10	Undetected
10	DEFINITION OF INTERPRETIVE FRAME	0/10	Undetected
11	LANGUAGE AND CONCEPTS	0/10	Undetected
12	MODERATOR BEHAVIOUR	0/10	Undetected
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	0/10	Undetected
14	FALSE BALANCE	0/10	Undetected
15	AGENDA-SETTING	0/10	Undetected

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

8.0/10

Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation



LEGEND — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

Overall deviation index — Interpretive ranges

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

Party-political bias (from –5 to +5)

–5 to –3	Strongly disadvantaged	The party is significantly under-represented in framing, speaking time or presentation.
–2 to –1	Mildly disadvantaged	Recognisable but mild disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No preferential treatment or disadvantage detectable.
+1 to +2	Mildly advantaged	Recognisable but mild preferential treatment.
+3 to +5	Strongly advantaged	The party is significantly over-represented in framing, speaking time or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Mttv. §83)

Assessment under Mttv. §83

Mttv. §83 requires that in news programmes and informational programmes the requirements of current, objective and balanced information must be observed, and diversity of opinion must be reflected.

Violation 1:

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

Facts: The broadcast features exclusively staff from four pro-government research institutes; not a single opposition, independent or objectively EU-representing voice is given space.

Evidence: 05:33–05:47 — "My guests this evening are Horváth József, director of the Sovereignty Protection Research Institute, Nádor Koppány Zsombor, research director of the Szent István Intézet, Petri Bernadett, researcher at the XXI. Század Intézet, and Szikra Levente, senior analyst at the Alapjogokért Központ."

Assessment: All four invited guests are affiliated with pro-government institutions; representatives of opposition parties, the independent civil sphere and EU institutions are entirely absent. This is a manifest violation of the diversity of opinion requirement prescribed by Mttv. §83.

Violation 2:

Norm: Mttv. §83 — objectivity

Facts: Three unsubstantiated claims are stated as facts, qualifying opposition politicians and EU institutions.

Evidence: 39:56 — "it turns out that this is a CIA front organisation, for long decades"; 04:04 — "gives them a kind of syllabus on how to do it, where to click"; 29:30 — "in the Zelensky plan, the third point is that Viktor Orbán's power must be shaken"

Assessment: The requirement of objectivity demands that unsubstantiated claims be presented as opinion, not as fact, and that the position of the persons/organisations concerned also be presented.

Violation 3:

Norm: Mttv. §83 — balance

Facts: Opposition parties (TISZA, DK) are presented exclusively through the pro-government guests' interpretation, in a hostile frame; their own position is not heard.

Evidence: 22:00 — "from Magyar Péter to Hatházi Ákos, many politicians are saying, well in advance, that this election will be stolen"; 31:34 — "DK's Molnár Csaba says that the capabilities provided by the democracy shield should be used against Hungary"

Assessment: The requirement of balance demands that the position of the parties concerned be presented objectively in their own words — this does not happen at all in the broadcast.

Violation 4:

Norm: Mttv. §83 — objectivity and balance

Facts: Numerical data appear without context, in one case likely incorrectly.

Evidence: 37:59 — "more money than the entire European Union allocates to research and development over 7 years" — the 95.5 billion euro framework of the EU's Horizon Europe programme refutes this claim.

Assessment: The requirement of objectivity demands that numerical data be verified and placed in context.

Overall assessment under Mttv. §83

The examined episode of Kommentár Klub violates the requirements of balance, objectivity and diversity of opinion prescribed by Mttv. §83 in four separate sets of facts. The violations do not stem from occasional or random errors but follow from the broadcast's editorial concept: the choice of guests, framing, omissions and language form a mutually



reinforcing system that consistently reinforces the pro-government narrative and excludes opposition/independent voices. The severity of the violations is increased by the fact that the broadcast airs two months before the 2026 elections and directly calls into question the legitimacy of opposition parties. It would fall within the jurisdiction of the NMHH Media Council to investigate and sanction these violations; however, the Media Council has been composed exclusively of persons close to Fidesz since 2010, which indicates the absence of structural enforcement.

SOURCE DEEP-CHECK (Mandatory for every cited specialist institution / NGO / advisory organisation)

1. Sovereignty Protection Research Institute

- 1. FUNDING:** Hungarian state — institution established by government decree, funded from the state budget.
- 2. MANDATE:** The institution's mandate is research related to the protection of Hungarian sovereignty — this is structurally incompatible with neutral assessment on the question of EU–Hungary relations.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** The institution's survival and funding depend on the maintenance of the governmental sovereignty discourse; this constitutes a direct conflict of interest.
 - D1 Interessenkonflikt: -2
 - D2 Persönliches Risiko: -1
 - D3 Fachkompetenz: +1
 - D4 Meinungskonsistenz: +1
 - D5 Emotionalisierung vs. Daten: -1
 - D6 Quellenstufe: -1
 - TOTAL: -3 → QUELLENAMPEL: S**
- 5. COUNTERVOICE:** Independent constitutional lawyer or EU law expert — not featured in the broadcast.

2. Alapjogokért Központ

- 1. FUNDING:** Private foundation with pro-government ties; its funding is not fully transparent.
- 2. MANDATE:** Legal protection and research activities — not neutral on the question of electoral integrity, since it is in the government's interest to refute the electoral fraud narrative.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** The organisation regularly appears in government communications; its research is used by the government as a reference basis.
 - D1 Interessenkonflikt: -2
 - D2 Persönliches Risiko: -1
 - D3 Fachkompetenz: +1
 - D4 Meinungskonsistenz: +1
 - D5 Emotionalisierung vs. Daten: -1
 - D6 Quellenstufe: -2
 - TOTAL: -4 → QUELLENAMPEL: S**
- 5. COUNTERVOICE:** Independent election researcher or OSCE/ODIHR — not featured in the broadcast.

3. XXI. Század Intézet

- 1. FUNDING:** Private foundation with pro-government ties; the institute regularly appears in government media.
- 2. MANDATE:** Political analysis — structurally biased on questions relating to the EU and the opposition.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** The institute's survival and visibility depend on alignment with the pro-government narrative.
 - D1 Interessenkonflikt: -2
 - D2 Persönliches Risiko: -1
 - D3 Fachkompetenz: +1
 - D4 Meinungskonsistenz: +1
 - D5 Emotionalisierung vs. Daten: -1
 - D6 Quellenstufe: -1
 - TOTAL: -3 → QUELLENAMPEL: S**
- 5. COUNTERVOICE:** Independent political scientist — not featured in the broadcast.

4. Szent István Intézet

- 1. FUNDING:** Mixed ecclesiastical/state funding; affiliated with both the Catholic Church and the governmental sphere.



2. MANDATE: Research and representation of Christian-democratic values — this is structurally incompatible with neutral assessment on the question of EU values.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: The institute's mandate determines its position; the representation of Christian-democratic values and the critique of the EU's "pseudo-value canon" are institutional interests.

D1 Interessenkonflikt: -2

D2 Persönliches Risiko: -1

D3 Fachkompetenz: +1

D4 Meinungskonsistenz: +1

D5 Emotionalisierung vs. Daten: 0

D6 Quellenstufe: -1

TOTAL: -2 → QUELLENAMPEL: S

5. COUNTERVOICE: Independent EU values researcher — not featured in the broadcast.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The labels "recognised" or "renowned" are social qualifications, not professional qualifications. Every source must be assessed on the basis of conflict of interest, mandate and the credibility matrix — regardless of how the broadcast frames them.

Source credibility overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Sovereignty Protection Research Institute	-2	-1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-3	S
Alapjogokért Központ	-2	-1	+1	+1	-1	-2	-4	S
XXI. Század Intézet	-2	-1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-3	S
Szent István Intézet	-2	-1	+1	+1	0	-1	-2	S

Legal and methodological classification

Not a finding of fact	The results presented do not constitute a finding of fact regarding individual persons, editorial offices or programmes. They are the results of standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.
Not a legal judgement	The overall deviation index does not replace the legal assessment under Mttv. §83. Determining whether a given broadcast violates the statutory requirements is exclusively the task of the competent authorities (in particular the Media Council).
Not evidence of causality	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.
Not an assessment of intent	The analysis measures the observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. 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 broadcasts, 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 press freedom (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 informational programmes.
- §83 (2): Information must reflect the diversity of opinions.
- §12: Protection of plurality of opinion as a fundamental principle.
- §13: Prohibition of one-sided information in news programmes.

Smtv. (Press Freedom Act 2010)

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

Fundamental Law

- Article IX: Freedom of opinion and 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 at the text of the law, but at the structural non-enforcement by the pro-government NMHH. MTVA is a broadcaster operating under de facto state-aligned control.

Supervisory authority

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

Complaints 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 Zürich 1 | www.svfab.ch | 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 | 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 or by email at kontakt@svfab.ch.



Unbalanced reporting as a response to the Swiss halving initiative: This book explains 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 with the book.

Also available as an audiobook.



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

Anyone who does not understand this distributes 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 counts 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 into things — and start shaping them.

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 that 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.