



## MTVA DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-03-21\_kommentar-klub

Programme: MTVA-Sendung (M1/Kossuth Rádió) | 2026-03-21 | Analysed: 2026-05-24 22:42  
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 is displayed 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**

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](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

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



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Government (since 2010, without interruption): Fidesz-KDNP – two-thirds parliamentary majority (135 seats out of 199). The governing party won 54.1% in 2022, achieving its fourth consecutive two-thirds majority victory.

Opposition: TISZA (Respect and Freedom party led by Magyar Péter) achieved 29.6% at the 2024 EP elections and has become the only significant opposition force. Also present are DK, Momentum, Jobbik, LMP, MSZP (on a united opposition list in 2022), as well as the extra-parliamentary Mi Hazánk (6 seats) and MKKP.

Party	CHES left-right	Seats (2022)	Government/Opposition	Basic position
MSZP	3,00	(United opp.)	Opposition	Social democratic, left-wing
MKKP	3,50	0	Extra-parliamentary	Satirical-libertarian, left-wing
LMP	3,79	(United opp.)	Opposition	Green-progressive, left-wing
Momentum	4,17	(United opp.)	Opposition	Centre-left, pro-EU, urban
DK	4,28	(United opp.)	Opposition	Centre-left, strongly pro-EU
TISZA	6,17	— (2024 new)	Opposition (strongest)	Centre-right, anti-corruption, pro-EU
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, irredentist

Hungarian political life is defined by four main fault lines: (1) the asymmetric power relationship between Fidesz-KDNP and all opposition forces; (2) the dispute over the rule of law and access to EU funds; (3) the generational and values-based realignment accelerated by the emergence of TISZA; (4) the question of sovereignty versus European integration, which the government links to migration and "sovereignty protection" narratives. The stakes of the 2026 parliamentary election are extraordinarily high: either a fourth two-thirds majority for Fidesz-KDNP or the first change of government since 2010.

MTVA (M1, M2, M4, M5, Duna TV) operates as a public service media provider that functions de facto as a government propaganda tool: the NMHH Media Council has been staffed exclusively by persons close to Fidesz since 2010, and the KESMA foundation (2018) consolidated approximately 500 media companies into a pro-government ownership circle. Section 83 of the Mttv. obliges public service media to provide current, objective and balanced information and to reflect diversity of opinion — an obligation that MTVA regularly violates. Hungary ranks 85th on the Reporters Without Borders (RSF) Press Freedom Index, the worst ranking in the EU.



## 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	29:48 "we are talking about the post-liberal hegemony represented by Viktor Orbán" — Programme position: sovereignty, illiberal democracy, strong prime ministerial power — partly correct, but framed uncritically and apologetically; rule of law concerns, KESMA consolidation, and the EU funds blockade are entirely omitted
TISZA	-4	There is not a single direct reference to TISZA or Magyar Péter; the opposition appears exclusively as the "other side" (40:10 "they don't even let the candidate representatives of the other side near a microphone") — Programme position: anti-corruption, rule of law, pro-EU — entirely omitted, programme positions not presented
DK	0	Does not appear in the broadcast.
Momentum	0	Does not appear in the broadcast.
Jobbik	0	Does not appear in the broadcast.
Mi Hazánk	0	Does not appear in the broadcast.
LMP	0	Does not appear in the broadcast.
MSZP	-2	32:20 "one was the SZDSZ, the other was the MSZP, and these two found each other well in this" — Programme position: social democracy — paired with negative association, the metaphor of the "ivory tower" and "cynical action"; programme position not presented

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate representation: Fidesz-KDNP (score: +3) — but even this is in an apologetic frame, without criticism
- Strongest distortion: TISZA (score: -4) — complete omission, the only reference is also dismissive
- Average deviation from 0: 1.1
- Conclusion: The broadcast conveys exclusively the Fidesz-KDNP government narrative; the programme positions of all opposition parties — especially the strongest opposition force, TISZA — are entirely absent. MSZP and SZDSZ appear exclusively as negative historical reference points, not as independent political actors. This is not merely one-sidedness, but a complete absence of pluralism.

### Left-right overall tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -4.8

CLASSIFICATION: Strongly right-leaning

Justification: The broadcast conveys the Fidesz-KDNP ideological framework — the narrative of "post-liberal hegemony", "national sovereignty", and "Christian-conservative cultural policy" — entirely without criticism. Not a single opposition voice, not a single alternative perspective is heard. The left side of the left-right spectrum is treated exclusively as a negative historical example (MSZP, SZDSZ) or as a potential "target for conversion" (left-wing authors who "resonate" with the right-wing narrative).



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST DATA AND TOPIC FRAMES

### Broadcast data

- Title: Kommentárklub (5th year, 20th anniversary broadcast)
- Date: Cannot be determined precisely from the filename; based on content, spring 2025 (reference to the 2026 elections, "the remaining two years" of Trump's presidency)
- Estimated length: approx. 52 minutes (estimate based on transcript)
- Host/Reporter: Békés Márton (editor-in-chief of the Kommentár journal — serving simultaneously as guest and host)
- Reporter: Németh Hunor (introductory report)

Invited persons:

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Békés Márton	Historian, editor-in-chief of Kommentár	Close to Fidesz, MCC affiliation	Conservative close to the far right
Stumpf István	Professor of constitutional law, member of the Prime Minister's strategic advisory body	Fidesz (former minister, former Constitutional Court judge)	Right-wing, pro-government
Hegyesi Zoltán	Historian	Not specified, but right-wing conservative based on context	Right-wing conservative
Galló Béla	Political sociologist	Not specified, but right-wing conservative based on context	Right-wing conservative
Bájer Zsolt	Fiction writer, publicist (in introductory report)	Close to Fidesz	Right-wing conservative

### Main topic

On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Kommentár journal, an inner-circle exchange of ideas about the nature of the symbiosis between the right-wing conservative intelligentsia and the Fidesz-KDNP government, the relationship between "people of the spirit" and "people of action", and the strategy for building "post-liberal hegemony".



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard facts — countable and scientifically grounded

#### Hardfacts — 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?

#### 1st expert: Békés Márton — historian, editor-in-chief of Kommentár

Timestamp: 05:36

Statement: "My guests tonight are Békés Márton, historian and editor-in-chief of the Kommentár journal."

Classification: Kommentár is the leading journal of the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit; Békés Márton is a leading staff member of MCC (Mathias Corvinus Collegium), a state-funded institution close to Fidesz. He is simultaneously host and participant — the conflation of the moderator and guest roles creates structural bias.

Missing counter-opinion: An independent historian who would critically assess the NER's cultural policy (e.g., in the context of the reorganisation of the MTA, the curtailment of university autonomy).

Source deep-check:

**(a) FUNDING:** MCC is funded from state sources (in 2021 it received assets worth 1,500 billion forints from the state); the Kommentár journal also lives on state and Fidesz-affiliated foundation funding. Structural conflict of interest: criticising the policies of the funder (Fidesz-KDNP government) would be tantamount to institutional suicide.

**(b) MANDATE:** Not compatible with neutral assessment of Fidesz-KDNP cultural policy — the institution itself is a product and beneficiary of that policy.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct institutional dependence on the funder

D2 Personal risk: -2 — Takes no personal risk with his statements

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Relevant as a historian, but makes statements in the fields of political sociology and constitutional law

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistently represents the same position

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -1 — Strongly normative, little empirical data

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary

**TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** The broadcast presents him as a "historian" and "editor-in-chief", not as an ideological partner of the government — this frames a structurally biased position as neutral.

#### 2nd expert: Stumpf István — professor of constitutional law, member of the Prime Minister's strategic advisory body

Timestamp: 05:46

Statement: "Stumpf István, professor of constitutional law, member of the Prime Minister's strategic advisory body."



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

Classification: Former Fidesz minister (1998–2002), former Constitutional Court judge (Fidesz nominee), currently the Prime Minister's personal adviser. Not a neutral constitutional lawyer, but a direct participant in the government.

Missing counter-opinion: An independent constitutional lawyer (e.g., staff of the Eötvös Károly Institute) who would critically comment on the legitimacy of the Basic Law and the concept of "integrated democracy".

Source deep-check:

**(a) FUNDING:** State employee (Prime Minister's adviser), professor at a state university. Direct dependence on the government.

**(b) MANDATE:** Completely incompatible with neutral constitutional assessment — as the Prime Minister's adviser, he is a direct participant in the system he is evaluating.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct government employee

D2 Personal risk: -2 — Takes no risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Constitutional lawyer, relevant field

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: 0 — Mixed

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary

**TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** He is introduced as a "professor of constitutional law", with the Prime Ministerial advisory role mentioned only in passing — this pushes the most important conflict of interest into the background.

### 3rd expert: Galló Béla — political sociologist

Timestamp: 05:54

Statement: "Galló Béla, political sociologist."

Classification: Right-wing conservative sociologist, a well-known figure in the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit. His institutional affiliations are not mentioned.

Missing counter-opinion: An independent sociologist who would assess social inequalities and the effects of cultural policy with empirical data.

Source deep-check:

**(a) FUNDING:** Not clarified in the broadcast — this is itself a deficiency.

**(b) MANDATE:** Relevant as a political sociologist, but speaks exclusively from a perspective that reinforces the government narrative.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Probable but not documented

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Minimal

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Relevant field

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -1 — Normative, little empirical data

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary

**TOTAL: 0 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

*Missing expert groups:*

- Independent constitutional lawyer (e.g., Eötvös Károly Institute)
- Independent media researcher (e.g., Mérték Médiaelemző Műhely)
- Opposition politician or political analyst

*Summary (matrix result):*

- Békés Márton: YELLOW (-3) — structural conflict of interest, framed as neutral
- Stumpf István: YELLOW (-1) — direct government employee, presented as "professor"
- Galló Béla: YELLOW (0) — probable conflict of interest, not documented
- Hegyesi Zoltán: Not verifiable — institutional affiliation not mentioned



**Source credibility overview:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
expert: Békés Márton — historian, editor-in-chief of Kommentár	-2	-2	+1	+1	-1	0	-3	<b>YELLOW</b>
expert: Stumpf István — professor of constitutional law, member of the Prime Minister's strategic advisory body	-2	-2	+2	+1	0	0	-1	<b>YELLOW</b>
expert: Galló Béla — political sociologist	-1	-1	+2	+1	-1	0	0	<b>YELLOW</b>



## 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?

### 1st source: Kommentár journal (2006 and 2018 issues)

Timestamp: 17:04 and 24:14

Statement: 17:04 "somewhere at the end perhaps a vision of a country emerges in which the fundamental questions no longer need to be debated, because a consensus has formed to protect our communities and traditions"; 24:14 "there is no small amount of work in creating the cultural frameworks appropriate to the time and tasks of 21st-century Hungary"

- (a) **Funding and operator:** A right-wing journal funded from state and Fidesz-affiliated foundation sources — it is both the subject and the source of the broadcast.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Kommentár cites itself in its own anniversary broadcast — this is not a source, but self-promotion.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Independent cultural journals (e.g., *Élet és Irodalom*, 2000) that represent a different perspective.

### 2nd source: Russell Berry (American agrarian writer)

Timestamp: 44:49

Statement: "Russell Barry, who is an American agrarian writer and farmer, said that there are two kinds of people. There are those who are content to become a machine themselves, and there are people who want to remain human."

- (a) **Funding:** Not relevant — literary quotation.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** The quotation is taken out of context and serves to support the right-wing conservative narrative.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** The source of the quotation is not verifiable — "Russell Barry" cannot be clearly identified as a known author (likely Wendell Berry, the well-known agrarian thinker).

Rumour check (penalty points):

#### 1st rumour:

Timestamp: 40:10

Claim: "they don't even let the candidate representatives of the other side near a microphone"

Verbal marker: "even" — implicit claim without proof

Primary source: Not indicated — penalty point: +1

#### 2nd rumour:

Timestamp: 29:48

Claim: "perhaps there is also an interaction between the Americans and the Hungarians"

Verbal marker: "perhaps" — speculative claim

Primary source: Not indicated — penalty point: +1

Summary: The broadcast uses exclusively sources belonging to the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit; Kommentár cites itself; two unsubstantiated claims incur penalty points. Not a single independent, critical or opposition source appears.



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



### 3. TIME ALLOCATION

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 8/10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time among different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Békés Márton (host + guest): approx. 18 minutes (35%)
- Stumpf István: approx. 12 minutes (23%)
- Galló Béla: approx. 10 minutes (19%)
- Hegyesi Zoltán: approx. 7 minutes (13%)
- Bájer Zsolt (introductory report): approx. 3 minutes (6%)
- Németh Hunor (reporter): approx. 2 minutes (4%)
- Opposition/critical voice: 0 minutes (0%)

Summary: 100% of the total broadcast time goes to persons belonging to the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit; not a single opposition, independent or critical voice is heard. This is not merely disproportionality, but a complete absence of pluralism, which constitutes a direct violation of Section 83 of the Mttv.



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 9/10

Definition: What is left out, even though it would be relevant?

#### 1st omission:

Context: MCC (Mathias Corvinus Collegium) is mentioned positively (03:31 "There are results, MCC, to name what I consider the most important straight away"), but the institution's 2021 state asset transfer of 1,500 billion forints, its political ties and the lack of public procurement transparency are not mentioned at all.

Relevant timestamp: 03:31

Effect: MCC appears exclusively as a success story; the question of public funds usage and institutional independence remains invisible.

#### 2nd omission:

Context: When discussing cultural policy (01:26–02:57), the independent cultural sphere is entirely omitted — free theatres, independent publishers, the political selectivity of the NKA (National Cultural Fund), the 2020 transformation of the University of Theatre and Film Arts (SZFE).

Relevant timestamp: 01:26

Effect: Cultural policy appears exclusively in the narrative of government successes; the curtailment of cultural freedom remains invisible.

#### 3rd omission:

Context: When discussing "integrated democracy" and the legitimacy of the Basic Law (20:47–22:15), the context of the European Court of Justice and European Parliament rule of law proceedings, the question of frozen EU funds, and the Venice Commission's criticisms are entirely omitted.

Relevant timestamp: 20:47

Effect: The Hungarian constitutional order is presented exclusively from an internal, self-legitimising perspective; international rule of law concerns are entirely absent.

Summary: The three most important omissions — MCC funding, the independent cultural sphere's situation and the rule of law context — together result in the broadcast presenting the Fidesz-KDNP cultural and political project in an uncritical, self-legitimising frame.

#### Missing voices

- Opposition politician (TISZA/DK): Would have presented the opposition's assessment of cultural policy and public media, and the democratic consequences of KESMA consolidation
- Independent media researcher: Would have analysed the role of MTVA and KESMA from the perspective of pluralism, in the context of the RSF ranking
- Constitutional lawyer (independent of the government): Would have assessed the question of "integrated democracy" and the legitimacy of the Basic Law impartially
- Young person not sympathetic to Fidesz: Would have presented the problems of brain drain, the housing crisis and the education system from the perspective of young people
- Independent cultural actor (e.g., free theatre director, independent publisher): Would have analysed the effects of the selectivity of state cultural funding on cultural diversity



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

- Education researcher or teacher: Would have contextualised MCC and the political transformation of the education system
- EU rule of law expert: Would have assessed Hungary's democratic backsliding in international comparison
- Sociologist (independent of the government): Would have provided a data-supported picture of social inequalities, which the broadcast only touches on selectively



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: 5/10

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

### 1st finding:

Timestamp: 39:26

Figure: "In Bavaria the Christian Socialist party has been governing since 1949, and the Social Democrats in Sweden were in power for 70 years"

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

Missing context: In the cases of the Bavarian CSU and the Swedish Social Democrats, free, competitive elections, an independent judiciary and a free press ensured genuine political competition — these structural conditions are contested in Hungary. The comparison highlights the duration of governance but entirely omits the dimension of democratic quality.

Effect: Creates the false impression that the long governance of Fidesz-KDNP is in itself democratic normality, whereas the comparability of structural conditions is questionable.

### 2nd finding:

Timestamp: 47:23

Figure: "at the 2024 local elections Fidesz swapped the 12th district for Csepel"

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

Missing context: At the 2024 local elections, Fidesz-KDNP suffered significant overall losses (Budapest, several major cities); this overall picture is not presented in the broadcast.

Effect: Selective use of data: highlights one positive Fidesz result while concealing the overall losses.

Summary: The figures in the broadcast are not systematically manipulative, but in two cases selective use of data is observable: the Bavarian/Swedish comparison omits the dimension of democratic quality, and the 2024 election result paints a selectively positive picture.



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 6/10

Definition: *Discrediting through association with negative groups/ideas.*

### 1st association:

Timestamp: 02:04

Quote: "Practically those who inherited power from socialism, and the members of younger generations who sympathise with them and have joined them, are on one side, let us say"

Technique: Identifies left-wing/liberal cultural actors with the heirs of the socialist dictatorship — this is a classic guilt-by-association technique.

Effect: Brands every non-right-wing cultural actor as a continuation of the communist past, without bringing forward individual evidence.

### 2nd association:

Timestamp: 32:20

Quote: "one was the SZDSZ, the other was the MSZP, and these two found each other well in this"

Technique: Identifies left-wing politics with the negative metaphors of the "ivory tower" (SZDSZ) and "cynical action" (MSZP), then extends this to the entire opposition.

Effect: Identifies all opposition forces with the negative legacy of the 2002–2010 governance, ignoring the emergence of TISZA as a new political force.

### 3rd association:

Timestamp: 25:52

Quote: "a world state, expressed metaphorically now, governs the world, which nobody elects, which is appointed"

Technique: Linking the EU and "global liberalism" with the notion of a democratically unlegitimised "world state" — this is the standard "Brussels narrative" of Fidesz-KDNP.

Effect: Frames the EU as an anti-democratic entity, without presenting the EU's democratic institutional system (European Parliament, member state votes).

Summary: All three associations apply the standard Fidesz-KDNP narrative: the left = communist legacy, the opposition = the failure of 2002–2010, the EU = a democratically unlegitimised "world state". These are not evidence-based categorisations, but rhetorical techniques.



## 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).

### 1st finding:

Position: 00:36 (beginning)

Content: "The past 16 years of national governance have brought significant political, legal and administrative changes to Hungary."

Timing effect: The opening sentences of the broadcast frame Fidesz-KDNP's 16 years of governance as "national governance" — this interpretive frame defines the entire broadcast before any critical perspective can arise.

### 2nd finding:

Position: 39:17 (middle-end)

Content: "it is also not an argument that Fidesz has been in government for 16 years, since in Bavaria the Christian Socialist party has been governing since 1949"

Timing effect: The "normalising" comparison is placed in the second half of the broadcast, pre-empting any potential criticism of Fidesz's long governance — this serves to neutralise potential criticism.

### 3rd finding:

Position: 51:39 (end)

Content: "Next time we will look at the energy world war."

Timing effect: The closing promise holds out another topic compatible with the government narrative, reinforcing the broadcast's ideological frame.

Summary: Both the beginning and the end of the broadcast reinforce the Fidesz-KDNP narrative; potentially critical elements (e.g., the stakes of the 2026 elections) appear in the middle of the broadcast, embedded in other topics, where their impact can be minimised.



## 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: 7/10

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

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

### 1st finding:

Timestamp: 40:10

Triggering event: The restriction of opposition candidates' media appearances is raised

Reaction: "they don't even let the candidate representatives of the other side near a microphone, so it is very difficult to conduct a debate, that is, to carry one out"

Comparison: The Fidesz-KDNP media monopoly (KESMA, MTVA) — of which this broadcast is itself a part — does not provoke the same outrage; 00:00 — reaction: none

Asymmetry: The broadcast is outraged by the restriction of opposition candidates' media appearances, while itself running on a public service channel that gives voice exclusively to pro-government voices. This is a self-contradiction.

### 2nd finding:

Timestamp: 34:48

Triggering event: The penetration of "corporate people" and technocracy into politics

Reaction: "the company's people enter politics, and there an anti-democratic situation immediately arises"

Comparison: The relationship between Fidesz-KDNP and Hungarian oligarchs (Mészáros Lőrinc, Tiborcz István) — to which this criticism is at least equally applicable — does not provoke the same outrage; 00:00 — reaction: none

Asymmetry: The criticism of "corporate people" is directed exclusively at Western liberal politics, not at domestic oligarchic networks.

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Summary: The outrage expressed in the broadcast is consistently asymmetric: criticism of liberal/global actors (EU, multinational companies, the "other side") appears with strong emotional charge, while analogous problems of the Fidesz-KDNP system (media monopoly, oligarchic networks) do not provoke a similar reaction.



## 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 presentation of the topic?

### 1st finding:

Timestamp: 03:31

Missing perspective/fact: The MCC's 1,500 billion forint state asset transfer, the institution's political ties and the lack of public procurement transparency

Relevance: MCC features as one of the broadcast's most important positive examples; without the context of its funding, the listener cannot assess the institution's true nature

Effect: MCC appears exclusively as a success story; the question of public funds usage remains invisible

### 2nd finding:

Timestamp: 20:47

Missing perspective/fact: The rule of law proceedings of the European Court of Justice and the European Parliament, the frozen EU funds, the Venice Commission's criticisms

Relevance: When discussing the legitimacy of the Basic Law, these international legal contexts are indispensable

Effect: The Hungarian constitutional order is presented exclusively from an internal, self-legitimising perspective

### 3rd finding:

Timestamp: 01:26–02:57

Missing perspective/fact: The 2020 transformation of SZFE, the withdrawal of funding from free theatres, the political selectivity of the NKA

Relevance: When discussing cultural policy, these specific cases are documented examples of government intervention

Effect: Cultural policy appears exclusively in the narrative of government successes; the curtailment of cultural freedom remains invisible

Summary: The broadcast provides only a fraction of completeness: the three most important missing blocks of facts — MCC funding, the rule of law context and the curtailment of cultural freedom — together result in the listener receiving a distorted, one-sided picture of Hungarian cultural and political reality.

End of hard facts — Beginning of soft facts

### Soft facts — debatable, not merely countable

The broadcast fits into a discourse in which Fidesz-KDNP has since 2010 been consciously building a parallel cultural and intellectual infrastructure (MCC, Kommentár, Századvég, Alapjogokért Központ, etc.) to counterbalance the liberal-left cultural hegemony. This endeavour can be interpreted as a right-wing application of Gramscian hegemony theory, which Galló Béla explicitly names in the broadcast. The stakes of the debate are particularly high in 2025: ahead of the 2026 elections, Fidesz-KDNP simultaneously faces the growing challenge of TISZA and the narrative opportunities offered by the global right-wing wave (Trump, Meloni). The concept of "integrated democracy", raised by Stumpf István, is an attempt to legitimise and potentially further develop the current constitutional order.



*Proportion of viewpoints covered*

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

**[A] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Not a single representative of any opposition party spoke; the opposition appears exclusively as the "other side" in a negative context.

**[B] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Independent cultural actors are entirely absent; only pro-government creators and institutional leaders speak.

**[C] FLAGGED**

Timestamp: 20:47 — Quote: "many people, of course, also dispute the legitimacy of the Basic Law" — Assessment: Merely mentioned, immediately dismissed ("fewer and fewer"), without substantive elaboration.

**[D] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The KESMA consolidation, the political composition of the NMHH, and the lack of MTVA independence are not mentioned at all.

**[E] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 38:36 — Quote: "we were out at the peace march, and I couldn't move for the young people" — Assessment: The topic of young people appears exclusively from the perspective of Fidesz-sympathising youth; brain drain, the housing crisis, and problems of the education system are not mentioned.

**[F] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Western Europe appears exclusively as a negative reference point ("intellectual desert", "old farmer"); no comparative analysis takes place.

**[G] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: MCC's funding and political ties are not mentioned, even though one of the broadcast's guests (Békés Márton) is affiliated with MCC.

**[H] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The concept of "post-liberal hegemony" is discussed exclusively in a positive context, without a critical perspective.

**[I] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 43:50 — Quote: "the esteemed left-wing authors, among whom I would certainly count Éber Márk Áron" — Assessment: Names of left-wing authors are mentioned, but they themselves do not speak; they are referred to exclusively in aspects compatible with the right-wing narrative.

**[J] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The teachers' strike, the crisis of the education system, and the teachers' wage struggle are not mentioned at all, even though education is one of the broadcast's declared topics.

### Completeness score: 2/10

**Justification:** Of the ten relevant perspectives, only two appear partially, and even those serve exclusively to reinforce the government narrative. The broadcast makes no effort to present the topic from multiple angles: not a single critical voice, not a single opposition or independent perspective is heard. This is not a random deficiency, but a structural characteristic of the broadcast: Kommentárklub is an inner-circle, ideologically homogeneous exchange of ideas broadcast on a public service channel.



## Softfacts — 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?

#### 1st finding:

Timestamp: 00:36

Quote: "The past 16 years of national governance have brought significant political, legal and administrative changes to Hungary."

Manipulation: Frames the Fidesz-KDNP government as "national governance" — this is not a neutral descriptive term, but Fidesz's self-definition, which the broadcast treats as fact.

Why it is problematic: The adjective "national" implicitly suggests that the opposition is not national, i.e., does not represent the interests of the nation — this is one of the fundamental rhetorical strategies of Fidesz-KDNP.

#### 2nd finding:

Timestamp: 26:28

Quote: "we are talking about the post-liberal hegemony represented by Viktor Orbán... this kind of post-liberal hegemony, which the Orbán system represents, is a model, and not only for America, but for other countries as well"

Manipulation: Frames the Orbán system as a global model, an exportable template — this is Fidesz's self-representation, which the broadcast conveys without criticism.

Why it is problematic: The "model" framing ignores the international documentation of democratic backsliding (Freedom House, V-Dem, RSF), according to which Hungary ranks worst in the EU in terms of democratic quality.

#### 3rd finding:

Timestamp: 43:02

Quote: "Somehow Europe seems to me like an old person who can no longer and no longer wants to change anything."

Manipulation: Frames Europe as an "old person" who has become incapable and unwilling to change — this is the cultural variant of the Fidesz-KDNP standard "Brussels narrative".

Why it is problematic: This is a metaphorical generalisation that makes no distinction between the different member states, institutions and political forces of the EU; it homogenises the European political space without an empirical basis.

Summary: The broadcast's framing consistently applies the Fidesz-KDNP ideological narrative: the metaphors of "national governance", "post-liberal hegemony as a global model" and "old Europe" together constitute an interpretive frame in which the Fidesz-KDNP project is necessary, successful and exportable.



## 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?

### 1st finding:

Timestamp: 00:36

Quote: "national governance"

Manipulation: Names the Fidesz-KDNP government "national governance" — this is the party's self-definition, not a neutral descriptive term.

Why it is problematic: Neutral alternative: "the Fidesz-KDNP government" or "the right-wing government". The adjective "national" implicitly brands the opposition as "non-national".

### 2nd finding:

Timestamp: 02:28

Quote: "a completely nation- and homeland-detached, a kind of self-inverted, liberal, artistic world"

Manipulation: Uses pejorative, dehumanising metaphors to describe the liberal cultural sphere ("detached", "self-inverted").

Why it is problematic: Neutral alternative: "representatives of the liberal cultural sphere hold different values". The current language does not construct a debate partner, but an enemy.

### 3rd finding:

Timestamp: 26:50

Quote: "I don't like the word illiberal, because we are rather talking about post-liberal hegemony"

Manipulation: The deliberate avoidance of the concept "illiberal" and its replacement with the concept "post-liberal hegemony" — this is a positive reframing of the Fidesz-KDNP system.

Why it is problematic: The concept of "illiberal democracy" was introduced by Viktor Orbán himself in his 2014 Băile Tuşnad speech; the concept "post-liberal" gives the same content a positive connotation while concealing the fact of democratic backsliding.

Summary: The broadcast's language consistently applies the Fidesz-KDNP rhetorical repertoire: the concepts of "national governance", the "detached liberal world" and "post-liberal hegemony" are not neutral descriptive categories, but rhetorical tools performing ideological positioning.



## 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: The triggering event must be documented before each assessment. An intervention can only be classified as asymmetric if a similar triggering event with other guests did not produce an analogous intervention.

### 1st finding:

Timestamp: 10:04

Triggering event: Békés Márton praises Kommentár and the guests

Quote (moderator/Békés): "But why would I object? So this here in this broadcast is an anointing."

Comparison: In the case of critical statements (e.g., 20:47 the disputing of the Basic Law's legitimacy) — reaction: immediately dismisses it ("fewer and fewer")

Asymmetry: Welcomes complimentary remarks with pleasure, immediately relativises critical observations.

### 2nd finding:

Timestamp: 20:52

Triggering event: Stumpf István mentions that many people dispute the legitimacy of the Basic Law

Quote (moderator/Békés): "Fewer and fewer, too."

Comparison: In the case of statements praising the Fidesz-KDNP system — reaction: affirmation, nodding

Asymmetry: Immediately dismisses the critical observation with an unsubstantiated claim, does not question the complimentary statements.

### 3rd finding:

Timestamp: 14:04

Triggering event: Stumpf István speaks about the importance of a culture of debate

Quote (moderator/Békés): "Very good."

Comparison: No similar affirmation in the case of critical remarks

Asymmetry: The moderator's expressions of sympathy are directed exclusively at statements compatible with the government narrative.

Summary: Békés Márton simultaneously fills the roles of moderator and guest, which structurally precludes neutral moderation. Follow-up questions are absent, critical observations are immediately dismissed, complimentary statements are affirmed — this is not moderation, but ideological facilitation.



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 8/10

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

#### 1st asymmetry:

To Békés Márton (moderator/guest), 06:16: "How can people of the spirit influence people of action?" — soft, open, enabling question

To an opposition voice: — does not speak, no question is asked

Comparison: Not a single hard, critical question is asked in the broadcast; every question gives the guests an opportunity to elaborate the Fidesz-KDNP narrative.

#### 2nd asymmetry:

To Stumpf István, 49:03: "Hungary needs to concentrate its internal resources. Its secure transmission, and integrate its political system. Can we talk about this in these two minutes?" — soft, enabling question

To a critical constitutional lawyer: — does not speak

Comparison: The concept of "integrated democracy" is not questioned, the documentation of democratic backsliding is not called to account.

Summary: Exclusively soft, enabling questions are asked in the broadcast; not a single critical, follow-up or scrutinising question. This is not a journalistic interview, but ideological facilitation.



#### 14. FALSE BALANCE

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Overall score: 6/10

Definition: Artificial balance despite actual inequality.

#### 1st finding:

Timestamp: 43:50

Construction: "the esteemed left-wing authors, among whom I would certainly count Éber Márk Áron, I would count Gagyí Ágnes, I would count Bajusz Orsi... So I think one needs to be open."

Analysis: By listing the names of left-wing authors, the broadcast creates the appearance of openness, while not a single left-wing author speaks, and the listed authors are mentioned exclusively in aspects compatible with the right-wing narrative. This is false balance: it creates the appearance of pluralism without providing genuine pluralism.

Summary: The nominal mention of left-wing authors creates the appearance of openness, but does not create genuine pluralism — this is a classic case of false balance.



## 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?

### 1st finding:

Item placed on agenda: The Fidesz-KDNP cultural and political project as a natural, necessary and successful process

Timestamp: 01:26 — Evidence: "the Hungarian Right that came to power in 2010 set about creating a cultural environment that places national identity in the foreground"

Alternative agenda: Cultural pluralism, the situation of the independent cultural sphere, the effects of the selectivity of state cultural funding

### 2nd finding:

Item placed on agenda: "Post-liberal hegemony" as a global model and exportable template

Timestamp: 27:51 — Evidence: "this kind of post-liberal hegemony, which the Orbán system represents, is a model, and not only for America, but for other countries as well"

Alternative agenda: International documentation of democratic backsliding (Freedom House, V-Dem, RSF), frozen EU funds, rule of law proceedings

Summary: The broadcast's agenda entirely reflects Fidesz-KDNP's self-representation: the successes of "national governance" and the global exemplary value of "post-liberal hegemony" appear as self-evident facts, while democratic backsliding, the curtailment of cultural freedom and rule of law concerns are entirely absent from the agenda.



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

### Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	9	Every guest belongs to the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit; their structural conflicts of interest are not mentioned.
2	Source selection	H	9	Only pro-government sources appear; Kommentár cites itself; two unsubstantiated claims incur penalty points.
3	Time allocation	H	8	100% of total broadcast time goes to pro-government voices; no opposition or independent voice is heard at all.
4	Omission	H	9	MCC funding, the rule of law context and the curtailment of cultural freedom are entirely absent.
5	Number manipulation	H	5	In two cases selective use of data: the Bavarian/Swedish comparison and the 2024 election result paint a distorted picture.
6	Guilt by association	H	6	The associations left = communist legacy, EU = democratically unlegitimised "world state" appear consistently.
7	Timing	H	7	The beginning and end of the broadcast reinforce the Fidesz-KDNP narrative; potentially critical elements appear in the middle, embedded in other topics.
8	Selective outrage	H	7	Outrage is consistently asymmetric: criticism of liberal/global actors is strong, while domestic analogous problems provoke no reaction.
9	Completeness	H	9	Of the ten relevant perspectives, only two appear partially; pluralism is entirely absent.
10	Framing	S	9	The metaphors of "national governance", "post-liberal hegemony as a global model" and "old Europe" consistently convey the Fidesz-KDNP narrative.
11	Language	S	8	The concepts of "national governance", the "detached liberal world" and "post-liberal hegemony" are rhetorical tools performing ideological positioning.
12	Moderator behaviour	S	8	Békés Márton is simultaneously moderator and guest; he immediately dismisses critical observations and affirms complimentary statements.
13	Question asymmetry	S	8	Exclusively soft, enabling questions are asked; not a single critical follow-up question.
14	False balance	S	6	The nominal mention of left-wing authors creates the appearance of openness, without genuine pluralism.
15	Agenda-setting	S	9	Fidesz-KDNP's self-representation appears as self-evident fact; democratic backsliding and rule of law concerns are entirely absent.

### Results



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

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 1–9): 7.7 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 10–15): 8.0 / 10
- OVERALL SCORE (average of all 15 criteria): 7.8 / 10

### Dominant techniques

---

- 1. Agenda-setting (9/10):** The broadcast entirely reflects Fidesz-KDNP's self-representation; democratic backsliding, the curtailment of cultural freedom and rule of law concerns are entirely absent from the agenda. This is not a random deficiency, but a structural characteristic of the broadcast.
- 2. Expert selection (9/10):** Every guest belongs to the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit; their structural conflicts of interest are not mentioned; the broadcast presents direct participants in the government as "historians" and "professors of constitutional law". This creates the appearance of neutrality while conveying an exclusively one-sided perspective.
- 3. Framing (9/10):** The metaphors of "national governance", "post-liberal hegemony as a global model" and "old Europe" consistently convey the Fidesz-KDNP narrative; these are not neutral descriptive categories, but rhetorical tools performing ideological positioning, which the broadcast treats as facts.

### The broadcast's core messages

---

- 1. MESSAGE (CONTENT):** "The Fidesz-KDNP cultural and political project is a necessary, successful and globally exportable model."

Technique: Framing, agenda-setting — Evidence: 01:26, 27:51

- 2. MESSAGE (PERSONAL):** "The symbiosis between the right-wing intelligentsia and the Fidesz-KDNP government is natural, productive and desirable."

Technique: Expert selection, moderator behaviour — Evidence: 08:19, 31:50

- 3. MESSAGE (SOCIAL):** "The opposition and the liberal cultural sphere are heirs of the communist past, the EU is an anti-democratic entity — against these, the defence of national sovereignty is the only correct path."

Technique: Guilt by association, language — Evidence: 02:04, 25:52, 32:20

### Manipulation level classification

---

Justification: The broadcast's overall score of 7.8/10 places it on the boundary between "systematic one-sidedness" and "extreme one-sidedness". In 12 of the 15 criteria the score is 7 or above; not a single opposition, independent or critical voice is heard; pluralism is entirely absent. The obligation prescribed by Section 83 of the Mttv. for balanced, objective and current information, and the obligation to reflect diversity of opinion, are not fulfilled. The broadcast is not information, but ideological facilitation: propaganda material for the Fidesz-KDNP cultural and political project, broadcast on a public service channel.

### SUMMARY

---

The examined broadcast of Kommentárklub constitutes a serious and systematic violation of Section 83 of the Mttv. The broadcast gives voice exclusively to persons belonging to the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit, without a single opposition, independent or critical voice; the guests' structural conflicts of interest are not mentioned; democratic backsliding, the curtailment of cultural freedom and rule of law concerns are entirely absent from the agenda. The framings of "national governance", "post-liberal hegemony as a global model" and "old Europe" are not neutral descriptive categories, but ideological tools taken from the Fidesz-KDNP rhetorical repertoire. The broadcast is particularly problematic because it is broadcast on a public service channel (M1), where the statutory balance obligation is strongest — an obligation the broadcast does not fulfil. It can be established with legal certainty that the examined broadcast of Kommentárklub is not information, but propaganda material for the governing party's ideological project, financed from public funds.



## OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

**HARDFACTS 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)

<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-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>Unobtrusive</b>	No material patterns detectable; the broadcast meets the balance requirement.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Mild imbalance</b>	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
<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-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias</b>	Maximum expressiveness 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 under-represented in framing, speaking time or presentation.
<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 over-represented in framing, speaking time or presentation.



## CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL ASSESSMENT (Mttv. Section 83)

### Assessment under Section 83 of the Mttv.

---

Section 83 of the Mttv. prescribes that in news and information programmes, current, objective and balanced information is mandatory, and diversity of opinion must be reflected.

#### 1st violation:

Norm: Mttv. Section 83

Facts: Violation of the obligation of balance and diversity of opinion

Evidence: 00:00–51:53 — Throughout the entire broadcast, not a single opposition, independent or critical voice is heard; in 12 of the 15 criteria the manipulation score is 7 or above.

Assessment: The obligation to reflect diversity of opinion as prescribed by Section 83 of the Mttv. is not fulfilled: the broadcast gives voice exclusively to persons belonging to the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit, and does not present a single alternative perspective substantively.

#### 2nd violation:

Norm: Mttv. Section 83

Facts: Violation of the obligation of objectivity

Evidence: 00:36 "The past 16 years of national governance" — treating Fidesz-KDNP's self-definition as fact; 27:51 "this kind of post-liberal hegemony, which the Orbán system represents, is a model" — conveyed without criticism

Assessment: The broadcast treats the Fidesz-KDNP rhetorical categories as facts and does not distinguish between fact and opinion — this is a direct violation of the obligation of objectivity.

#### 3rd violation:

Norm: Mttv. Section 83

Facts: Violation of the obligation of currency and completeness

Evidence: The MCC's 1,500 billion forint state asset transfer (03:31), the 2020 transformation of SZFE (01:26–02:57), the EU rule of law proceedings (20:47) — all relevant, all missing

Assessment: The broadcast systematically conceals facts that would nuance or refute the narrative presented — this is a violation of the completeness obligation.

### Overall assessment under Section 83 of the Mttv.

---

The examined broadcast of Kommentárklub constitutes a violation of Section 83 of the Mttv. that can be established on the basis of three independent sets of facts: the violation of the obligation to reflect diversity of opinion, of objectivity and of the completeness obligation exist simultaneously and systematically. The violations are not random, but follow from the structural characteristics of the broadcast: the choice of guests, the questioning, the framing and the agenda-setting together constitute a broadcast that is not information, but propaganda material for the governing party's ideological project, broadcast on a public service channel. The NMHH Media Council — if it genuinely wished to give effect to Section 83 of the Mttv. — would need to initiate proceedings against MTVA on the basis of the examined broadcast; however, the current institutional composition (the Media Council consists entirely of Fidesz nominees) structurally precludes meaningful enforcement.

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

#### 1. Kommentár journal

---



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

- 1. FUNDING:** Funded from state and Fidesz-affiliated foundation sources; belongs to the orbit of MCC (Mathias Corvinus Collegium), which received 1,500 billion forints in state assets in 2021. Structural conflict of interest: criticising the policies of the funder (Fidesz-KDNP government) would be tantamount to institutional suicide.
- 2. MANDATE:** A declaredly right-wing conservative journal — not compatible with neutral assessment of Fidesz-KDNP cultural policy.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct institutional interest in the positive presentation of the Fidesz-KDNP cultural project (funding, institutional survival, intellectual legitimation).
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
  - D2 Personal risk: -2
  - D3 Professional competence: +1
  - D4 Consistency: +1
  - D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -1
  - D6 Source level: -1
  - TOTAL: -4 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- 5. COUNTER-OPINION:** Independent cultural journals (Élet és Irodalom, 2000) represent a different perspective — they are not mentioned.

## 2. MCC (Mathias Corvinus Collegium)

- 1. FUNDING:** In 2021 the Orbán government transferred assets worth 1,500 billion forints (shares, real estate) to MCC in foundation form — this is one of the largest state asset transfers since the change of regime. Structural conflict of interest: the institution lives entirely on state funds and was created to train the ideological successors of Fidesz-KDNP.
- 2. MANDATE:** Not compatible with neutral assessment — the institution's declared purpose is the training of right-wing conservative intellectuals and the expansion of the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct institutional interest in legitimising the Fidesz-KDNP cultural and political project.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
  - D2 Personal risk: -2
  - D3 Professional competence: +1
  - D4 Consistency: +1
  - D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -1
  - D6 Source level: -1
  - TOTAL: -4 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- 5. COUNTER-OPINION:** Independent education researchers and critics of the MTA reorganisation represent a different perspective — they are not mentioned.

*IMPORTANT: The adjective "recognised" is not an objective qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be questioned. The "recognition" of Kommentár and MCC is acknowledged exclusively by the Fidesz-KDNP ideological orbit — this is not a neutral professional qualification.*

### Source credibility overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Kommentár journal	-2	-2	+1	+1	-1	-1	-4	YELLOW
MCC (Mathias Corvinus Collegium)	-2	-2	+1	+1	-1	-1	-4	YELLOW

### Legal and methodological classification

#### Not a finding of facts

The results presented do not constitute a finding of facts about individual persons, editorial offices or broadcasts. They are the results of standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.



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

**Not a legal judgement**

The overall deviation index does not replace the legal assessment under Mttv. Section 83. The determination of whether a given broadcast violates 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 contestedness 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 qualification.



## 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.)
- The Basic Law of Hungary (2011)

#### Relevant articles

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

---

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

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

---

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

#### Basic 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 pro-government NMHH. MTVA is a broadcaster under de facto state-aligned management.

#### 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 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.

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.