



MTVA DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-03-25_hirado

Programme: MTVA-Sendung (M1/Kossuth Rádió) | 2026-03-25 | Analysed: 2026-05-24 20:57

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Mércé: Mttv. §83

TOTAL SCORE

8.5/10

Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

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

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

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

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

6.0 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Government: Fidesz-KDNP has governed without interruption since 2010, currently holding a two-thirds parliamentary majority (135 seats out of 199). Prime Minister Viktor Orbán leads the cabinet. The governing coalition represents the model of "illiberal democracy," with a sovereignty-oriented, EU-sceptical and Russia-friendly foreign policy.

Opposition: The strongest opposition force since 2024 is TISZA (Magyar Péter), which received 29.6% in the 2024 EP elections. Other parliamentary opposition parties include: DK, Momentum, Jobbik, LMP, MSZP (they ran as the United Opposition in 2022). Mi Hazánk is a far-right party with 6 seats.

Party	CHES left-right	Seats	Government/Opposition	Base position
MSZP	3,00	(Unit. Opp.)	Opposition	Social democratic, left-wing
MKKP	3,50	0	Extra-parliamentary	Satirical-libertarian
LMP	3,79	(Unit. Opp.)	Opposition	Green-progressive
Momentum	4,17	(Unit. Opp.)	Opposition	Centre-left, pro-EU
DK	4,28	(Unit. Opp.)	Opposition	Centre-left, strongly pro-EU
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, irredentist

Ahead of the 2026 parliamentary elections, the main fault line runs between Fidesz-KDNP and TISZA: Magyar Péter's party is the only force that can realistically threaten Viktor Orbán's power. The "sovereignty versus foreign interference" narrative is a central element of the Fidesz campaign, with which it seeks to portray the opposition as serving Ukrainian and Brussels interests. Energy policy (Russian gas, Ukrainian oil blockade) and the question of war neutrality also generate sharp debate. Media freedom and the partisanship of public media constitute a separate axis of conflict.

MTVA (M1, M2, M4, M5, Duna) operates as a de facto government media outlet: the Media Council of NMHH has been staffed exclusively by persons close to Fidesz since 2010, and the KESMA foundation encompasses nearly 500 media companies. On the Reporters Without Borders (RSF) Press Freedom Index, Hungary ranks 85th — the worst ranking in the EU. The legal mandate of public media under Mttv. §83 is to provide current, objective and balanced information, and to reflect diversity of opinion.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. party programme position
Fidesz-KDNP	+4	00:21–19:45 — All government measures (gas shutdown, energy security, Chinese investment, vocational training) appear in a positive context, without criticism. Party programme position: sovereignty protection, energy independence, Eastern Opening — accurate, but in a one-sidedly favourable frame
TISZA	-5	01:38–13:23 — The party appears exclusively in the context of "agent scandal", "Ukraine-friendly", "foreign creation". Party programme position: anti-corruption, rule of law, pro-EU — actively distorted, with complete omission of programme positions
DK	-1	13:23–13:49 — Klára Dobrev's announcement of withdrawal appears as a neutral statement of fact, but the party's programme positions are not mentioned. Omitted
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.

Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: DK (-1) — factual, though incomplete
- Strongest distortion: TISZA (-5) — complete omission of programme positions, appears exclusively in a negative "agent" narrative
- Average deviation from 0: 1.7
- Summary: The broadcast consistently and uncritically conveys the Fidesz-KDNP government narrative, while portraying TISZA exclusively within the frame of the "TISZA agent scandal," never presenting its programme positions (anti-corruption, rule of law, EU integration). The other opposition parties are almost entirely absent from the broadcast.

Left-right overall tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -4.2

CLASSIFICATION: Strongly right-leaning

Justification: The entire content of the broadcast reinforces the narrative of the governing Fidesz-KDNP: every topic, from the gas shutdown to the "agent scandal," validates the government's position. The opposition — especially TISZA — appears exclusively in a negative context, without its own programme positions. Not a single critical voice, independent expert or opposition viewpoint is given space.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST DATA AND TOPIC FRAMES

Broadcast data

- Title: M1 News (11 o'clock edition)
- Date: 2025 (exact date cannot be determined from the filename; based on internal references: early April 2025, before the April 12 election)
- Estimated length: approx. 20 minutes (estimate based on transcript)
- Presenter/Reporter: Meszes Boglárka (presenter); Csiráki Viktória (Vienna correspondent)
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Orbán Viktor	Prime Minister	Fidesz-KDNP	Far right
Szijjártó Péter	Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Fidesz-KDNP	Far right
Hidvégi Balázs	State Secretary	Fidesz-KDNP	Far right
Orbán Balázs	Political Director	Fidesz-KDNP	Far right
Kocsis Máté	Parliamentary Group Leader	Fidesz-KDNP	Far right
Bóka János	Minister for EU Affairs	Fidesz-KDNP	Far right
Kovács Zoltán	State Secretary for Government Communication	Fidesz-KDNP	Far right
Szent-Királyi Alexandra	Fidesz Budapest President	Fidesz-KDNP	Far right
Donald Trump	US President	Republican Party (USA)	Right-wing populist
Dobrev Klára	Party President	DK	Centre-left
Újpéter (editor-in-chief)	Editor-in-chief of 444.hu	Independent/opposition-leaning	Centre-left
Csiráki Viktória	Correspondent	MTVA	—
Hankó Balázs	Minister of Culture and Innovation	Fidesz-KDNP	Far right

Main topic

The main topic of the broadcast is the affair referred to by Fidesz-KDNP as the "TISZA agent scandal," which the party frames as Ukrainian intelligence interference and evidence of foreign direction of the TISZA opposition party, supplemented by energy policy and campaign news.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts — countable and scientifically verifiable

Hard facts — 9 measurable and scientifically verifiable techniques

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

Total score: 9/10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Kocsis Máté (Fidesz parliamentary group leader)

Timestamp: 06:12–10:26

Quote: "It must be established how information obtained from foreign intelligence services ended up in the vicinity of the TISZA party."

Classification: Fidesz parliamentary group leader, direct political stakeholder; he interprets the content of the AH briefing as if he were a neutral expert.

Missing counter-opinion: An independent intelligence expert or lawyer who could assess the content of the AH briefing.

Source deep-check:

(a) FUNDING: Hungarian state budget (parliamentary group). Conflict of interest: direct political interest in discrediting TISZA ahead of the 2026 elections.

(b) MANDATE: Party-political representation — not compatible with neutral expert assessment.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct political stakeholder

D2 Personal risk: -2 — Risks nothing with the claim

D3 Professional competence: -1 — Legal background, but not an expert in intelligence matters

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistently represents the Fidesz narrative

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -2 — Strongly emotional, without data

D6 Source level: -2 — Tertiary (own interpretation of the AH briefing)

TOTAL: -8 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The broadcast treats him as a neutral fact-reporter, even though he is a direct political stakeholder.

Expert 2: Bóka János (Minister for EU Affairs)

Timestamp: 10:40–11:30

Quote: "Brussels and Kyiv do not shy away from intelligence tools in order to replace the national government."

Classification: Government minister, direct political stakeholder; not an expert in intelligence matters.

Missing counter-opinion: An independent EU law expert or intelligence analyst.

Source deep-check:



(a) **FUNDING:** Hungarian state budget. Conflict of interest: defends the government's position.

(b) **MANDATE:** Government representation — not compatible with neutral assessment.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct government stakeholder

D2 Personal risk: -2 — Risks nothing

D3 Professional competence: 0 — EU law background, but not an expert in intelligence matters

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent government narrative

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -2 — Claims without evidence

D6 Source level: -2 — Tertiary

TOTAL: -7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** The broadcast presents it as a ministerial statement but treats it as expert opinion.

Expert 3: Szent-Királyi Alexandra (Fidesz Budapest President)

Timestamp: 11:37–12:19

Quote: "They do not shy away from intelligence tools to replace us and to be able to install, practically, an agent government in our place."

Classification: Party politician, direct stakeholder; has no professional competence whatsoever in intelligence matters.

Missing counter-opinion: An independent political scientist or intelligence expert.

Source deep-check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Fidesz party. Conflict of interest: direct campaign interest.

(b) **MANDATE:** Party-political representation — not compatible with neutral assessment.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2

D2 Personal risk: -2

D3 Professional competence: -2 — Zero competence in intelligence matters

D4 Opinion consistency: +1

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -2 — Speculative, emotional

D6 Source level: -2

TOTAL: -9 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED

Missing expert groups: Independent intelligence analyst; independent constitutional lawyer; independent energy expert.

Summary (matrix result):

- Kocsis Máté: RED (-8) — political stakeholder, not an expert
- Bóka János: RED (-7) — government minister, not an intelligence expert
- Szent-Királyi Alexandra: RED (-9) — party politician, zero professional competence on the topic

Source credibility overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
expert: Kocsis Máté (Fidesz parliamentary group leader)	-2	-2	-1	+1	-2	-2	-8	RED
expert: Bóka János (Minister for EU Affairs)	-2	-2	0	+1	-2	-2	-7	RED
expert: Szent-Királyi Alexandra (Fidesz Budapest President)	-2	-2	-2	+1	-2	-2	-9	RED



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

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Total score: 9/10

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

Source 1: Mandiner (pro-government outlet)

Timestamp: 08:37–08:56

Quote: "Magyar Péter is lying low in silence after the gigantic TISZA agent scandal, as Mandiner puts it."

- (a) **Funding and operator:** KESMA foundation, Fidesz-affiliated media conglomerate.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Mandiner is part of the Fidesz media ecosystem; the negative portrayal of Magyar Péter is a direct editorial interest.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Assessment by independent press (e.g. Telex, 444.hu) of Magyar Péter's reaction.

Source 2: Ellenpont (statement by a Ukrainian YouTuber)

Timestamp: 02:01–02:44

Quote: "Ellenpont drew attention to this based on a statement by a Ukrainian YouTuber."

- (a) **Funding and operator:** Unknown; the "ellenpont" source is not identified.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** A statement by an unidentified Ukrainian YouTuber appears as primary evidence of Ukrainian intelligence interference.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Any verified, identifiable source.

Source 3: Briefing by the Constitutional Protection Office (AH)

Timestamp: 09:44–10:26

Quote: "The briefing of the Director General of the Constitutional Protection Office to the National Security Committee on information declassified from secret classification was communicated."

- (a) **Funding and operator:** Hungarian state, a body subordinate to the government.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** The AH is an intelligence service subordinate to the government; the content of its briefing is interpreted exclusively by Kocsis Máté, Fidesz parliamentary group leader.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Independent legal assessment of the AH briefing; reaction of opposition committee members.

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 02:01–02:14

Claim: "Ukrainian intelligence services interfered in the Moldovan and Romanian elections, and are interfering in the Hungarian one as well"

Verbal marker: "based on a statement by a Ukrainian YouTuber" — unidentified source

Primary source: none — +1 penalty point

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 10:00–10:10



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

Claim: "the IT specialists associated with the TISZA party worked for the Ukrainians and maintained regular contact with the Ukrainian embassy in Budapest"

Verbal marker: "the truth is that" — claim without evidence

Primary source: none — +1 penalty point

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 12:08–12:19

Claim: "we would not even be surprised if, from the very beginning of the TISZA party, this project were actually a foreign project"

Verbal marker: "we would not be surprised if" — speculative

Primary source: none — +1 penalty point

Summary: The sources in the broadcast are exclusively governmental and pro-government actors; not a single independent, verified source appears. Three unsubstantiated claims appear at the level of rumour. Total penalty points: +3.



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

Total score: 8/10

Definition: Distribution of airtime between different positions.

Estimated airtime:

- Fidesz-KDNP government actors: approx. 10 minutes (50%)
- Fidesz-affiliated media content (Mandiner, Ellenpont): approx. 1.5 minutes (7.5%)
- Donald Trump (statement supporting Fidesz): approx. 0.5 minutes (2.5%)
- TISZA/opposition (exclusively in negative context): approx. 1 minute (5%)
- DK (neutral statement of fact): approx. 0.5 minutes (2.5%)
- 444.hu editor-in-chief (predicts Fidesz victory): approx. 0.5 minutes (2.5%)
- Foreign news (Austria, Iran): approx. 3 minutes (15%)
- Chinese Eximbank / vocational training: approx. 2.5 minutes (12.5%)
- Presenter: approx. 2 minutes (10%)

Summary: Government actors dominate nearly 60% of airtime; the opposition appears in a total of approx. 5%, exclusively in a negative context. Not a single opposition actor is given the opportunity to present their own position.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

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

Omission 1:

Context: The detailed position of Panyi Szabolcs and Direkt36 on the audio recording.

Relevant: 03:04–03:12

Effect: The journalist's rebuttal is dealt with in a single sentence, then the government narrative immediately continues; the viewer gets the impression that the rebuttal is of no interest.

Omission 2:

Context: The substantive reaction and rebuttal of Magyar Péter and TISZA to the "agent" accusations.

Relevant: 08:37–08:56

Effect: The Mandiner's pro-government assessment replaces TISZA's actual position; the viewer is not informed of what the party says in response to the accusations.

Omission 3:

Context: The economic consequences of the halt to Ukrainian gas transit, and the Ukrainian side's position on the oil blockade.

Relevant: 00:16–01:34

Effect: The decision appears exclusively within the government's sovereignty-protection narrative; the economic risks and the Ukrainian position are entirely absent.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits all information that could weaken or nuance the government narrative. The omissions are not random but form a consistent pattern.

Missing voices

- Journalist Panyi Szabolcs (Direkt36): Could have presented his own position in detail, the context of the audio recording and his rebuttal regarding the wiretapping.
- Magyar Péter / TISZA spokesperson: Could have presented the party's programme positions and a substantive response to the "agent" accusations.
- Independent intelligence or legal expert: Could have defined what legally constitutes intelligence cooperation and what does not.
- Independent energy analyst: Could have assessed the economic and supply security consequences of halting gas transit.
- Ukrainian government source: Could have provided the Ukrainian perspective on the oil blockade and the halt to gas transit.
- Independent election researcher: Could have provided a methodological assessment of the 444.hu forecast and other polling data.
- Independent economist: Could have analysed the comparison of Austrian and Hungarian fuel price regulation and the sustainability of utility cost reductions.
- Independent researcher on Chinese investments: Could have assessed the risks of the Chinese Eximbank regional centre and the lack of transparency.



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



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

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

Total score: 5/10

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:42

Figure: "Hungarians pay the lowest prices at petrol stations across all of Europe"

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

Missing context: Nominal price vs. purchasing power parity; the budgetary burden of utility cost reductions; the sustainability of artificially regulated prices.

Effect: The viewer gets the impression that the utility cost reduction is unambiguously successful and sustainable, while the real economic context remains unknown.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 12:55–13:22

Figure: "Fidesz will receive two and a half million votes on the party list, and TISZA at most two million four hundred thousand"

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

Missing context: The methodology of the estimate, its margin of uncertainty, results of other opinion polls.

Effect: A single forecast appears as fact, without methodological context.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 19:20–19:41

Figure: "development programme of 488 billion... expanded by a further 300 million forints"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value — provided; (b) ratio — not provided (300 million is 0.06% of 488 billion); (c) trend — not provided

Missing context: 300 million forints is 0.06% of the total programme; this ratio is not mentioned, even though it would fundamentally determine the significance of the "expansion."

Effect: The small amount appears as a major development.

Summary: The figures in the broadcast consistently appear without context, exclusively in a way that reinforces the government narrative; the three-dimensional check (absolute value, ratio, trend) is not complete in a single case.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

10/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total score: 10/10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups/ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 05:10–05:15

Quote: "The secret of the election is that instead of a national government, there will be a Ukraine-friendly TISZA government in Hungary"

Technique: TISZA is labelled "Ukraine-friendly," thereby identifying it with a wartime aggressor.

Effect: TISZA voters serve Ukrainian interests, not Hungarian ones.

Association 2:

Timestamp: 07:21–07:27

Quote: "TISZA, in cooperation with a spy disguising himself as a journalist, is already working on assembling a Ukraine-friendly government."

Technique: TISZA is identified with a spy organisation; the word "journalist" is placed in quotation marks, thereby also calling into question the journalistic status.

Effect: TISZA is not a political party but a tool of a foreign intelligence service.

Association 3:

Timestamp: 11:39–11:53

Quote: "as long as Viktor Orbán is the Hungarian Prime Minister, the joint ventures of Kyiv and Brussels cannot be realised"

Technique: Brussels and Kyiv appear as a "joint venture," thereby placing the EU and Ukraine in a single hostile bloc.

Effect: Identification of EU membership with Ukrainian interests; the pro-EU opposition automatically represents "hostile" interests.

Verification of Panyi Szabolcs's "spy" classification:

- Does he work with primary sources? YES — Direkt36 is investigative journalism with documented sources
- Are his claims falsifiable? YES — journalistic methodology is verifiable
- Risk analysis: Panyi Szabolcs risks his career, reputation and personal safety with his claims; he gains nothing from the "spy" label
- Tone: Professional, data-based journalism
- RESULT CATEGORY: A — System-critical journalist with methodology

The broadcast's classification of him as a "spy" is exclusively framing, not evidence-based categorisation.

Association chain: TISZA → Panyi Szabolcs → Ukrainian intelligence → Brussels → "agent government"

Summary: The broadcast consistently and systematically applies the guilt by association technique: it identifies TISZA with Ukrainian intelligence, Brussels and "spies," without citing any court verdict or legally binding finding. Panyi Szabolcs belongs to category A (investigative journalist with methodology); the broadcast's "spy" classification is framing without evidence.



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

Total score: 8/10

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

Finding 1:

Position: 00:16 (beginning of broadcast)

Content: "Hungary is gradually halting gas transit to Ukraine" — announcement by Orbán Viktor

Timing effect: In the first minute of the broadcast, the government appears as a strong, capable decision-maker; this sets the interpretive frame for the entire broadcast.

Finding 2:

Position: 01:34–12:19 (middle of broadcast, approx. 10 minutes)

Content: Full exposition of the "TISZA agent scandal," with mutually reinforcing statements from eight different government actors

Timing effect: The longest and most intensive block conveys the most important campaign message; the repetition (eight actors saying the same thing) achieves a cumulative persuasion effect.

Finding 3:

Position: 12:20–12:49 (as the closing of the "agent scandal" block)

Content: "Donald Trump once again stood by Viktor Orbán"

Timing effect: The Trump statement follows the "agent scandal" block, thereby reinforcing the government's international legitimacy; the viewer gets the impression that the world's most powerful politician is also siding with the government.

Summary: The structure of the broadcast is consciously constructed: strong government decision (beginning) → detailed discrediting of the opposition (middle) → international legitimation (Trump) → neutral foreign news → positive government performance (end). This structure maximises the effectiveness of the campaign message.



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

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

Total score: 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 other positions did not produce an analogous reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 03:26–03:58

Triggering event: Journalist Panyi Szabolcs admitted that he is audible on the audio recording on which he provides Szijjártó's phone number.

Reaction: "It has been proven that foreign intelligence interference is taking place in the Hungarian election campaign."

Comparison: The question of foreign funding of the Fidesz-affiliated media system (KESMA), 00:00 — reaction: none

Asymmetry: The journalist's passing on of a phone number appears as "proven interference"; the funding questions of the Fidesz media system are never raised.

Degree of outrage: 4/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 05:43–05:57

Triggering event: The publication of the audio recording.

Reaction: "The TISZA agent scandal clearly proves that a Ukraine-friendly agent government is being prepared."

Comparison: The question of the Fidesz government's dependence on Russian gas (00:16–01:34) — reaction: none, in fact it appears in a positive frame

Asymmetry: The Ukrainian connection "proves" an "agent government"; Russian energy dependence appears as sovereignty protection.

Degree of outrage: 5/5

Selectivity: 5/5

Summary: The broadcast shows intense and consistent outrage in the "foreign interference" narrative concerning the opposition (TISZA), while the government's Russian energy dependence, the funding of the KESMA media system or Fidesz's foreign connections (Trump, Chinese Eximbank) are not treated with any similar critical perspective. The selectivity is systematic and consistent.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE									9/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Total score: 9/10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:34–12:19

Missing perspective/fact: The entire "agent scandal" block lacks any independent legal, intelligence or journalistic expert assessment; the opposition's substantive rebuttal; presentation of Direkt36's methodology.

Relevance: The viewer cannot judge whether the government's claims are proven or political campaign rhetoric.

Effect: The broadcast paints a one-sided picture; the viewer learns only the government narrative.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:16–01:34

Missing perspective/fact: The economic consequences of halting gas transit, the Ukrainian side's position, independent energy analysis.

Relevance: The consequences of such a significant energy policy decision fundamentally affect Hungarian consumers and the economy.

Effect: The decision appears exclusively in a positive, sovereignty-protection frame; the risks remain unknown.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 18:02–18:56

Missing perspective/fact: The risks of the Chinese Eximbank regional centre (debt trap, transparency, geopolitical dependence).

Relevance: The growth of Hungary's economic dependence on China is a fundamental sovereignty issue — the same sovereignty narrative that the broadcast applies to the Ukrainian connection is entirely absent here.

Effect: The Chinese investment appears exclusively as a positive economic opportunity; the risks are not raised.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits all perspectives that could weaken the government narrative. The omissions are not random: they form a consistent pattern that reinforces the government's position and weakens that of the opposition.

End of hard facts — Beginning of soft facts

Soft facts — debatable, not merely countable

The "TISZA agent scandal" is built on an audio recording on which journalist Panyi Szabolcs (Direkt36) allegedly shared Szijjártó Péter's phone number with the intelligence service of an EU member state. Fidesz interprets this as Ukrainian intelligence interference and evidence of foreign direction of TISZA. The affair broke out in the context of the 2026 election campaign and serves to reinforce the government's sovereignty narrative. Panyi Szabolcs admitted that he is audible on the recording, but denied any involvement in the wiretapping of Szijjártó. Direkt36 is an independent investigative outlet that Fidesz regularly labels a "foreign agent."

Relevant perspectives for a balanced broadcast

- * The position of Panyi Szabolcs and Direkt36, his own explanation of events



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

- * The reaction and rebuttal of Magyar Péter / TISZA to the "agent" accusations
- * The opinion of an independent legal expert on what constitutes intelligence cooperation
- * The content of the Constitutional Protection Office (AH) briefing and its independent assessment
- * The economic and geopolitical consequences of halting Ukrainian gas transit (independent energy analysis)
- * The legal background of the oil blockade and the Ukrainian side's position
- * The context and credibility of the Trump statement (when, on what platform, in what context)
- * The election forecast of the 444.hu editor-in-chief with methodological background
- * A comparison of the Austrian fuel price reduction and the Hungarian utility cost reduction from the perspective of an independent economist
- * The risks of the Chinese Eximbank regional centre (debt trap, transparency)

Proportion of perspectives covered

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

[A] OMITTED

Timestamp: 03:04–03:12 — Quote: "Panyi Szabolcs admitted on his social media page that he is audible on the recording. He already told Telex that he had absolutely nothing to do with the wiretapping of Szijjártó Péter." — Assessment: Panyi's rebuttal is presented in a single sentence, without context, then the government narrative immediately continues; the journalist's detailed position is not given space.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: 08:37–08:56 — Quote: "Magyar Péter is lying low in silence after the gigantic TISZA agent scandal" — Assessment: The broadcast does not present Magyar Péter's and TISZA's rebuttal or programme position at all; instead, the assessment of the pro-government outlet Mandiner appears.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Assessment: Not a single independent legal or intelligence expert speaks in the broadcast.

[D] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 09:44–10:00 — Quote: "The briefing of the Director General of the Constitutional Protection Office to the National Security Committee on information declassified from secret classification was communicated." — Assessment: The content of the AH briefing is interpreted exclusively by Kocsis Máté, Fidesz parliamentary group leader; there is no independent assessment.

[E] OMITTED

Timestamp: 00:16–01:34 — Quote: "Hungary is gradually halting gas transit to Ukraine" — Assessment: Independent energy analysis and assessment of the economic consequences of the decision are entirely absent.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: 00:33 — Quote: "Ukraine has been blocking the operation of the Friendship oil pipeline for 30 days." — Assessment: The Ukrainian side's position and the legal background of the blockade are not included.

[G] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 12:20–12:49 — Quote: "Donald Trump once again stood by Viktor Orbán" — Assessment: The context of the statement (when, on what platform, in what political context) is not analysed; there is no critical assessment.

[H] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 12:50–13:22 — Quote: "The editor-in-chief of 444.hu considers a sweeping Fidesz victory likely." — Assessment: The methodology and uncertainty factors are not raised; the forecast appears without context.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: 15:19–18:00 — Assessment: During the presentation of the Austrian measures, a comparison with the Hungarian utility cost reduction and an independent economic assessment are entirely absent.

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: 18:02–18:56 — Quote: "The Chinese Eximbank is ready to establish a regional centre in Hungary" — Assessment: The risks of Chinese investments (debt trap, transparency, geopolitical dependence) are not raised at all.

Completeness score: 2/10

Justification: Out of ten relevant perspectives, the broadcast addresses only two partially (D, G, H), and none comprehensively. The most important parties concerned — Panyi Szabolcs, Magyar Péter/TISZA, independent



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

experts — are not given a meaningful opportunity to speak. The broadcast one-sidedly conveys the government narrative.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

9/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 9/10

Definition: How is the topic fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:38

Quote: "We have so far successfully defended ourselves against Ukrainian blackmail."

Manipulation: The Hungarian–Ukrainian energy dispute is framed as "blackmail"; Hungary appears as victim, Ukraine as aggressor.

Why problematic: This frame excludes the possibility of learning the Ukrainian side's position; the viewer does not find out why Ukraine blocked the oil transit (e.g. to reduce Russian energy revenues in order to prevent the financing of the war).

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 05:10–05:15

Quote: "The secret of the election is that instead of a national government, there will be a Ukraine-friendly TISZA government in Hungary."

Manipulation: The opposition "national government" vs. "Ukraine-friendly government" frames TISZA automatically as a non-national force representing foreign interests.

Why problematic: This frame makes it impossible to substantively discuss TISZA's programme positions; any pro-EU or Ukraine-sympathetic stance automatically qualifies as "treason."

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 13:56–14:14

Quote: "the TISZA party's political campaign against public media has once again failed"

Manipulation: TISZA's electoral complaints are framed as a "political campaign"; holding public media accountable for its legal obligations appears as aggression.

Why problematic: This frame suggests that demanding balance from public media is a political attack, not a legitimate claim; it thereby pre-emptively invalidates criticism of public media.

Summary: The broadcast consistently applies three fundamental frames: (1) Hungary as victim facing foreign aggression; (2) Fidesz = national interest, TISZA = foreign interest; (3) criticism of public media = political attack. These frames exclude the possibility of alternative interpretations.



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

Total score: 9/10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:38, 02:45, 05:43, 06:09, 07:28, 08:37, 09:08 (repeatedly)

Quote: "TISZA agent scandal"

Manipulation: The word "agent" means intelligence spy; the word "scandal" implies a criminal act. The expression is repeated eight times in the broadcast, thereby becoming a slogan.

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "Panyi Szabolcs audio recording affair" or "Szijjártó wiretapping affair." "Agent scandal" is a prejudicial label, not a statement of fact.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 05:43–05:49

Quote: "a Ukraine-friendly agent government is being prepared"

Manipulation: The expression "agent government" labels a democratically electable opposition party as a puppet government of a foreign intelligence service.

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "the opposition party's plans to form a government." "Agent government" is a label without a court verdict.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 04:09–04:14

Quote: "The Hungarian journalist who was found to be cooperating with foreign intelligence services"

Manipulation: The word "found" implies a proven fact, even though there is no legally binding court verdict; the word "cooperating" implies a continuous, intentional activity.

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "the journalist about whom, based on an audio recording, it is claimed that..." The presumption of innocence is not upheld.

Summary: The broadcast's language is consistently prejudicial: the terms associated with the opposition (agent, spy, Ukraine-friendly, agent government) are labels without court verdicts that predetermine the viewer's value judgement. Government actors, by contrast, appear with neutral or positively connotated words (we are defending, we protect, we stand by).



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

Total score: 7/10

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 other guests did not produce an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:16–12:19

Triggering event: Eight different government actors make consecutive, evidence-free claims about the opposition.

Quote (presenter): [No follow-up question, no interruption, no request for clarification]

Comparison: Panyi Szabolcs's rebuttal (03:04–03:12) — reaction: a single sentence, then the government narrative immediately continues

Asymmetry: The presenter never challenges the government actors' claims; Panyi Szabolcs's rebuttal is not elaborated in detail.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 15:38–18:00

Triggering event: Report on the Austrian fuel price reduction.

Quote (presenter): "What exactly does this package of proposals contain?" — neutral, informative question

Comparison: Regarding the Hungarian utility cost reduction (00:42) — follow-up question: none; the claim of "lowest prices in Europe" is not challenged

Asymmetry: An informative question is asked about the Austrian measures; not a single critical question is raised about the Hungarian utility cost reduction.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 13:56–14:48

Triggering event: MTVA's own statement on the legal proceedings against TISZA is read out.

Quote (presenter): [Neutral reading, without commentary]

Comparison: The content of TISZA's complaints is not presented; only MTVA's own assessment is heard

Asymmetry: Public media provides information on its own case itself, without the other party's position.

Summary: The presenter is consistently passive towards government claims (no follow-up questions, no requests for clarification), while handling the rebuttals of opposition actors with minimal coverage. This creates a structural asymmetry that is incompatible with the balance requirement under Mttv. §83.



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

Total score: 7/10

Definition: Questions of differing difficulty posed to different persons.

Asymmetry 1:

To Csiráki Viktória (Vienna correspondent), 15:41: "What exactly does this package of proposals contain?" — neutral, informative

To government actors (00:16–12:19): [No questions — exclusively statements are made, without follow-up questions]

Comparison: An informative question is posed to the foreign correspondent; government actors speak without questions, their claims are not challenged.

Asymmetry 2:

Handling of Panyi Szabolcs's rebuttal, 03:04–03:12: a single sentence, without follow-up question

Handling of Szijjártó Péter's claims, 03:26–04:52: detailed elaboration, without follow-up question

Comparison: The accusation receives detailed elaboration; the rebuttal receives a single sentence.

Summary: In the broadcast, questions are posed exclusively to the foreign correspondent; government actors speak without questions. This represents a structural asymmetry that leaves the government narrative unchecked.



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

Total score: 6/10

Definition: Artificial balance despite actual inequality.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 12:50–13:22

Construction: "The editor-in-chief of 444.hu considers a sweeping Fidesz victory likely."

Analysis: The statement of the editor-in-chief of the opposition-leaning portal 444.hu predicting a Fidesz victory appears as confirmation coming from an "opposition source." This creates a false balance: the viewer gets the impression that even the opposition press acknowledges Fidesz's superiority, even though a single forecast without methodological context is not representative.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 13:23–13:49

Construction: Klára Dobrev's DK withdrawal announcement appears as a neutral statement of fact, thereby presenting DK as a "responsible" opposition party.

Analysis: DK's withdrawal in favour of TISZA is in fact a sign of opposition unity; the broadcast does not interpret this, merely states it as fact, thereby creating a false balance between "responsible DK" and "silent TISZA."

Summary: The broadcast applies false balance in two instances: with the 444.hu forecast it validates the Fidesz victory "from an opposition source"; with DK's withdrawal it implicitly portrays TISZA as irresponsible.



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

Total score: 9/10

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

Finding 1:

Agenda item: The foreign direction of TISZA appears as a self-evident fact.

Timestamp: 01:56 — Quote: "Ukrainian intelligence services are interfering in the Hungarian election."

Alternative agenda: Examination of the Fidesz government's Russian energy dependence and the foreign funding of the KESMA media system.

Finding 2:

Agenda item: The growth of Chinese economic presence is self-evidently a positive development.

Timestamp: 18:02 — Quote: "The Chinese Eximbank is ready to establish a regional centre in Hungary."

Alternative agenda: Transparency of Chinese investments, debt trap risk, growing geopolitical dependence.

Finding 3:

Agenda item: The balance of public media is a self-evident fact.

Timestamp: 13:56–14:48 — Quote: "the TISZA party's political campaign against public media has once again failed"

Alternative agenda: The actual balance of MTVA under Mttv. §83; the context of the RSF 85th place ranking.

Summary: The broadcast's agenda consistently reinforces the government narrative: foreign interference is placed on the agenda exclusively in connection with the opposition; the government's foreign connections (Russia, China, Trump) appear in a positive or neutral context. Public media treats its own balance as self-evident.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	9	Exclusively government actors speak; every source is rated RED.
2	Source selection	H	9	Three unsubstantiated claims at rumour level; not a single independent source.
3	Time allocation	H	8	Government actors dominate ~60% of airtime; the opposition appears in ~5%, exclusively in a negative context.
4	Omission	H	9	The opposition's rebuttal, independent experts and the Ukrainian position are systematically absent.
5	Number manipulation	H	5	Figures consistently appear without context, exclusively reinforcing the government narrative.
6	Guilt by association	H	10	TISZA is identified with Ukrainian intelligence and "spies"; Panyi Szabolcs is a category-A journalist.
7	Timing	H	8	The structure of the broadcast consciously maximises the effectiveness of the campaign message.
8	Selective outrage	H	8	Intense outrage at the opposition's "foreign connections"; zero reaction to the government's Russian/Chinese connections.
9	Completeness	H	9	The broadcast systematically omits all perspectives that could weaken the government narrative.
10	Framing	S	9	Three consistent frames: Hungary as victim; Fidesz = national; TISZA = foreign.
11	Language	S	9	"Agent scandal," "agent government," "Ukraine-friendly" — labels without court verdicts.
12	Presenter behaviour	S	7	Consistently passive towards government claims; handles opposition rebuttals minimally.
13	Question asymmetry	S	7	Questions only for the foreign correspondent; government actors speak unchecked.
14	False balance	S	6	The 444.hu forecast validates the Fidesz victory "from an opposition source."
15	Agenda-setting	S	9	Foreign interference is placed on the agenda exclusively in connection with the opposition.

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 1–9): 8.3 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 10–15): 7.8 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average of all 15 criteria): 8.1 / 10



Dominant techniques

- 1. Guilt by association (10/10):** The broadcast consistently and systematically identifies TISZA with Ukrainian intelligence, "spies" and Brussels, without citing any legally binding court verdict or independent evidence. Panyi Szabolcs is a category-A investigative journalist whom the broadcast labels a "spy" without evidence.
- 2. Agenda-setting (9/10):** The broadcast's agenda consistently reinforces the government narrative: foreign interference is raised exclusively in connection with the opposition, while the government's Russian energy dependence, Chinese economic connections and the KESMA media system are never examined with similar scrutiny.
- 3. Framing (9/10):** The broadcast consistently applies three fundamental frames — Hungary as victim, Fidesz = national interest, TISZA = foreign interest — which exclude the possibility of alternative interpretations and predetermine the viewer's value judgement.

Messages of the broadcast

- 1. MESSAGE (CONTENT):** "Ukrainian intelligence and Brussels are interfering in the Hungarian election through intelligence tools via TISZA."

Technique: Guilt by association + framing + repetition (eight actors say the same thing) — Evidence: 01:56, 05:43, 07:21, 10:00, 11:30

- 2. MESSAGE (PERSONAL):** "Magyar Péter and TISZA are tools of foreign agents and do not represent the interests of Hungarians."

Technique: Language + omission (TISZA's programme positions are never raised) — Evidence: 05:10, 07:07, 08:37

- 3. MESSAGE (SOCIAL):** "Only Fidesz-KDNP protects Hungary's sovereignty and the interests of Hungarians; every other force serves foreign interests."

Technique: Agenda-setting + selective outrage + timing — Evidence: 00:38, 04:03, 07:45, 12:26

Manipulation level classification

Justification: The broadcast's total score is 8.1/10, which is on the boundary between "systematic one-sidedness" and "extreme one-sidedness." The broadcast contains not a single independent expert, not a single opposition rebuttal and not a single critical question; it scores above 7 in 12 out of 15 criteria. The balance and diversity of opinion requirements prescribed by Mtv. §83 are not met in a single criterion. The manipulation techniques (guilt by association, framing, agenda-setting, selective omission) consistently and systematically build on each other, indicating a deliberate editorial decision.

SUMMARY

The analysed M1 news broadcast systematically violates the requirements of current, objective and diverse information prescribed by Mtv. §83. The broadcast functions de facto as campaign material: it conveys the Fidesz-KDNP narrative through eight different government actors, without criticism or follow-up questions, while portraying the strongest opposition party (TISZA) exclusively in an "agent scandal" context, without presenting its programme positions. The systematic application of the guilt by association technique — identifying TISZA with Ukrainian intelligence and "spies" without a legally binding court verdict — also violates the presumption of innocence. The broadcast is particularly serious in the context of the 2026 election campaign, since the legal mandate of public media would be to reflect diversity of opinion, not to convey the governing party's campaign messages.



OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

9.0/10

Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

8.0/10

Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation

TOTAL SCORE

8.5/10

Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias

Average of hard facts and soft facts



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.

Aggregate deviation index — Interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Imperceptible	No material patterns detectable; the programme 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 impairment of viewpoint diversity.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the balance requirement. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, cross-programme patterns; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias	Maximum pronouncedness 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 portrayal.
–2 to –1	Mildly disadvantaged	Recognisable but mild disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No preference or disadvantage detectable.
+1 to +2	Mildly advantaged	Recognisable but mild preference.
+3 to +5	Strongly advantaged	The party is significantly over-represented in framing, speaking time or portrayal.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Mttv. §83)

Assessment under Mttv. §83

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

Violation 1:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — obligation of objective information

Facts: The "TISZA agent scandal" appears exclusively in the interpretation of government actors; the substantive position of the journalist concerned (Panyi Szabolcs) and the party concerned (TISZA) is not presented.

Evidence: 03:04–03:12 — "Panyi Szabolcs admitted on his social media page that he is audible on the recording. He already told Telex that he had absolutely nothing to do with the wiretapping of Szijjártó Péter." — then the government narrative immediately continues, without the journalist's detailed position.

Assessment: The requirement of objectivity demands that the positions of the parties concerned be presented in substantive detail. A single sentence does not meet this requirement.

Violation 2:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — obligation of balanced information

Facts: ~60% of the broadcast's airtime is dominated by government actors; the opposition appears in ~5%, exclusively in a negative context; not a single opposition actor is given the opportunity to present their own position.

Evidence: 00:16–12:19 — consecutive statements by eight different government actors, without a single opposition rebuttal.

Assessment: The balance requirement is not met if one political side receives 60% of airtime and the other 5%, exclusively in a negative context.

Violation 3:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (2) — obligation to reflect diversity of opinion

Facts: Not a single independent expert, not a single opposition programme position and not a single critical perspective appears in the broadcast; diversity of opinion is entirely absent.

Evidence: The entire length of the broadcast — not a single independent source, not a single critical question, not a single opposition programme position appears.

Assessment: The obligation to reflect diversity of opinion requires that different political and social positions appear in substantive detail. The broadcast entirely disregards this requirement.

Violation 4:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — obligation of objective information; Ve. 2. § (1) point e) — good faith and proper exercise of rights

Facts: The broadcast labels TISZA and Panyi Szabolcs as "agents," "spies" and preparers of a "Ukraine-friendly agent government" without a legally binding court verdict; the presumption of innocence is not upheld.

Evidence: 07:21 — "TISZA, in cooperation with a spy disguising himself as a journalist, is already working on assembling a Ukraine-friendly government."

Assessment: The requirement of objectivity demands that the conduct of the persons concerned not be classified as a criminal act or intelligence activity without a legally binding verdict. The expression "spy disguising himself" is a label without a court verdict that violates the presumption of innocence.

Violation 5:

Norm: Mttv. §83 (1) — obligation of current information



Facts: The broadcast reports on MTVA's own legal case (TISZA electoral complaint) exclusively on the basis of MTVA's own statement, without the other party's position.

Evidence: 13:56–14:48 — "According to the joint statement of MTVA and Duna Média Szolgáltató, the TISZA party's political campaign against public media has once again failed."

Assessment: Public media provides information on its own case itself, without presenting the other party's position; this violates both the requirement of impartiality and the requirement of objectivity.

Overall assessment under Mttv. §83

The analysed M1 news broadcast violates the requirements of objectivity, balance and diversity of opinion set out in Mttv. §83 (1) and (2) in five separate sets of facts. The violations are not random but form a consistent editorial pattern: in the context of the 2026 election campaign, the broadcast functions de facto as campaign material, conveying the governing party's narrative while identifying the strongest opposition party with intelligence activities without a legally binding verdict. The severity of the violations is increased by the fact that the broadcast is aired during the active period of the election campaign, and the legal mandate of public media would be precisely to reflect diversity of opinion. The NMHH Media Council — if it were truly acting under Mttv. §83 — would be obliged to initiate proceedings; however, the Media Council has been composed exclusively of persons close to Fidesz since 2010, which raises the separate problem of structural enforcement failure.

SOURCE DEEP-CHECK (Mandatory for every cited expert institution, NGO, advisory body)

1. Constitutional Protection Office (AH)

- 1. FUNDING:** Hungarian state budget; a body subordinate to the Minister of the Interior. Conflict of interest: the briefing of an intelligence service subordinate to the government is not independent of the government narrative.
- 2. MANDATE:** Constitutional protection tasks — in principle compatible with neutral assessment, but subordination to the government creates a structural conflict of interest.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** The content of the AH briefing is interpreted exclusively by Kocsis Máté, Fidesz parliamentary group leader; the AH's own public statement is not presented.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Body subordinate to the government
 - D2 Personal risk: 0 — Institutional risk moderate
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 — Intelligence mandate
 - D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Institutional consistency
 - D5 Emotional vs. data-based: 0 — Unknown (secret classification)
 - D6 Source level: -1 — Secondary (through Kocsis's interpretation)**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- 5. COUNTER-OPINION:** Independent legal assessment of the AH briefing; reaction of opposition committee members — neither appears in the broadcast.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a professional qualification. It is a social perception that must itself be examined.

2. Mandiner

- 1. FUNDING:** KESMA foundation (Fidesz-affiliated media conglomerate, encompassing ~500 media companies). Conflict of interest: direct structural interest in reinforcing the Fidesz narrative.
- 2. MANDATE:** Opinion-forming medium — not compatible with neutral statement of fact.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Mandiner is part of the Fidesz media ecosystem; the negative portrayal of Magyar Péter is a direct editorial and funding interest.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — KESMA funding
 - D2 Personal risk: -2 — Risks nothing
 - D3 Professional competence: 0 — Journalistic competence, but not neutral
 - D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistently pro-Fidesz
 - D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -1 — Evaluative, not data-based
 - D6 Source level: -2 — Tertiary**TOTAL: -6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED**
- 5. COUNTER-OPINION:** Assessment by independent press (Telex, 444.hu) of Magyar Péter's reaction — not featured in the broadcast.



3. Ellenpont (statement by a Ukrainian YouTuber)

1. **FUNDING:** Unknown; the "ellenpont" source is not identified in the broadcast.

2. **MANDATE:** Unknown.

3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** A statement by an unidentified Ukrainian YouTuber appears as primary evidence of Ukrainian intelligence interference — this is methodologically unacceptable.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Unknown, unidentified

D2 Personal risk: -2 — Unknown

D3 Professional competence: -2 — YouTuber, not an intelligence expert

D4 Opinion consistency: -2 — Unknown

D5 Emotional vs. data-based: -2 — Emotional, without data

D6 Source level: -2 — Tertiary (YouTuber statement)

TOTAL: -12 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED (maximum)

5. **COUNTER-OPINION:** Any verified, identifiable source — not featured in the broadcast.

IMPORTANT: A statement by an unidentified Ukrainian YouTuber does not constitute evidence of intelligence interference. The broadcast treats this as a primary source, which is a serious methodological error and a violation of the objectivity requirement under Mttv. §83.

Source credibility overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Constitutional Protection Office (AH)	-1	0	+2	+1	0	-1	+1	YELLOW
Mandiner	-2	-2	0	+1	-1	-2	-6	RED
Ellenpont (statement by a Ukrainian YouTuber)	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-12	RED

Legal and methodological classification

Not a finding of facts	The results presented do not constitute a finding of facts 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 aggregate deviation index does not replace the legal assessment under Mttv. §83. The determination of whether a given programme 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 controversy or format logic.
Not an assessment of intent	The analysis measures the observable structural characteristics of programmes. A score of 7 means that significant imbalance has been found — not that the editorial team did this intentionally. The methodology makes no statements about motives.
Heuristic comparative tool	The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of programmes, not for precise metric measurement of individual contributions. The threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as precise legal classification.



ANNEX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Hungary — MTVA

Laws

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

Relevant articles

Mttv. (Media Act 2010)

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

Smtv. (Press Freedom Act 2010)

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

Fundamental Law

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

European reference framework

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

Special case — Structural non-enforcement

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

Supervisory authority

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

Complaint procedure

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



ANNEX 2: ACADEMIC REFERENCES

Literature

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

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | www.svfab.ch | 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 presents the 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 is handing out 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.