

1. Housing Crisis Policies: "The Czech government should solve the housing crisis mainly by simplifying construction approvals rather than through increased subsidies." *Example: Streamlining approval procedures to speed up the building of affordable housing.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement indicates a preference for addressing the housing crisis by reducing bureaucratic hurdles. This stance aligns with a common center-right approach that favors deregulation and market-oriented solutions, such as streamlining approval procedures to expedite the construction of affordable housing, rather than relying primarily on increased subsidies.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement suggests a focus on practical and efficiency-driven solutions. Simplifying construction approvals to speed up housing development aligns with their emphasis on effective governance and removing administrative bottlenecks.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement reflects their broader agenda of leveraging efficiency and transparency through streamlined governmental processes. They support simplifying construction approvals as a primary method to tackle the housing shortage, viewing it as a way to accelerate the availability of affordable housing.
- Zelení: Neutral
  - Justification: Zelení's neutral stance likely signifies a nuanced position. While they may recognize the potential benefits of faster approval processes for housing, their environmental focus would lead to caution against simplification that could compromise ecological standards or sustainable development. Their neutrality suggests that simplifying approvals alone, without other considerations (like environmental protection or social impact), is not a solution they fully endorse or reject.
- ANO: Agree
  - Justification: ANO's agreement points to a pragmatic approach aimed at increasing housing supply by making the construction process more straightforward. They see simplifying approvals as a key lever to address the housing crisis, rather than focusing on increased subsidies.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality suggests they do not fully align with prioritizing simplified approvals over subsidies as the *main* solution. This could indicate a desire for a more balanced approach or a focus on other aspects of housing policy, without strongly committing to deregulation as the primary driver.
- SPD: Disagree

- Justification: SPD's disagreement indicates a skepticism towards solving the housing crisis mainly through simplified construction approvals. Their stance suggests a preference for more direct state intervention, potentially through subsidies or other regulatory measures, rather than relying on deregulation to stimulate construction.
- Stačilo!: Disagree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s disagreement signals a clear opposition to the idea that simplifying construction approvals should be the main strategy. This likely stems from a belief in stronger state control and intervention in the housing market, possibly advocating for significant public investment or robust subsidy programs instead of deregulation.

2. Managing Inflation: "Long-term economic reforms and diversification are better strategies for managing inflation than immediate solutions like price controls or fines." *Example: Investing in technology and innovation rather than imposing temporary price caps on essential goods.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement underscores a commitment to addressing inflation through structural economic adjustments. This aligns with their preference for sustainable, market-based solutions like investing in technology and innovation, rather than resorting to short-term interventions like price controls.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement reflects a strategic, long-term perspective on economic management. They favor foundational reforms and economic diversification, such as investments in innovation, over temporary fixes like price caps to manage inflation.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement is consistent with their focus on innovation and systemic solutions. They support long-term economic reforms and diversification as more effective tools against inflation than immediate, potentially market-distorting measures like price controls.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement highlights their support for sustainable and forward-looking economic policies. Investing in technology and innovation aligns with their goals for a modern, resilient economy, which they see as a better approach to inflation than temporary price controls.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutral stance suggests a pragmatic or possibly mixed approach. While they might not disagree with the value of long-term reforms, their neutrality could imply that they do not rule out the use of immediate solutions like price controls or fines in certain situations, or they believe both can play a role.

- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality indicates they may not fully endorse one approach over the other. They might see merit in both long-term strategies and immediate interventions depending on the specific economic context, thus not committing exclusively to long-term reforms as the definitively "better" strategy.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement suggests a preference for more immediate and direct measures to combat inflation. They likely believe that solutions like price controls or fines can be more effective or necessary, at least in the short term, compared to relying solely on long-term reforms and diversification.
- Stačilo!: Disagree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s disagreement indicates a strong inclination towards interventionist policies. They likely favor immediate solutions such as price controls to manage inflation, viewing long-term reforms as insufficient or too slow to address pressing economic challenges for the populace.

3. Economic Growth vs. Climate: "Prioritizing economic growth and traditional industries is more important than addressing climate change." *Example: Continuing significant state support for traditional automotive industries instead of transitioning funds to green technologies.*

- SPOLU: Neutral
  - Justification: SPOLU's neutral stance suggests an attempt to balance economic priorities with environmental concerns. They may not explicitly prioritize traditional economic growth over climate action, nor fully advocate for a rapid shift away from established industries, perhaps seeking a middle ground where both are addressed concurrently or where transitions are managed gradually.
- STAN: Disagree
  - Justification: STAN's disagreement signals a belief that addressing climate change should not be secondary to prioritizing economic growth and traditional industries. This suggests a leaning towards sustainable development and a willingness to transition support towards greener technologies rather than solely propping up traditional sectors like the automotive industry.
- PIRÁTI: Disagree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's disagreement indicates a strong commitment to addressing climate change, viewing it as at least equally, if not more, important than unchecked economic growth in traditional sectors. They would likely support transitioning funds to green technologies over continued significant state support for industries that may hinder climate goals.
- Zelení: Disagree
  - Justification: Zelení's disagreement is central to their core ideology. They unequivocally prioritize addressing climate change, advocating for a shift away

from traditional, potentially polluting industries towards green technologies and sustainable economic models.

- ANO: Agree
  - Justification: ANO's agreement indicates a clear prioritization of economic growth and the support of traditional industries, even if it means climate change considerations take a backseat. This is exemplified by favoring continued state support for sectors like the automotive industry over a primary focus on green technology transitions.
- Přísaha: Agree
  - Justification: Přísaha's agreement suggests that, when a direct choice is presented, they lean towards supporting established economic drivers and traditional industries over aggressive climate change mitigation efforts. This implies a concern for job preservation in these sectors and economic stability derived from them.
- SPD: Agree
  - Justification: SPD's agreement shows a strong emphasis on national economic interests and traditional industries, viewing them as more critical than proactive climate change policies. They would likely support measures that protect existing industries, such as the automotive sector, even at the expense of a faster transition to green technologies.
- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement indicates a stance where immediate economic concerns and the support of traditional industries are deemed more pressing than policies aimed at addressing climate change. This often aligns with a populist approach focusing on current jobs and economic output from established sectors.

4. EU Membership and Authoritarian Regimes: "The Czech Republic should strengthen its EU membership and minimize relations with authoritarian regimes." *Example: Reducing economic dependency on countries with authoritarian governments such as Russia or China.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement reflects a strong pro-European and pro-Western orientation. They advocate for deepening ties within the EU and reducing dependencies on authoritarian regimes like Russia or China, aligning with a foreign policy based on democratic values.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement signifies a commitment to strong EU membership and a cautious approach to relations with authoritarian states. They support measures such as reducing economic dependency on such regimes to safeguard national interests and align with EU partners.
- PIRÁTI: Agree

- Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement is consistent with their emphasis on human rights, democratic values, and international cooperation within frameworks like the EU. They advocate for minimizing ties with authoritarian regimes and reducing reliance on them.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement stems from their commitment to human rights, international law, and democratic principles, which are foundational to the EU. They support strengthening EU ties and limiting engagement with authoritarian regimes.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutral stance suggests a pragmatic foreign policy approach. While not necessarily opposing stronger EU ties, they might be hesitant to "minimize" relations with all authoritarian regimes across the board, perhaps due to perceived economic interests or a desire for a more independent foreign policy footing that allows for engagement based on specific circumstances.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality could indicate a 'Czechia-first' approach that is wary of both deep EU integration if it infringes on sovereignty, and of unequivocally minimizing relations with all authoritarian regimes if specific national interests are perceived to be at stake. They may prefer a case-by-case assessment.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement points to a Euroskeptic stance and a desire for more sovereign foreign policy, which may include maintaining or even cultivating relations with regimes the EU might consider authoritarian. They likely oppose the idea of the Czech Republic's foreign relations being dictated by a general principle of minimizing ties with such states or an unconditional strengthening of EU membership if it curtails national autonomy.
- Stačilo!: Disagree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s disagreement signals opposition to both strengthening EU membership and a blanket policy of minimizing relations with authoritarian regimes. This suggests a sovereigntist and possibly anti-Western viewpoint, advocating for an independent foreign policy that does not automatically align with the EU's common stances and may seek pragmatic ties with any nation, regardless of its governance.

5. NATO Membership: "The Czech Republic should consider exiting NATO." *Example: Evaluating alternative defense alliances or neutrality.*

- SPOLU: Disagree
  - Justification: SPOLU's disagreement strongly affirms their commitment to NATO membership as a cornerstone of Czech security. They view continued

participation in the alliance as essential for national defense and do not support exploring alternatives like neutrality or exiting the pact.

- STAN: Disagree
  - Justification: STAN's disagreement reflects their firm support for NATO membership. They see the alliance as crucial for the Czech Republic's security and geopolitical stability, rejecting any notion of withdrawal or seeking alternative defense arrangements.
- PIRÁTI: Disagree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's disagreement indicates their backing of NATO membership. While open to reforms in many areas, they align with the mainstream consensus on the importance of the alliance for collective defense and Czech security.
- Zelení: Disagree
  - Justification: Zelení's disagreement shows their support for remaining in NATO. Despite their strong pacifist leanings in some contexts, they recognize the current geopolitical realities and the security benefits provided by the alliance.
- ANO: Disagree
  - Justification: ANO's disagreement confirms their position that the Czech Republic should remain a member of NATO. They see the alliance as a key component of the country's defense strategy and do not advocate for its abandonment.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutral stance suggests an openness to at least discussing or evaluating the Czech Republic's role in NATO, without outright calling for an exit. This could stem from a desire to assert national sovereignty even within alliances or to explore all options, though not necessarily leading to a decision to leave.
- SPD: Agree
  - Justification: SPD's agreement indicates their clear stance that the Czech Republic should consider exiting NATO. This aligns with their nationalist and sovereigntist ideology, which often views international alliances as impinging on national decision-making and may advocate for neutrality or alternative security arrangements.
- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement signals their desire for the Czech Republic to leave NATO. This position is typically rooted in a strongly anti-establishment, sovereigntist, and often anti-Western viewpoint, favoring neutrality or a complete reorientation of defense policy.

6. Corporate Taxes: "Large corporations should pay higher taxes to improve funding for healthcare, education, and infrastructure." *Example: Increasing corporate tax rates on multinational companies to fund public hospitals.*

- SPOLU: Disagree
  - Justification: SPOLU's disagreement indicates a preference for maintaining or lowering the tax burden on corporations. This aligns with a center-right economic philosophy that higher corporate taxes could hinder investment and economic growth, and that public services should be funded through other means or improved efficiency.
- STAN: Neutral
  - Justification: STAN's neutral stance suggests a cautious or conditional approach to raising corporate taxes. They might be open to some adjustments but are not unequivocally in favor of significant increases, perhaps weighing the need for public funding against potential economic impacts on businesses.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement shows support for higher taxes on large corporations to fund public services. This reflects a progressive stance on fiscal policy, aiming to ensure that profitable large businesses, including multinationals, contribute more significantly to societal needs like healthcare and education.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement aligns with their social justice and public investment priorities. They advocate for large corporations to bear a greater tax responsibility to adequately fund essential public services and infrastructure.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutral position suggests they are not firmly committed to either raising or maintaining current corporate tax levels. This could reflect a pragmatic stance, potentially open to targeted increases or specific tax measures but wary of broad hikes that could affect competitiveness.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality indicates an ambivalent or case-by-case stance on increasing corporate taxes. They may not have a fixed ideological position on this, preferring to evaluate such measures based on specific economic conditions and the proposed use of funds.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement suggests opposition to increasing taxes on large corporations. While populist, their focus might be on other forms of revenue or a belief that higher corporate taxes could harm national businesses or lead to job losses, preferring to fund public services through different mechanisms.

- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement signals strong support for making large corporations pay higher taxes. This is consistent with a leftist-populist agenda that seeks wealth redistribution and robust funding for public services through increased contributions from large businesses.

7. Business Subsidies: "Government subsidies to businesses should be minimized to allow free market competition to drive growth." *Example: Reducing state financial support for large enterprises, allowing market forces to determine success.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement reflects a commitment to free-market principles. They believe that minimizing government subsidies allows for healthier competition and more efficient allocation of resources, where market forces, rather than state support, determine business success.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement indicates a preference for limited state intervention in the economy. They support reducing subsidies to foster a competitive environment where businesses succeed based on merit and market demand, rather than reliance on state aid.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement aligns with their focus on transparency, fairness, and reducing opportunities for corruption or inefficient use of public funds. Minimizing subsidies supports a level playing field for businesses and allows market competition to drive growth.
- Zelení: Neutral
  - Justification: Zelení's neutral stance likely stems from a selective approach to subsidies. While they might agree with minimizing subsidies for large, established, or polluting enterprises, they would likely support targeted subsidies for green initiatives, small local businesses, or sectors undergoing sustainable transition. Thus, they would not agree with a blanket minimization.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutrality suggests a pragmatic or strategic use of subsidies. They may not support wholesale minimization, perhaps seeing subsidies as a tool to support key industries, attract investment, or achieve specific economic goals, rather than relying purely on free-market competition.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality indicates they are not strictly for or against minimizing business subsidies. Their position might depend on the type of business, the purpose of the subsidy, or the overall economic climate, suggesting a flexible rather than ideologically fixed approach.



- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement suggests a belief in the state's role in supporting national businesses through subsidies. They may see subsidies as a way to protect domestic industries, maintain employment, or ensure national economic sovereignty, rather than letting free market competition be the sole driver.
- Stačilo!: Disagree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s disagreement indicates a strong preference for state intervention and support for businesses, likely with a focus on national enterprises or specific sectors deemed vital. They would oppose minimizing subsidies if it means abandoning state tools to guide economic development or support businesses.

8. Women's Rights: "Further progress is needed to achieve true gender equality in the Czech Republic." *Example: Introducing stronger workplace protections against gender discrimination.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement indicates an acknowledgment that gender equality has not yet been fully achieved and that further measures, such as stronger workplace protections against discrimination, are necessary.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement reflects a commitment to improving gender equality. They support the idea that more progress is required and are likely in favor of practical steps like enhancing workplace protections to address existing disparities.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement is consistent with their strong emphasis on human rights and equality. They advocate for continued efforts and concrete measures, such as improved anti-discrimination laws in the workplace, to advance gender equality.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement aligns with their core principles of social justice and equality for all genders. They strongly believe that further progress is essential and support proactive measures like strengthening protections against gender discrimination.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutral stance suggests that while they may not deny the existence of some gender inequality, they might not see it as a pressing issue requiring significant further action, or they may believe current measures are largely sufficient.
- Přísaha: Neutral

- Justification: Přísaha's neutrality could indicate a view that current laws and societal norms are generally adequate regarding gender equality, or that this issue is not a primary focus of their platform. They may not be convinced that "further progress is needed" as a matter of priority.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement suggests a belief that gender equality is already sufficiently established or that current efforts are adequate, possibly even viewing further measures as unnecessary or counterproductive. They may oppose active interventions like stronger workplace protections against gender discrimination if they perceive them as overreach.
- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement indicates that they see a need for more action to achieve true gender equality. This aligns with a progressive or leftist stance on social issues, supporting measures like enhanced workplace protections.

9. Definition of Marriage: "Marriage should remain exclusively between a man and a woman."

*Example: Opposing legislation that allows same-sex marriage.*

- SPOLU: Neutral
  - Justification: SPOLU's neutral stance reflects internal diversity on this socially conservative versus liberal issue. Some factions within the coalition may support the traditional definition, while others may be open to or supportive of same-sex marriage, leading to an official party line of neutrality.
- STAN: Neutral
  - Justification: STAN's neutrality suggests a similar internal division or a desire not to take a strong official stance on a sensitive social issue like the definition of marriage. They may allow their members to vote according to their conscience on such matters.
- PIRÁTI: Disagree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's disagreement signals strong support for marriage equality. They advocate for extending the right to marry to same-sex couples and would oppose legislation that maintains marriage as exclusively between a man and a woman.
- Zelení: Disagree
  - Justification: Zelení's disagreement is consistent with their commitment to LGBTQ+ rights and equality. They firmly support same-sex marriage and oppose defining marriage exclusively as a union between a man and a woman.
- ANO: Agree
  - Justification: ANO's agreement indicates their support for maintaining the traditional definition of marriage as exclusively between a man and a woman. They would therefore oppose legislation aimed at legalizing same-sex marriage.

- Přísaha: Agree
  - Justification: Přísaha's agreement shows a socially conservative stance, upholding the definition of marriage as solely between a man and a woman. They would oppose efforts to introduce same-sex marriage.
- SPD: Agree
  - Justification: SPD's agreement reflects their socially conservative and traditionalist values. They strongly support keeping marriage exclusively for heterosexual couples and oppose any changes to this definition.
- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement on this issue indicates a socially conservative position, despite potentially leftist economic stances. They support the traditional definition of marriage and would oppose same-sex marriage legislation.

10. Local vs. Central Governance: "Local and regional authorities should have greater decision-making powers compared to the central government." *Example: Allowing regions to independently manage education and healthcare policies.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement signals support for decentralization and strengthening local governance. This aligns with principles of subsidiarity, where decisions are made at the closest appropriate level to the citizen, such as allowing regions more autonomy in areas like education and healthcare.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's (Mayors and Independents) agreement is core to their identity, strongly advocating for increased powers for local and regional authorities. They believe that local bodies are better equipped to manage services like education and healthcare according to local needs.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement reflects their preference for decentralized power structures and citizen participation. Granting more autonomy to local and regional authorities in policy areas like education and healthcare aligns with this philosophy.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement indicates support for empowering local communities and ensuring that decisions affecting them are made at a more grassroots level. They would likely favor regional management of services like education if it leads to more responsive and tailored policies.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutral stance suggests a cautious approach to further decentralization. While potentially supporting some local competencies, they

might also favor a degree of central control to ensure national standards or strategic direction, especially in key areas like education and healthcare.

- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality implies they do not have a strong leaning towards either greater decentralization or centralization. Their focus might be more on the efficiency and integrity of governance at any level, rather than a fundamental shift in power balance.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement suggests a preference for stronger central government control. They may believe that key policy areas like education and healthcare require uniform national standards and centralized management, opposing significant devolution of power to regions.
- Stačilo!: Disagree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s disagreement indicates a belief in a more centralized state. They likely advocate for the central government retaining significant decision-making powers, including over education and healthcare, to ensure uniformity or implement their national policies effectively.

11. Impact of Anti-Minority Politics: "Politicians who blame minorities for societal issues threaten democracy and societal harmony." *Example: Criticizing political rhetoric that targets minorities, fostering division.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement reflects a commitment to democratic principles and social cohesion. They recognize that rhetoric blaming minorities is divisive and undermines democratic values.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement underscores their support for a tolerant and inclusive society. They condemn political tactics that scapegoat minorities, viewing such actions as detrimental to democracy and harmony.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement is consistent with their strong stance on human rights and inclusivity. They actively oppose rhetoric that targets minorities, seeing it as a threat to democratic norms and social peace.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement stems from their core values of equality, anti-discrimination, and social justice. They believe that politicians scapegoating minorities are a danger to both democracy and societal harmony.
- ANO: Neutral

- Justification: ANO's neutral stance is somewhat ambiguous. It could mean they do not fully agree that such rhetoric is always a major threat, or they might be hesitant to broadly condemn it without specific contexts, perhaps due to past instances of their own or allied politicians using populist rhetoric.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality might indicate a focus on other perceived threats to democracy or a reluctance to engage deeply with this specific aspect of political discourse. They may not view criticizing such rhetoric as a priority or may believe the issue is exaggerated.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement is highly significant, as their political platform often involves strong rhetoric concerning minorities and immigration. Disagreeing with the statement suggests they do not view their own or similar political rhetoric that blames minorities for societal issues as a threat to democracy or harmony, but rather as a legitimate expression of public concern or political strategy.
- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement, despite being a more radical party, suggests an alignment with the principle that scapegoating minorities is harmful. This might stem from a class-based solidarity perspective that sees such rhetoric as a distraction from core socio-economic issues, or a specific opposition to certain types of divisive politics.

12. Recognition of Foreign Qualifications: "The Czech Republic should streamline and expedite recognition of foreign professional qualifications." *Example: Faster validation processes for foreign-trained healthcare professionals and teachers.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement indicates support for policies that make it easier for qualified foreign professionals to integrate into the Czech labor market. This can address skill shortages, for instance, by enabling faster validation for foreign-trained healthcare professionals and teachers.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement reflects a pragmatic approach to addressing labor needs and attracting talent. Streamlining the recognition of foreign qualifications, especially in critical sectors like healthcare and education, is seen as beneficial.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement aligns with their focus on efficiency, reducing bureaucracy, and openness. They support faster validation processes for foreign qualifications to enable skilled individuals to contribute to the Czech economy and society more easily.

- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement shows support for facilitating the entry of foreign professionals, which can enhance diversity and fill workforce gaps. They would favor quicker validation, especially for professions that serve public well-being like healthcare and teaching.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutral stance might suggest a cautious approach, balancing the need for foreign professionals with concerns about maintaining national standards or protecting the domestic labor market. They may not be fully convinced of the need for significant acceleration without careful controls.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality could indicate that while not opposed in principle, they may have reservations about the implementation or potential risks of expediting recognition, perhaps prioritizing stringent checks over speed.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement suggests a protectionist stance, prioritizing Czech citizens in the labor market. They likely oppose measures that would make it easier or faster for foreign professionals to have their qualifications recognized, fearing competition for jobs or a lowering of standards.
- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement here might seem surprising given other stances but could be interpreted as a pragmatic recognition of needs in specific sectors like healthcare. Alternatively, it could be a nuanced position where they support it for certain professions or under specific conditions, perhaps distinguishing between different types of foreign workers.

13. Accelerating Citizenship for Contributors: "The Czech Republic should simplify and accelerate citizenship procedures for foreigners significantly contributing to society." *Example: Quicker citizenship paths for highly skilled professionals, entrepreneurs, or healthcare workers who actively support Czech society.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement reflects a desire to attract and retain talent that benefits the Czech Republic. They support making citizenship more accessible for foreigners, such as highly skilled professionals or entrepreneurs, who make significant contributions.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement aligns with a pragmatic view of immigration, valuing individuals who actively contribute to society. They favor simplified and quicker citizenship for those, like skilled workers or healthcare professionals, who demonstrably support the Czech Republic.

- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement is consistent with their open and merit-based approach to immigration and integration. They support facilitating citizenship for those who contribute significantly, seeing it as beneficial for societal development.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement reflects their inclusive values and recognition of the positive impact immigrants can have. They support easier citizenship paths for individuals making substantial contributions to Czech society.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutral stance suggests a cautious or non-committal position. While they might not oppose the idea outright, they may have reservations about broadly accelerating citizenship procedures, perhaps preferring a more stringent or case-by-case evaluation, even for significant contributors.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality indicates they are not strongly for or against simplifying citizenship for contributors. Their focus on national identity and security might make them wary of accelerating such processes without very strict criteria.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement shows a restrictive stance on citizenship. They generally oppose measures that would make it easier or faster for foreigners to obtain Czech citizenship, regardless of their contributions, prioritizing a more ethnically or culturally homogenous concept of nationality.
- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement to accelerate citizenship for contributors might appear to contrast with some of their more nationalistic or anti-establishment views on other topics. This could suggest a pragmatic acceptance that skilled individuals or those who integrate and contribute significantly should have a clearer path to citizenship, perhaps with a focus on those who fill critical roles.

14. Support for Ukraine: "The Czech Republic should actively support Ukraine against Russian aggression through humanitarian and military assistance." *Example: Providing military aid, medical supplies, and refugee assistance to Ukraine.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement demonstrates strong solidarity with Ukraine. They advocate for comprehensive support, including humanitarian and military aid, reflecting a firm stance against Russian aggression and alignment with Western partners.

- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement shows a clear commitment to supporting Ukraine's sovereignty and defense. They favor providing both humanitarian relief and military assistance in the face of Russian aggression.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement aligns with their internationalist values and condemnation of aggression. They support active assistance to Ukraine, encompassing military, medical, and refugee aid.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement reflects their commitment to international law, human rights, and solidarity with victims of aggression. They support providing humanitarian and, often, other forms of assistance to Ukraine.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutral stance on *active* support, including military assistance, might indicate a more cautious approach or internal divisions. While likely supporting humanitarian aid, their neutrality on the broader question suggests hesitation or reservations about the extent or nature of military involvement or other forms of active support.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality could stem from a 'Czechia-first' perspective that, while perhaps sympathetic to Ukraine, prioritizes national resources and avoids deep entanglement in foreign conflicts. They may support some aid but hesitate on "active" or extensive military assistance.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement signals opposition to active Czech support for Ukraine, particularly military assistance. This aligns with their often non-interventionist or pro-Russian leaning stance, advocating for neutrality or prioritizing perceived national interests over involvement in the conflict.
- Stačilo!: Disagree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s disagreement indicates strong opposition to providing support, especially military aid, to Ukraine. This often comes from an anti-Western, anti-NATO, and sometimes pro-Russian viewpoint, calling for an end to involvement and promoting negotiation on terms potentially favorable to Russia.

15. Promoting Equal Opportunities: "Laws and policies should actively promote equal opportunities within Czechia's multicultural and diverse society." *Example: Implementing anti-discrimination policies and diversity training in public institutions.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement indicates a commitment to fairness and inclusivity within Czech society. They support laws and policies, such as anti-



discrimination measures, aimed at ensuring equal opportunities for all members of a diverse population.

- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement reflects their support for a society where everyone has a fair chance, regardless of background. They would likely favor practical measures like anti-discrimination policies and diversity initiatives in public institutions.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement is central to their ethos of equality, human rights, and social justice. They strongly advocate for proactive policies to promote equal opportunities and combat discrimination within a multicultural society.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement stems from their deep commitment to equality, diversity, and anti-discrimination. They champion active measures to ensure equal opportunities for all, including robust anti-discrimination laws and diversity training.
- ANO: Neutral
  - Justification: ANO's neutral stance suggests they may believe current provisions for equal opportunities are largely sufficient, or they may be wary of "actively promoting" such policies if it implies significant new interventions or quotas. They might not see a pressing need for more expansive measures like diversity training in all public institutions.
- Přísaha: Neutral
  - Justification: Přísaha's neutrality could indicate a belief that formal legal equality is adequate, without necessarily endorsing "active promotion" of equal opportunities through specific programs, or that this is not a priority issue for them.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement suggests an opposition to active measures promoting equal opportunities in a multicultural context. They may view such policies as unnecessary, divisive, or a threat to the majority culture, and would likely oppose initiatives like diversity training in public institutions.
- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement on promoting equal opportunities aligns with a leftist concern for social justice and combating discrimination. They would support laws and policies aimed at leveling the playing field within a diverse society.

16. Wealthy Politicians and Democracy: "Wealthy politicians with conflicts of interest pose significant threats to Czech democracy's integrity." *Example: Advocating for stricter conflict-of-interest laws to prevent business leaders from unduly influencing politics.*

- SPOLU: Agree
  - Justification: SPOLU's agreement indicates a concern for transparency and accountability in politics. They recognize that conflicts of interest involving wealthy politicians can undermine democratic integrity and would likely support stricter laws to prevent undue influence.
- STAN: Agree
  - Justification: STAN's agreement reflects their emphasis on good governance and combating corruption. They view wealthy politicians with conflicts of interest as a threat and would advocate for measures like stronger conflict-of-interest legislation.
- PIRÁTI: Agree
  - Justification: The Pirate Party's agreement is a cornerstone of their anti-corruption and transparency platform. They strongly believe that conflicts of interest, particularly involving wealthy politicians, are detrimental to democracy and advocate for robust preventative measures.
- Zelení: Agree
  - Justification: Zelení's agreement aligns with their commitment to ethical governance and reducing the influence of money in politics. They see wealthy politicians with conflicts of interest as a significant threat and support stricter regulations.
- ANO: Disagree
  - Justification: ANO's disagreement is notable, given the party was founded by a wealthy businessman (Andrej Babiš) who faced numerous conflict-of-interest accusations. Their disagreement suggests they do not perceive wealthy politicians with business interests as an inherent or significant threat to democratic integrity, or they may believe existing regulations are sufficient or that such accusations are politically motivated.
- Přísaha: Agree
  - Justification: Přísaha's agreement, despite often focusing on law and order, indicates a concern for the integrity of the political system. They likely agree that conflicts of interest involving wealthy politicians can be a threat and would support measures to ensure accountability.
- SPD: Disagree
  - Justification: SPD's disagreement might stem from a populist appeal that sometimes downplays concerns about the wealth of politicians if they are seen as "outsiders" fighting a corrupt establishment, or they may prioritize other perceived threats to democracy. They might not agree that wealth or business

ties in themselves, or the current state of conflict-of-interest laws, pose a *significant* threat.

- Stačilo!: Agree
  - Justification: Stačilo!'s agreement reflects a common anti-establishment and anti-elite sentiment found in leftist-populist movements. They would strongly agree that wealthy politicians with conflicts of interest pose a threat to democracy and would advocate for strict controls.