



ANNEX 1



Horizon Europe (HORIZON)

Description of the action (DoA)

Part A

Part B

DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION (PART A)

COVER PAGE

Part A of the Description of the Action (DoA) must be completed directly on the Portal Grant Preparation screens.

PROJECT	
<i>Grant Preparation (General Information screen) — Enter the info.</i>	
Project number:	101060899
Project name:	Neo-authoritarianisms in Europe and the liberal democratic response
Project acronym:	AUTHLIB
Call:	HORIZON-CL2-2021-DEMOCRACY-01
Topic:	HORIZON-CL2-2021-DEMOCRACY-01-01
Type of action:	HORIZON-RIA
Service:	REA/C/01
Project starting date:	fixed date: 1 October 2022
Project duration:	36 months

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project summary	3
List of participants	3
List of work packages	4
Staff effort	18
List of deliverables	20
List of milestones (outputs/outcomes)	33
List of critical risks	34
Project reviews	36

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project summary

Grant Preparation (General Information screen) — Provide an overall description of your project (including context and overall objectives, planned activities and main achievements, and expected results and impacts (on target groups, change procedures, capacities, innovation etc)). This summary should give readers a clear idea of what your project is about.

Use the project summary from your proposal.

To protect the future of liberal democracy in Europe, we must first understand its challengers. AUTHLIB is a multidisciplinary project that aims to explore the varieties of neo-authoritarian, illiberal ideologies in Europe, their social, psychological and historical causes, their organisational background and their political implications. The study aims to capture the dynamics of ideological change in the European Union as a whole, but it will particularly focus on Poland, France, Italy, Hungary, Czechia, the United Kingdom and Austria.

We will map ideological configurations by analysing textual data and social media, and by organising surveys of citizens and experts. The mapping of ideological structures will be complemented by a study of emotional triggers and rhetorical strategies pursued by illiberal actors. The contemporary ideological configurations of illiberalism will be embedded within their historical-cultural context, and the study of ideas and preferences will be supplemented by investigation of illiberalism in power, and the co-operation of illiberal political actors. To develop interventions that effectively target these new challenges, AUTHLIB will define the normative limits for actions that democracies may take in their own defence. In order to identify the mechanisms behind the support of illiberalism, and the susceptibility of citizens towards changing their attitudes, we will conduct laboratory and online panel-based survey experiments.

Finally, in order to observe how ideological and emotional stimuli work in co-operative settings, we will set up deliberative fora, involving both ordinary citizens, ideological opponents, and individuals responsible for educating future generations and operating the intricate procedures of liberal democracy.

The research will provide policy-makers with a comprehensive toolbox to improve support for liberal democracy.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

PARTICIPANTS

Grant Preparation (Beneficiaries screen) — Enter the info.

Number	Role	Short name	Legal name	Country	PIC
1	COO	CEU	KOZEP-EUROPAI EGYETEM	HU	999480338
1.1	AE	CEU PU	CEU GMBH	AT	901064817
2	BEN	Sciences Po	FONDATION NATIONALE DES SCIENCES POLITIQUES	FR	999957869
3	BEN	CUNI	UNIVERZITA KARLOVA	CZ	999923434
4	BEN	SNS	SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE	IT	999886962
5	BEN	SWPS University	SWPS UNIWERSYTET HUMANISTYCZNOSPoleczny	PL	999884634
6	BEN	TF	THE TRANSATLANTIC FOUNDATION	BE	961148363
7	BEN	UNIVIE	UNIVERSITAT WIEN	AT	999866883
8	AP	UOXF	THE CHANCELLOR, MASTERS AND SCHOLARS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	UK	999984350

LIST OF WORK PACKAGES

Work packages <i>Grant Preparation (Work Packages screen) — Enter the info.</i>						
Work Package No	Work Package name	Lead Beneficiary	Effort (Person-Months)	Start Month	End Month	Deliverables
WP1	Project management	1 - CEU	33.00	1	36	D1.1 – Data Management Plan D1.2 – Progress report D1.3 – AUTHLIB final publishable summary
WP2	Identifying the challenges to liberal democracy	5 - SWPS University	19.00	2	6	D2.1 – Literature review: ideological stakes and dimensions D2.2 – Guidelines for empirical data collection
WP3	Ideological configurations	2 - Sciences Po	70.20	7	25	D3.1 – A paper on measurement and methodological innovations D3.2 – A visual map of the ideological space D3.3 – A paper on the ideological space and contemporary ideological configurations D3.4 – Integrated data set of text analyses
WP4	Survey-based data-collection and experiments on public attitudes	5 - SWPS University	62.40	7	25	D4.1 – An analysis of the relationship between socio-demographic attributes and the propensity to support particular types of neo-authoritarianism D4.2 – A data set that integrates information on the social characteristics of neo-authoritarianism (based on previous surveys – ESS, ISSP, EES, EVS) with the ideological configurations that emerged from WP3 D4.3 – A paper including a typology on

Work packages*Grant Preparation (Work Packages screen) — Enter the info.*

Work Package No	Work Package name	Lead Beneficiary	Effort (Person-Months)	Start Month	End Month	Deliverables
						the distribution of the types of illiberal orientations across the EU Member States D4.4 – A data set on the reactions of citizens in experimental setting D4.5 – A paper on the survey experiments, focusing on factors shaping attitudes towards liberal democracy
WP5	Rhetorical and emotional appeals	8 - UOXF	19.10	7	25	D5.1 – Data set and report on rhetorical and emotional strategies of illiberal actors D5.2 – Data set and report on the laboratory experiments of emotional responses
WP6	Illiberalism in power	1 - CEU	23.30	7	15	D6.1 – Paper on the commonalities between and variation among the policies of illiberal actors in power
WP7	International cooperation and diffusion	4 - SNS	40.10	7	21	D7.1 – Paper on the forms of co-operation among authoritarian forces D7.2 – Data set on the forms of international co-operation among authoritarian forces
WP8	Historical embedding	1 - CEU	16.80	13	28	D8.1 – A qualitative analysis of the antecedents of current ideological alternatives D8.2 – Workshop and report on placing contemporary illiberalism into historical context
WP9	Building and validating the multidimensional map	1 - CEU	19.80	21	28	D9.1 – The integrated and validated map of illiberalism
WP10	The normative limits of interventions	8 - UOXF	11.10	21	26	D10.1 – Workshop and report on the

Work packages <i>Grant Preparation (Work Packages screen) — Enter the info.</i>						
Work Package No	Work Package name	Lead Beneficiary	Effort (Person-Months)	Start Month	End Month	Deliverables
						normative boundaries of interventions aiming to safeguard the liberal order
WP11	Mini-publics	3 - CUNI	29.50	18	34	D11.1 – Report on the Ideological Opponents' Forum, with policy recommendations D11.2 – Report on the Professionals of Democracy Forum, with policy recommendations D11.3 – Report on the Citizens' Forum, with policy recommendations D11.4 – E-learning platform
WP12	Delivering the results – impact and outreach	6 - TF	28.50	1	36	D12.1 – Communication strategy & dissemination/exploitation plan D12.2 – AUTHLIB Newsletter D12.3 – Policy papers and recommendations on the impact of illiberalism on specific, ideologically charged issues such as gender equality, integration of immigrants, and citizens' engagement D12.4 – Country-specific policy papers with policy recommendations D12.5 – Report on online launch events for the issue – and country-specific policy papers
WP13	Ethics requirements	1 - CEU	0.00	1	36	D13.1 – OEI - Requirement No. 1 D13.2 – OEI - Requirement No. 2

Work package WP1 – Project management

Work Package Number	WP1	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Work Package Name	Project management		
Start Month	1	End Month	36

Objectives

The objectives of this WP are three-fold: (1) to manage the project's resources effectively, to ensure efficient communication between partners within the consortium and between the consortium and the Commission, to produce periodic and final reports, manage the finances of the Consortium; (2) to ensure suitable ethical reviews for key empirical research elements (to be done within WP13 but PMs are assigned here); (3) to set up appropriate data management structures for the whole research initiative.

Description

Task 1–Project management: CEU will act as the primary liaison towards key staff at the European Commission; it will ensure smooth coordination and communication between project partners and will assist partners in making all planned subcontracts, if necessary. CEU will put in place all the internal communication channels and document management structures necessary for effective co-working. Prior to the launch of the project CEU will facilitate the drafting of an internal Consortium Agreement which sets the cornerstones of partners' cooperation in this project, in addition to adherence to what the Grant Agreement sets forth. Confidentiality issues, and management of knowledge and outputs will be addressed in the CA. Decisions will be made at the following levels: (1) at the level of the consortium, decisions associated with the design and planning of work tasks and communications will be made by the Management Team (one representative per partner institution) and the leaders of particular Work Packages, if necessary; (2) at the individual participant level, decisions concerning a particular participant's activities will be made within this participant's team—these decisions will then be communicated to the Coordinator for approval, coordination, recording and reporting requirements; (3) decisions about liaison with the local academic communities, and other stakeholders, will be made jointly by all the participants; (4) decisions related to the day-to-day running of the project will be the responsibility of the Coordinator. Regular/periodical co-ordination conference calls will be organised with all or some participants to review the major milestones and the progress of the project's tasks, mitigate risks if necessary, and ensure adherence to the workplan. Periodic, progress and final reports (activity reports, management reports, summary financial reports, technical reports, and reports on the distribution of the Community financial contribution between contractors) will be produced and audit certificates requested for and produced by each participant where required. The coordinator will distribute the Community financial contribution between partners without unjustified delay.

Task 2–Research ethics (Note: these tasks are mirrored in WP13 and will be accomplished there with their deliverables, but are assigned PMs in this WP): Each partner will be responsible for conducting an internal research ethics review, as required by their own institution. This is the first level of approval/endorsement. As a second level, since the project will involve the processing of personal data and experiments, the consortium will establish its own Ethics Board, consisting of experts working across the partner institutions, and the consent of the Ethics Board will be needed for approving empirical investigations. The consortium, under the leadership of CEU will draft a research ethics review document, to identify and address any key points or phases in the planned project where ethical guidelines and procedures need to be set forth. These will be consulted with the Ethics Board, and a formal Ethics Review will be completed by month 5.

Task 3–Data management: With CEU's leadership the AUTHLIB consortium will produce a Data Management Plan to describe data management life cycles of all types of data the project will collect, store, and analyse. We will ensure that the data generated and used by the project is findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable. CEU will conduct a review and re-assessment of the DMP throughout the lifetime of the project, as it becomes necessary.

All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner: UOXF: commits to dedicating at least 1.5 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources

Work package WP2 – Identifying the challenges to liberal democracy

Work Package Number	WP2	Lead Beneficiary	5. SWPS University
Work Package Name	Identifying the challenges to liberal democracy		

Start Month	2	End Month	6
--------------------	---	------------------	---

Objectives

The goal is to identify challenges based on the already accumulated, albeit fragmented, knowledge and to prepare for the phase of new empirical data-collection.

Description

The task of this WP is to prepare a list of theoretically justifiable dimensions that can be used in the subsequent, data-gathering stage. The WP will define the nature and processes of liberal democracy, and its principal challenges, along constitutional, social and ideological dimensions. The theoretical work will produce definitions and ontological claims that will help to structure the review of the literature and the existing data. We will identify the variety of constellations of challenges to liberal democracy across Europe, both with respect to the presence and the intensity of a challenge in any given country. The historically informed perspective on social, economic, and technological tendencies will not only help to identify current challenges, but it will also provide possible scenarios for the near future. Tendencies such as growing executive dominance, the pernicious social implications of artificial intelligence (especially regarding the silencing of social groups), the lack of accountability in the case of transnational activities or Anthropocene-driven threats are increasingly relevant for the future-oriented elements of the contemporary ideological struggles. The WP will consider whether, how and to what extent illiberals can exploit these tendencies and challenges. This Work Package will consider the potential for diverse shades of both liberal democratic and neo-authoritarian ideological proposals, and how these various ideological dimensions may interact. It will unpack the contents and attachments within and across political dimensions, such as cultural cosmopolitanism vs. nativism, moral liberalism vs. traditionalism and secularism vs. religiosity; as well as the question of how hierarchical views on ethnic and racial politics and gender-issues are related to other issues, such as economic protectionism and support for European integration.

While some of the dimensions that AUTHLIB will use to describe ideologies will be constructed in an inductive fashion, and others, such as religious orientation, attitude towards ethnic supremacy, social hierarchy, or individual autonomy, are provided by the standard models of political values, the task of WP2 is to provide a comprehensive list of theoretically justifiable dimensions that can be used in the subsequent, data-gathering stage.

All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner: UOXF: commits to dedicating at least 1.5 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources

Work package WP3 – Ideological configurations

Work Package Number	WP3	Lead Beneficiary	2. Sciences Po
Work Package Name	Ideological configurations		
Start Month	7	End Month	25

Objectives

The goal is to identify the ideological alternatives to liberal democracy, and their relative position in the new ideological-political space in 21st century Europe.

Description

The identification and mapping of liberal and illiberal ideologies will rely upon an extensive empirical data-collection module at the centre of WP3. The focus will be both elite and citizen communication through textual data. Liberal democracy and its challengers take a variety of stances on diverse political issues, both in terms of the position and the salience they attach to it. Actors compete not only on long-standing issues that divide societies through positioning, but also through the introduction of new or under-emphasised issues. The process of political competition, including the contest between liberal democratic actors and neo-authoritarians, thus revolves around the construction of ideological packages produced through associations between political stances on diverse issues and novel frames attached to such issue stances. This Work Package will analyse the diverse shades of liberal democratic and neo-authoritarian ideological proposals through both unsupervised and supervised computational text analysis methods combined with qualitative approaches. Interpretation of results and inputs for deductive approaches will heavily rest on the theoretical and conceptual work of WP2. The key deliverable of this Work Package will be an ideological map, highlighting the

distinctive ideological features of different forms of neo-authoritarianism, as well as the liberal democratic appeals in a common space. To achieve this, the Work Package (and WP5 below, which draws on the same data sources to investigate the emotional content of neo-authoritarian texts) will utilise and combine distinct data sources and two analytical processes:

Task 1—Construction of elite communication data set: The political elite communication data set will consist of five different types of text data that will be combined into a common data frame. First, manifesto data provide information on the formally communicated position of parties on various topics and their salience. These raw text data and annotated data sets are available via the Manifesto Project Database (MARPOR) of WZB. Secondly, the data will integrate text transcripts of parliamentary debates. These data will be partially drawn from the ParlSpeech data set (Rauh & Schwalbach, 2020) and otherwise will be obtained via scraping directly from the respective parliament websites. Thirdly, speeches by heads of parties and government will be included, partially drawing upon and extending the work of Maerz and Schneider (2019) and Jenneet al. (2021), using party websites and archives of associates foundations. Fourthly, we will draw upon social media communication by political actors as another source of public communication of their preferences. To do so, we will use the Twitter Academic API to utilise all tweets posted by all members of parliament in our country cases that have verified Twitter accounts for the past 10 years, and, finally, we will use the posts on the Facebook pages of political parties. The linkage points to integrate these five data sets relate to time, party affiliation and individual politicians. WP3 will co-operate with the OPTED project for insights into data availability and linking.

Task 2—Unsupervised and semi-supervised inductive analysis of elite communication: Given that our conceptual theoretical work may not uncover all types of illiberal discourse, we will take a bottom-up approach to analyse our data frame. This will combine a qualitative analysis of a given set of speeches, and a topic modelling approach. The latter extends to topic modelling with interpretative loops to refine the roster of alternatives. The results will capture the salience of certain topics and claims within the discourse.

Task 3—Supervised analysis of elite communication: We will use the information available on the political affiliation of certain actors (political elites) and treat their speech acts as typical instances of their respective ideologies. With this labelled data set of texts associated with ideological features, we expect to train classifiers that would be able to recognise such attitudes in other unlabelled corpora.

Task 4—Construction of social media data set from the larger engaged public: We will make use of the Academic API for Twitter to collect tweets from citizens who discuss specific political events or ideologically relevant issues (same-sex marriage, immigration policy, etc.). Going beyond the top political elites, we will exploit our previously trained classifiers to predict the ideological preferences of engaged citizens. We will strive to incorporate into our analysis the social position of users as publicly shared in their description.

Task 5—Scaling and network analysis of social media dataset: With ideology scaling methods we will assign every engaged Twitter user in every country a position in an attitudinal space based on its structural position (followers/following network). In the last stage of the analysis, we will further probe the data to find out how these attitudinal characteristics correlate with ideological preferences (as measured in task 4) and translate into certain behavioural features, such as the propensity of users to retweet, to refer to mainstream media sources, the ideological homogeneity of their ego-networks, etc.

Task 6—Integration of analyses into ideological map: The results of the different analytical steps above will be brought together in a final mapping exercise and will be compared to the configuration of the party-political space as derived from expert survey data on party positions (Chapel Hill data)

Work package WP4 – Survey-based data-collection and experiments on public attitudes

Work Package Number	WP4	Lead Beneficiary	5. SWPS University
Work Package Name	Survey-based data-collection and experiments on public attitudes		
Start Month	7	End Month	25

Objectives

The purpose is to embed the ideological orientations into a social context, and to identify the mechanisms behind the acceptance and rejection of particular authoritarian frames.

Description
<p>This Work Package will focus on the individual level, and it will identify the propensity of citizens to support different authoritarian forces and different illiberal ideologies. It is divided into two main tasks:</p> <p>Task 1–Identification of a set of individual social characteristics associated with illiberal views: We will identify a broad set of individual social characteristics associated with illiberal orientation, and we will use them to predict the probability of supporting diverse authoritarian actors and frames. In a first step, we will analyse existing surveys. In a second step, our own survey carried out in Task 2 will provide new data on illiberal orientations that are currently not present in the aforementioned survey programs. This data will enrich our understanding of the relationships between social characteristics and illiberal orientations. This comprehensive analysis of social characteristics in conjunction with illiberal attitudes will allow us to develop typologies in which we can categorise various individual citizens and draw a picture of (il)liberal citizen types across the Member States of the EU. Task 1 will be led by Sciences Po.</p> <p>Task 2–Identification of citizens’ responses to illiberal frames: The overall aim of is to obtain knowledge of how citizens respond to the various illiberal frames produced by political elites, and how they solve the potential dilemmas of contradictory stimuli. To do so, we will conduct surveys in all seven countries, including survey experiments, complementing the laboratory analyses conducted in WP5. The surveys will allow us to capture the relevant socio-political configuration of the adult populations, while the experiments will make it possible to test the malleability of attitudes and to separate commitment to ideological values, attitudes to decision-making procedures, and self-identifications. The latter is particularly important, because many illiberal and neo-authoritarians claim they are the “true democrats,” supporting what Welzel and Kirsch (2017) call “authoritarian notions of democracy”. Survey experiments will expose citizens to specific (ideational, rhetorical, and emotional) elements of the current illiberal discursive strategies that we will obtain from WP3. This will enable us to estimate the potential appeal of these elements. Whether one ends up in the camp of liberal democracy or not depends upon a host of factors that can be grouped into two major clusters and are important co-variants for our models: social context (bonds, interactions, social pressure) and strictly political phenomena factors (party identification, political polarisation, ideological identities). The experiment is embedded in questions, which will contain items representing all these factors. To separate support for cultural-political objectives from preferences for particular modes of political decision-making, we will use conjoint design. The choice of conjoint analysis is motivated by the complexity of the phenomena and multi-dimensionality of the decision-making processes, allowing us to control and vary several factors and estimate the impact of multiple components (Hainmuller et al 2014). The timing of polling will take into account the election cycles to filter out the campaign-related politicisation of certain attitudes. Task 2 will be led by SWPS.</p> <p>All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner UOXF: commits to dedicating at least 3 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources</p>

Work package WP5 – Rhetorical and emotional appeals

Work Package Number	WP5	Lead Beneficiary	8. UOXF
Work Package Name	Rhetorical and emotional appeals		
Start Month	7	End Month	25

Objectives
The goal is to map the emotional strategies used by supporters and opponents of liberal democracy, the reactions they stir, and the ways in which ideological goals, rhetorical formulae, and affections cluster.

Description
<p>We start with the hypothesis that liberal democracy and its challengers offer strong rhetorical and emotional appeals, and that the success of illiberalism in particular contexts may be due to the emotional connections it achieves. The emotional content of these appeals and how emotional appeals map on to programmatic content –or indeed whether they do at all – is weakly understood. Is the appeal based on anger or disgust? Does it have a positive or largely negative valence? What is the connection of emotionality to other aspects of illiberalism? Does emotionality support or substitute for programmatic appeals? What kinds of people may be most moved by illiberal emotionality? How does illiberal emotionality vary across countries and contexts? And, in line with our aim to build a toolkit to combat illiberalism, how might supporters of liberal</p>

democracy provide emotional alternatives suited to specific contexts and citizens? Outlining which emotional appeals are present or salient in any given constellation of liberalism/illiberalism will therefore be a significant contribution.

We will investigate emotionality via analysis of text and data that will also be considered in the programmatic analysis (WP3 above). We will employ sentiment analysis tools, and we will exploit the fact that, in certain settings, e.g., on social media, we can expect the textual material to also show the social reactions (anger, surprise, adhesion, conversation, etc.) that the speech triggers. This Work Package will directly build on the results of WP3, matching the ideational aspects of the new political landscape with the strategies focused on channelling and exploiting the emotions of citizens. To address these questions, this Work Package will analyse political texts including party manifestos, press releases, and social media output from key illiberal politicians. In what follows, we describe the two principal methodologies we will use to analyse political rhetoric, and our strategy to measure mass responses to different styles of rhetoric.

Task 1—Measuring rhetoric using dictionaries: The most straightforward way to analyse political content is by utilising validated dictionaries like the Linguistic Inquirer and Word Count (LIWC) or the Affective Norms of English Words (ANEW). These dictionaries contain thousands of words that are scored across several dimensions pertaining to emotion. For example, ANEW scores words in terms of Enthusiasm, Dominance, and Arousal, while LIWC adds Anger, Fear, and Positive and Negative Emotion. The ANEW is an English dictionary that has been validated in other languages, while later versions of the LIWC dictionary are multilingual. Importantly, when these dictionaries are combined with ‘word embeddings’, researchers can learn a lot more by analysing a more precise account of rhetoric. Word embeddings denote distances from key-words (e.g., the dictionary words) and can highlight how politicians from different parties use language to put forward their political views. A typical example in the literature is the use of ‘immigration’ by the left and right. The left tends to combine ‘immigration’ with ‘reform’, while right-wing orators combine it with ‘illegal’.

Task 2—Measuring rhetoric using Machine Learning: While dictionaries offer a rich set of words that are commonly used in politics, elite rhetoric is often more nuanced, and meanings change in response to context. To get a better sense of our measures, we will deploy machine learning algorithms to measure political text. The advantages of this approach are obvious: 1) we will be able to measure the dimensions of political rhetoric that matter most (divisiveness, polarisation, anger, hope, attacks etc), and 2) because our training sets will be created by ‘crowds’, we will have full knowledge of their predispositions and exploit their heterogeneity. This is important for our project, because if context matters, divisiveness and polarisation will also be in the eye of the beholder and thus different coders might produce different training sets. Once we have scores for our text samples, we will extrapolate our results from the training sets to measure unseen text. To train our text effectively, we will deploy the state of the art in AI algorithms (e.g., Penalised LASSO, random forests, neural networks) and judge them in terms of fit statistics.

Task 3—Measuring emotional reactions in laboratory experiments: Finally, and in parallel with the work undertaken in surveys of citizens’ opinions, we will also conduct laboratory experiments to better understand the lability of emotional responses to different illiberal stimuli. Our hypothesis is that citizens receiving (or rejecting) illiberal appeals do so on the basis of distinctive emotional responses—such as anger, disgust, surprise, happiness, fear, or sadness—and it is possible that different varieties of illiberalism have their own emotional response bases. Understanding whether and how emotional responses to illiberal messages in each rhetorical configuration may vary depending on how these messages are framed may prove a vital element in the construction of the toolkit to combat such messages. Building on the analysis of rhetoric using dictionaries and machine learning, we plan to undertake laboratory experiments to see to what extent emotional responses to illiberal messages may be altered in the groups that we identified as most and least likely to receive them.

All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner UOXF: commits to dedicating at least 25.5 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services, and at least a 83,000 EUR subcontracting budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources

Work package WP6 – Illiberalism in power

Work Package Number	WP6	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Work Package Name	Illiberalism in power		
Start Month	7	End Month	15

Objectives

The goal is to identify the nature of public policies and discourse of those illiberal forces that attain governmental power.

Description
<p>Political forces with strong ideological profiles occasionally follow pragmatic policies in government, but there is increasing evidence that illiberal values induce illiberal policies (Jenne 2021). Contrary to stereotypes about protest-based populists, illiberal parties do not necessarily behave in a myopic way in government, but instead pursue policies that are designed to have long-term consequences (Enyedi and Whitefield 2020). They can implement institutional reforms, using the state to nurture a new social elite, they invest in structures of socialisation, they build geopolitical alliances, and they influence the patterns of social reproduction (Fodor 2021, Enyedi 2020). With the help of a manufactured crisis-atmosphere, illiberals in power complement or replace traditional arenas of interest-articulation with top-down mechanisms of representation (Pitkin 1967, Körösényi 2005).</p> <p>Task 1–Identification of policies and narratives developed by neo-authoritarians: WP6 will review policies and narratives developed by neo-authoritarians in power, focusing on the policy areas that are most relevant in this context: education, welfare, media, family-support, childcare, citizenship-rights, religious freedoms, and foreign policy. These policies are examined from the point of view of how they affect various minority groups and social integration. We will record the differences between various authoritarian actors in government, examining whether they openly reject international standards and agreements (such as the Istanbul convention), and whether they provide actual support to vulnerable segments of the population. We follow the assumptions that various policies are compatible with illiberalism on such issues (see Mudde and Rovira Kaltwasser 2013; Scheiring 2021; Szikra and Öktem 2020). The empirical basis of this WP is provided by decrees and laws introduced by governments or proposed by government parties, and those practices and discourses that have emerged once illiberals transitioned from opposition into power.</p> <p>Task 2–Use of democratic rhetoric by the illiberal regimes: Finally, WP6 will analyse the use and abuse of democratic rhetoric and practice in cases where illiberals are in power, especially concerning the institutionalisation of phony consultations, and the development of discursive strategies that allows illiberals to appear as the defenders of the ‘real people’ against threatening ‘internationalist, secretive’ forces.</p> <p>All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner UOXF commits to dedicating at least 1.6 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources</p>

Work package WP7 – International cooperation and diffusion

Work Package Number	WP7	Lead Beneficiary	4. SNS
Work Package Name	International cooperation and diffusion		
Start Month	7	End Month	21

Objectives
The purpose is to record and analyse the forms of interactions among political and intellectual forces that advocate illiberal alternatives.

Description
<p>The task of this WP is the exploration and mapping of the co-operation of illiberal organisations. Illiberal frames and initiatives increasingly travel across national borders, with the help of coordinating organisations. Domestic responses to the challenges of such issues as same-sex marriage or immigration are influenced by foreign illiberal political entrepreneurs, and common authoritarian arguments are developed in newly established think tanks and through various other forms of coordination. With the help of social network analysis based on online links, WP7 will explore and map the spread of such new initiatives and their impact on the illiberal intellectual agenda. We will also identify the role played by external forces, such as the Russian government and radicalised U.S. think tanks, in ideational production and in providing resources for the spread of ideas. The social media analysis conducted within WP3 will provide additional information as it will uncover the role of bots (highly automated accounts). This is a resource for the dissemination of political information which can help anti-liberal parties and movements overcome their organisational or financial deficiencies (Ellinas 2009: 209). This is important because today more than 50% of accounts active in public matters on social media are bots, and they are the preferred tools of authoritarian regimes to suppress voices and influence agendas. The WP will investigate how these bots distort the processes of deliberation to amplify illiberal messages, and it will also identify strategies that civic activists deploy to resist bot attacks.</p>

The focus on international exchange has been justified recently by the intensification of co-operation between right-wing authoritarians at the European and global levels. In Europe, the latest, and in some respects boldest, attempt happened recently, on 2 July 2021, with the ‘Declaration on the future of Europe’ signed by many of the parties that are the focus of our analysis. A parallel arena of co-operation exists outside the institutional setting. It has been argued that “transnational processes of exchange and learning play an important role in the success of right-wing extremism and right-wing populism in Europe” (Langenbacher and Schellenberg 2011, 22). Confronted with the global challenges of the 21st century, there are increasing efforts to create a transnational network based on a “global white identity” (Daniels 2009).

To date, however, in sociology and political science there have been few empirical analyses on the topic of the transnationalisation of illiberal forces (but see Mudde 2007; Simmons 2003; Caiani, DellaPorta and Wagemann 2012, Enyedi 2021). This WP will draw on social movement studies, and research on political parties to address the dynamics of internationalisation, paying special attention to the political opportunities European integration provides for transnationalisation, as well as the (cognitive and material) resources of the actors (DellaPorta 1995). It will also consider the role of ideological and narrative frames in facilitating co-operation and the impact of new internet-based techniques. All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner UOXF: commits to dedicating at least 1.6 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources

Work package WP8 – Historical embedding

Work Package Number	WP8	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Work Package Name	Historical embedding		
Start Month	13	End Month	28

Objectives

The purpose is to identify the anti-liberal and authoritarian intellectual traditions that have played a role in shaping the debate around liberal democracy today.

Description

The task of Work Package 8 is the identification of the ideational historical contexts of illiberalism. The existing programmatic, emotional, and social configurations behind the challenges to liberal democracy cannot be understood properly without situating them in their historical trajectories. While many of the illiberal ideological packages are novel, they usually build on country-specific or regional intellectual traditions. Those who study the dimensions of contemporary political competition rarely work together with historians who can trace the inter-generational trajectories of political ideas. Our interdisciplinary team will provide an overview of alternative, often underground, ideological developments of the 20th and 21st centuries that inform current political cleavages. The usual frameworks of interpretation tend to contrast the current rise of authoritarian politics with the nostalgically evoked post-war “Trente Glorieuses” and focus on analogies with the inter-war radical right. Instead, we propose a multi-level comparative and genealogical analysis of key ideological components of the contemporary anti-liberal wave, highlighting the contextual differences (for instance, between the two sides of the Iron Curtain) but also the transnational transfers at different points of time (such as between various sub-cultures of anti-modernist radicalism). We will assess whether the detected ideological configurations occurred as deliberate attempts to design a socio-political order of a certain type with clearly identifiable authors (e.g., Carl Schmitt, evoked by different actors in different contexts), or instead arose as unintentional side-effects of different “axiological sentiments” dominant at a given period and a particular place.

All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner UOXF commits to dedicating at least 1.6 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources

Work package WP9 – Building and validating the multidimensional map

Work Package Number	WP9	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Work Package Name	Building and validating the multidimensional map		

Start Month	21	End Month	28
--------------------	----	------------------	----

Objectives

The goal is to build the multidimensional map of illiberal challenges based on the research in the previous phase and to validate the map.

Description

The task of WP 9 is to integrate the results of previous Work Packages into a comprehensive map of the ideological challenges to liberal democracy and to generalize the findings of the case studies to the wider European context.

The outputs outlined above will provide the input to produce the map of challenges to liberalism that is a key component of the project. We will consider several questions concerning the dimensions analysed so far: are they aligned, such that programmatic and emotional appeals are regularly associated? If so, which kinds of programmatic appeals operate with what kinds of emotions? Are the social bases of each appeal similar across settings, or do they vary systematically with the constellation? Are the legislative and legal responses consistent across constellations, or do they also vary? And what kinds of factors at the national, party, societal and elite levels explain the variation in the constellations that we observe?

We will pay particular attention in this analytical phase to the internal and external validity of the map that we produce. In terms of internal validity, we will seek to establish theoretically plausible mechanisms that will link programmatic, emotional, societal, and legislative outcomes. This process will rely on various data reduction techniques, such as principal component analysis, and item response theory. In terms of external validity, we will look to test the expected relationships identified in the map with a most similar/most different setting.

All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner UOXF commits to dedicating at least 2.2 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources

Work package WP10 – The normative limits of interventions

Work Package Number	WP10	Lead Beneficiary	8. UOXF
Work Package Name	The normative limits of interventions		
Start Month	21	End Month	26

Objectives

The goal is to delineate the normative boundaries for the defence of liberalism.

Description

The overall aim of AUTHLIB is to build a toolkit for liberal democracies to push back against the challenges of varieties of illiberalism. Any toolkit, however, must provide policy-makers and agents in favour of liberal democracy with resources that are not only effective, but that are also normatively acceptable. As obvious as that statement sounds, contemporary illiberalism raises new challenges for political philosophers and normative theorists about the limits that liberal democracies may reach in their own defence. Therefore, the principal aim of this Work Package is to convene a principled discussion of those limits that will guide other Work Packages, particularly those that seek to develop interventions. For this Work Package, therefore, we envisage seeking the input of normative political theorists, who will assist the team to address two sets of questions.

Task 1—Theoretical analysis of illiberalism and the key concepts behind it: First, there is the conceptual work of analysing what illiberalism is, and how it differs from germane concepts and ideologies such as populism, traditionalism, illiberal democracy, democratic backsliding, etc. We intend to update this literature by considering more current controversies that appear to motivate cultural divisions over ‘woke culture’ in which illiberals demonstrate their capacity to co-opt liberal language (freedom of speech, academic freedom) to undermine causes that liberal democrats hold dear (anti-racism, minority rights).

Task 2—Identifying normative boundaries for liberal intervention and the free speech: Secondly, ‘what should liberal democracies do to defend themselves?’ is a normative question. We will seek to build on two salient debates in the

field. The first is the question, raised by John Rawls, of what the liberal state can legitimately do to ‘contain’ illiberal (‘unreasonable’) citizens. This concerns the question of whether the full set of liberal rights must in principle be extended to those who reject those rights and are ready to use them to undermine liberal democracy. In short, we plan a sophisticated update, in contemporary normative philosophy, of the old 1789 question: how much liberty should be granted to the enemies of liberty. The second debate that is relevant (and connected) is about the limits of free speech, and particularly the regulation of hate speech. This is of considerable interest to philosophers, partly because the idea that free speech is an absolute liberal right is central to the US liberal tradition – but other philosophers disagree.

The question, ‘what should liberal democracies do to defend themselves?’ of course involves not only ethical questions but also issues of feasibility, practicality, legitimacy, etc. Moreover, normative constraints on the defence of liberal democracy are not free-floating, but are bounded by specific national and international laws and other norms. In some cases, for example, imposing significant limits on illiberal freedom of speech might be illegal or for other reasons undesirable even if they could be argued to be potentially legitimate elements in the toolkit of liberal democracy. In convening a discussion of limits, therefore, we will also involve legal scholars and take full account of other aspects of our research on the broader normative landscape of the countries that we will study.

This Work Package will bring the empirical research and policy intervention aspects of the project into ongoing productive dialogue with political philosophy and legal scholarship to ensure that our conceptual approach to illiberalism is tightly focused, and that the toolkit we produce will be robust and compatible with the norms of liberal democracy and national contexts.

All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner UOXF commits to dedicating at least 6 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources

Work package WP11 – Mini-publics

Work Package Number	WP11	Lead Beneficiary	3. CUNI
Work Package Name	Mini-publics		
Start Month	18	End Month	34

Objectives

The goal is to implement a set of interventions to gauge the impact of illiberal ideologies and possible responses.

Description

Based on project inputs such as ideological arguments, narratives, and various forms of appeal, this Work Package will (1) develop targeted interventions, in the form of deliberative forums –the Ideological Opponents’ Forum (IOF), the Professionals of Democracy Forum (PDF) and the Citizen Forum (CF); (2) develop and test novel educational toolkits; and (3) create a virtual e-learning platform. The IOF and CF will be domestic groups, while the PDF will be transnational. The IOF will allow us to record the arguments (narratives), the room for convergence (to adjust toolkits), and the group-based stereotypes that shape political attitudes. In the CF, we will also see how face-to-face exchange of arguments differs from the ideological communication embodied by political texts (narratives and toolkits). The IOF and CF will provide information on how ideological values, or the lack of such values, shape deliberation about problems that require practical solutions. The transnational character of the PDF will allow us to shape the instruments for the IOF and CF before their deployment (input phase) and after the assessment of the two mini-publics (output), as well as shape policy recommendations and act as multipliers in their dissemination. With the help of the mini-publics, AUTHLIB will co-operate with the School of Transnational Governance (STG) initiative on Transnational Democracy organised within the European University Institute and complement the Policy Dialogues conducted within that framework with discussions focusing on the most effective anti-liberal arguments.

Task 1–Organisation of Ideological Opponents’ Forum (IOF): In the first phase we will train facilitators and prepare pilot experience workshops in selected localities to identify issues that pose a direct challenge to the functioning of liberal democracy in general, and to vulnerable and disadvantaged groups in particular (migration, gender, LGBTQ +and reproductive rights, the environment, etc). In the second phase, upon evaluation of phase one, two issues will be identified, and deliberative fora will be organised around them. We will prepare neutral background information, as well as various forms of cues. Assisted by facilitators, the ideological opponents will be tasked with finding a problem.

Their positions will be measured pre-and post-participation in the deliberative forum. Participants will be split into smaller groups. Each group will be provided factual information plus one type of cue (e.g., emotional appeal or rational argument). All groups will have the same task and a trained facilitator, whose role will aid the process without shaping it. This will enable us to analyse whether and under what conditions ideological opponents can co-operate and whether participation in a deliberative forum can lead to changes in (illiberal) positions. We will also be able to assess which type of illiberals are open –and under what impulses –to the acceptance of the values and procedures of liberal democracy. Finally, in the third phase, upon analysis of the outcomes we will be able to put narratives and methodologies forwards to the Professionals of Democracy Forum (PDF).

Task 2–Organisation of Professionals of Democracy Forum (PDF): In the first phase, practitioners, educators, civil society representatives, and journalists will be provided detailed findings of the IOF for a detailed discussion. The aim is to assess the input, process, and outputs of the IOF. In the second phase, the PDF will provide toolkits within their area of expertise, including target groups, communication strategies, and forms of outreach. In terms of professional standards, a crucial question will be how journalists and educators should choose between the strategies of treating liberal and illiberal alternatives as equally valid, showing commitment to fundamental values of liberal democracy, and providing factual information to facilitate debates. The aim of the second phase is to identify target groups, arenas for intervention, and to generate input into toolkits. In the third phase, the PDF will engage with the outputs of the project more broadly to generate policy recommendations and validate the final dissemination strategy for toolkits and other project outputs. An offline meeting will be complemented with two online discussions.

Task 3–Organisation of Citizen Forum (CF): This forum will mix the approaches deployed in the IOF and the PDF. Combining deliberative mini-publics and action research methodology, we will engage citizens into co-creating concrete tools for fighting illiberalism and defending liberal democracy. Two such deliberative fora will be convened. The aim will be to test narratives and methodologies and to provide input into toolkits and the e-learning platform—especially validating communication strategies.

In the first phase, using the blueprint for the deliberative mini-public, the CF participants' political attitudes (especially to liberal democracy) will be tested before and after their participation. The CF participants will be tasked with finding a solution to a salient issue (e.g., combating hate speech, challenging misinformation online and offline, convoking democratic imagination). Like the IOF, participants will be provided with different types of information, and a facilitator will aid their deliberation.

In the second phase, outcomes of the CF deliberation will be analysed, providing information on how ideological values, or the lack of such values, shape deliberation about problems requiring practical solutions. The findings will be utilised in building the e-learning platform.

Finally, in the third phase, the CF participants will be invited to test the e-learning platform and provide feedback, thus validating the toolkits. In organising the mini-publics, representativeness and inclusiveness will be paramount goals. Multiple recruitment channels will be utilised. For the IOF we will count on open calls and on the assistance of party-affiliated think tanks and NGOs. For the CF, special attention will be paid to ensuring participation of the least engaged citizens –thus additional measures such as co-operation with NGOs catering to minorities, the elderly, the homeless, etc. are necessary to ensure inclusiveness in the mini-public.

Transparency about the process will be key for the participants –enabling them to trust the process, even if they might not, in the end, agree with its outcomes. The presence of trained facilitators will ensure conflict resolution during the debates and a productive atmosphere. Before participation, all participants will be pre-screened for basic demographic information and political attitudes. Before deliberation, trained facilitators will provide communication training and accompany the deliberation to ensure all voices can be heard. As with other mini-publics, impartial information prepared by experts will be provided to all participants. Post-deliberation attitudes will be measured alongside satisfaction with the process and outcome. The selection criteria are age, gender, education, employment status, and level of political information & engagement (especially key for the IOF, but also informative for the CF to ensure inclusiveness). Transparency about the process and aim will be key for the participants, enabling them to trust the process, even if they might not, in the end, agree with its outcomes. The presence of trained facilitators will ensure conflict resolution during mini-publics and a productive atmosphere. We will take into consideration the input from these fora in considering how to respond to the authoritarian arguments mapped in the previous phases of the research, and how to tailor our proposition for specific arenas such as classrooms, media, and grass-roots activities.

All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner UOXF to dedicating at least 3 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources

Work package WP12 – Delivering the results – impact and outreach

Work Package Number	WP12	Lead Beneficiary	6. TF
Work Package Name	Delivering the results – impact and outreach		
Start Month	1	End Month	36

Objectives

The main objective is to disseminate the results of the project to the wider academic community and to other stakeholders, including governmental and political figures and civil society organisations, with an interest in using the project's toolkit to strengthen liberal democracy.

Description

The Work Package will consist of seven interrelated dissemination tasks and outputs. In co-ordination with all the project partners, the Work Package lead will develop a detailed communication strategy that assigns specific dissemination and communication measures for all the project outputs.

Task 1—Creation of the website and organisation of the project's social media presence: The Work Package lead will set-up a dedicated website and social media accounts for AUTHLIB to facilitate and encourage scholarly, policy, and public discussion considering the theoretical and empirical achievements of the project on the illiberal challenge to liberal democracy. The AUTHLIB data sets, reports and recommendations will be made available as open-access public goods for scholars, stakeholders, and the public on the project's website. All project partners will publish academic papers, articles, policy papers and policy toolkits, including an edited special issue of a high-ranking academic journal, and a book proposal for a major publishing company representing the main findings and key milestones of the project. The academic outputs will be regularly presented at large international conferences, with a major closing conference being planned in the final year of the project and organised by AUTHLIB itself. Policy outputs will be disseminated at closed stakeholder workshops and public launch events.

Task 2—Organisation of active dissemination: Policy outputs will be disseminated among active policy, civil society, and business leaders (including acting MPs) through TF's Leadership Programs Alumni Network and Open European Dialogue (OED) network. Through institutionalised co-operation with the Review of Democracy (RevDem) platform op-eds, podcasts, e-books, and debate transcripts will be made accessible to the public. The publishing of op-eds within influential legacy media outlets will be facilitated by the communication team of the Work Package leader to facilitate public discussion on the main challenges addressed by the project and to enhance AUTHLIB's public footprint.

All tasks per partner are unchanged and Associated Partner UOXF commits to dedicating at least 0.5 person-months and the necessary travel & subsistence, other goods & services budget to completing its tasks from other financial sources

Work package WP13 – Ethics requirements

Work Package Number	WP13	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Work Package Name	Ethics requirements		
Start Month	1	End Month	36

Objectives

The objective is to ensure compliance with the 'ethics requirements' set out in this work package.

Description

This work package sets out the 'ethics requirements' that the project must comply with.

STAFF EFFORT

Staff effort per participant											
Grant Preparation (Work packages - Effort screen) — Enter the info.											
Participant	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	WP7	WP8	WP9	WP10	Total Person-Months
1 - CEU	19.00	4.00	20.00	8.00	4.00	2.00	6.00	8.00	8.00	3.00	95.00
1.1 - CEU PU	5.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	6.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	30.00
2 - Sciences Po	1.50	0.50	25.00	7.00	0.50	0.30	0.40	0.40	0.30	0.30	36.70
3 - CUNI	1.50	0.50	3.60	4.00	1.80	6.00	3.00	1.60	3.00	1.30	41.30
4 - SNS	1.50	1.50	4.60	1.40	1.80	2.50	23.00	1.60	1.30	1.30	42.00
5 - SWPS University	1.50	10.00	4.00	27.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	60.00
6 - TF	1.50	0.50				1.50	2.50				24.00
7 - UNIVIE	1.50	1.00	9.00	13.00	8.00	1.00	1.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	43.80
Total Person-Months	33.00	19.00	70.20	62.40	19.10	23.30	40.10	16.80	19.80	11.10	372.80

Staff effort per participant				
Grant Preparation (Work packages - Effort screen) — Enter the info.				
Participant	WP11	WP12	WP13	Total Person-Months
1 - CEU	6.00	7.00		95.00
1.1 - CEU PU	2.00	2.00		30.00
2 - Sciences Po		0.50		36.70
3 - CUNI	14.50	0.50		41.30
4 - SNS	1.00	0.50		42.00
5 - SWPS University	3.00	0.50		60.00

Staff effort per participant <i>Grant Preparation (Work packages - Effort screen) — Enter the info.</i>				
Participant	WP11	WP12	WP13	Total Person-Months
6 - TF	1.00	17.00		24.00
7 - UNIVIE	2.00	0.50		43.80
Total Person-Months	29.50	28.50	0.00	372.80

LIST OF DELIVERABLES

Deliverables <i>Grant Preparation (Deliverables screen) — Enter the info.</i> <i>The labels used mean:</i> <i>Public — fully open (🚩 automatically posted online)</i> <i>Sensitive — limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement</i> <i>EU classified — RESTREINT-UE/EU-RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIEL-UE/EU-CONFIDENTIAL, SECRET-UE/EU-SECRET under Decision 2015/444</i>						
Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Work Package No	Lead Beneficiary	Type	Dissemination Level	Due Date (month)
D1.1	Data Management Plan	WP1	1 - CEU	DMP — Data Management Plan	SEN - Sensitive	6
D1.2	Progress report	WP1	1 - CEU	R — Document, report	SEN - Sensitive	27
D1.3	AUTHLIB final publishable summary	WP1	1 - CEU	R — Document, report	PU - Public	36
D2.1	Literature review: ideological stakes and dimensions	WP2	5 - SWPS University	R — Document, report	PU - Public	5
D2.2	Guidelines for empirical data collection	WP2	5 - SWPS University	R — Document, report	SEN - Sensitive	6
D3.1	A paper on measurement and methodological innovations	WP3	2 - Sciences Po	R — Document, report	PU - Public	12
D3.2	A visual map of the ideological space	WP3	2 - Sciences Po	DEC — Websites, patent filings, videos, etc	PU - Public	18
D3.3	A paper on the ideological space and contemporary ideological configurations	WP3	2 - Sciences Po	R — Document, report	PU - Public	24
D3.4	Integrated data set of text analyses	WP3	2 - Sciences Po	DATA — data sets, microdata, etc	PU - Public	25
D4.1	An analysis of the relationship between socio-demographic attributes and the	WP4	5 - SWPS University	R — Document, report	PU - Public	24

Deliverables

Grant Preparation (Deliverables screen) — Enter the info.

The labels used mean:

Public — fully open (🚩 automatically posted online)

Sensitive — limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement

EU classified — RESTREINT-UE/EU-RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIEL-UE/EU-CONFIDENTIAL, SECRET-UE/EU-SECRET under Decision [2015/444](#)

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Work Package No	Lead Beneficiary	Type	Dissemination Level	Due Date (month)
	propensity to support particular types of neo-authoritarianism					
D4.2	A data set that integrates information on the social characteristics of neo-authoritarianism (based on previous surveys – ESS, ISSP, EES, EVS) with the ideological configurations that emerged from WP3	WP4	5 - SWPS University	DATA — data sets, microdata, etc	PU - Public	24
D4.3	A paper including a typology on the distribution of the types of illiberal orientations across the EU Member States	WP4	5 - SWPS University	R — Document, report	PU - Public	25
D4.4	A data set on the reactions of citizens in experimental setting	WP4	5 - SWPS University	DATA — data sets, microdata, etc	PU - Public	25
D4.5	A paper on the survey experiments, focusing on factors shaping attitudes towards liberal democracy	WP4	5 - SWPS University	R — Document, report	PU - Public	25
D5.1	Data set and report on rhetorical and emotional strategies of illiberal actors	WP5	8 - UOXF	R — Document, report	PU - Public	24
D5.2	Data set and report on the laboratory experiments of emotional responses	WP5	8 - UOXF	R — Document, report	PU - Public	25
D6.1	Paper on the commonalities between and variation among the policies of illiberal actors in power	WP6	1 - CEU	R — Document, report	PU - Public	15

Deliverables

Grant Preparation (Deliverables screen) — Enter the info.

The labels used mean:

Public — fully open (🚩 automatically posted online)

Sensitive — limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement

EU classified — RESTREINT-UE/EU-RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIEL-UE/EU-CONFIDENTIAL, SECRET-UE/EU-SECRET under Decision [2015/444](#)

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Work Package No	Lead Beneficiary	Type	Dissemination Level	Due Date (month)
D7.1	Paper on the forms of co-operation among authoritarian forces	WP7	4 - SNS	R — Document, report	PU - Public	20
D7.2	Data set on the forms of international co-operation among authoritarian forces	WP7	4 - SNS	DATA — data sets, microdata, etc	PU - Public	21
D8.1	A qualitative analysis of the antecedents of current ideological alternatives	WP8	1 - CEU	R — Document, report	PU - Public	28
D8.2	Workshop and report on placing contemporary illiberalism into historical context	WP8	1 - CEU	R — Document, report	PU - Public	28
D9.1	The integrated and validated map of illiberalism	WP9	1 - CEU	R — Document, report	PU - Public	28
D10.1	Workshop and report on the normative boundaries of interventions aiming to safeguard the liberal order	WP10	8 - UOXF	R — Document, report	PU - Public	26
D11.1	Report on the Ideological Opponents' Forum, with policy recommendations	WP11	3 - CUNI	R — Document, report	PU - Public	34
D11.2	Report on the Professionals of Democracy Forum, with policy recommendations	WP11	3 - CUNI	R — Document, report	PU - Public	34
D11.3	Report on the Citizens' Forum, with policy recommendations	WP11	3 - CUNI	R — Document, report	PU - Public	34

Deliverables

Grant Preparation (Deliverables screen) — Enter the info.

The labels used mean:

Public — fully open (🚩 automatically posted online)

Sensitive — limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement

EU classified — RESTREINT-UE/EU-RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIEL-UE/EU-CONFIDENTIAL, SECRET-UE/EU-SECRET under Decision [2015/444](#)

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Work Package No	Lead Beneficiary	Type	Dissemination Level	Due Date (month)
D11.4	E-learning platform	WP11	3 - CUNI	DEC — Websites, patent filings, videos, etc	PU - Public	34
D12.1	Communication strategy & dissemination/ exploitation plan	WP12	6 - TF	R — Document, report	SEN - Sensitive	2
D12.2	AUTHLIB Newsletter	WP12	6 - TF	DEC — Websites, patent filings, videos, etc	PU - Public	6
D12.3	Policy papers and recommendations on the impact of illiberalism on specific, ideologically charged issues such as gender equality, integration of immigrants, and citizens' engagement	WP12	6 - TF	R — Document, report	PU - Public	33
D12.4	Country-specific policy papers with policy recommendations	WP12	6 - TF	R — Document, report	PU - Public	33
D12.5	Report on online launch events for the issue – and country-specific policy papers	WP12	6 - TF	R — Document, report	PU - Public	36
D13.1	OEI - Requirement No. 1	WP13	1 - CEU	ETHICS	SEN - Sensitive	6
D13.2	OEI - Requirement No. 2	WP13	1 - CEU	ETHICS	SEN - Sensitive	5

Deliverable D1.1 – Data Management Plan

Deliverable Number	D1.1	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Deliverable Name	Data Management Plan		
Type	DMP — Data Management Plan	Dissemination Level	SEN - Sensitive
Due Date (month)	6	Work Package No	WP1

Description
The Data Management Plan will describe data management life cycles of all types of data the project will collect, store, and analyse

Deliverable D1.2 – Progress report

Deliverable Number	D1.2	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Deliverable Name	Progress report		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	SEN - Sensitive
Due Date (month)	27	Work Package No	WP1

Description
Showing progress between the interim and final reports

Deliverable D1.3 – AUTHLIB final publishable summary

Deliverable Number	D1.3	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Deliverable Name	AUTHLIB final publishable summary		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	36	Work Package No	WP1

Description
AUTHLIB final publishable summary

Deliverable D2.1 – Literature review: ideological stakes and dimensions

Deliverable Number	D2.1	Lead Beneficiary	5. SWPS University
Deliverable Name	Literature review: ideological stakes and dimensions		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	5	Work Package No	WP2

Description
A literature review of the theoretically relevant ideological stakes and dimensions

Deliverable D2.2 – Guidelines for empirical data collection

Deliverable Number	D2.2	Lead Beneficiary	5. SWPS University
Deliverable Name	Guidelines for empirical data collection		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	SEN - Sensitive
Due Date (month)	6	Work Package No	WP2

Description
Guidelines for empirical data collection across all Beneficiaries of the consortium

Deliverable D3.1 – A paper on measurement and methodological innovations

Deliverable Number	D3.1	Lead Beneficiary	2. Sciences Po
Deliverable Name	A paper on measurement and methodological innovations		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	12	Work Package No	WP3

Description
A paper on measurement and methodological innovations

Deliverable D3.2 – A visual map of the ideological space

Deliverable Number	D3.2	Lead Beneficiary	2. Sciences Po
Deliverable Name	A visual map of the ideological space		
Type	DEC — Websites, patent filings, videos, etc	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	18	Work Package No	WP3

Description
An ideological map, highlighting the distinctive ideological features of different forms of neo-authoritarianism, as well as the liberal democratic appeals in a common space

Deliverable D3.3 – A paper on the ideological space and contemporary ideological configurations

Deliverable Number	D3.3	Lead Beneficiary	2. Sciences Po
Deliverable Name	A paper on the ideological space and contemporary ideological configurations		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	24	Work Package No	WP3

Description
A publication on the ideological space and contemporary ideological configurations, with particular emphasis on types of illiberalism, as reflected in the various datasets

Deliverable D3.4 – Integrated data set of text analyses

Deliverable Number	D3.4	Lead Beneficiary	2. Sciences Po
Deliverable Name	Integrated data set of text analyses		
Type	DATA — data sets, microdata, etc	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	25	Work Package No	WP3

Description
Integrated data set of text analyses

Deliverable D4.1 – An analysis of the relationship between socio-demographic attributes and the propensity to support particular types of neo-authoritarianism

Deliverable Number	D4.1	Lead Beneficiary	5. SWPS University
Deliverable Name	An analysis of the relationship between socio-demographic attributes and the propensity to support particular types of neo-authoritarianism		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	24	Work Package No	WP4

Description
A publication analysing of the relationship between socio-demographic attributes and the propensity to support particular types of neo-authoritarianism

Deliverable D4.2 – A data set that integrates information on the social characteristics of neo-authoritarianism (based on previous surveys – ESS, ISSP, EES, EVS) with the ideological configurations that emerged from WP3

Deliverable Number	D4.2	Lead Beneficiary	5. SWPS University
Deliverable Name	A data set that integrates information on the social characteristics of neo-authoritarianism (based on previous surveys – ESS, ISSP, EES, EVS) with the ideological configurations that emerged from WP3		
Type	DATA — data sets, microdata, etc	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	24	Work Package No	WP4

Description
A data set that integrates information on the social characteristics of neo-authoritarianism (based on previous surveys – ESS, ISSP, EES, EVS) with the ideological configurations that emerged from WP3

Deliverable D4.3 – A paper including a typology on the distribution of the types of illiberal orientations across the EU Member States

Deliverable Number	D4.3	Lead Beneficiary	5. SWPS University
---------------------------	------	-------------------------	--------------------

Deliverable Name	A paper including a typology on the distribution of the types of illiberal orientations across the EU Member States		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	25	Work Package No	WP4

Description
A publication including a typology on the distribution of the types of illiberal orientations across the EU Member States

Deliverable D4.4 – A data set on the reactions of citizens in experimental setting

Deliverable Number	D4.4	Lead Beneficiary	5. SWPS University
Deliverable Name	A data set on the reactions of citizens in experimental setting		
Type	DATA — data sets, microdata, etc	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	25	Work Package No	WP4

Description
A data set on the reactions of citizens in experimental setting

Deliverable D4.5 – A paper on the survey experiments, focusing on factors shaping attitudes towards liberal democracy

Deliverable Number	D4.5	Lead Beneficiary	5. SWPS University
Deliverable Name	A paper on the survey experiments, focusing on factors shaping attitudes towards liberal democracy		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	25	Work Package No	WP4

Description
Publication on the survey experiments, focusing on factors shaping attitudes towards liberal democracy

Deliverable D5.1 – Data set and report on rhetorical and emotional strategies of illiberal actors

Deliverable Number	D5.1	Lead Beneficiary	8. UOXF
Deliverable Name	Data set and report on rhetorical and emotional strategies of illiberal actors		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	24	Work Package No	WP5

Description
Data set and report on rhetorical and emotional strategies of illiberal actors

Deliverable D5.2 – Data set and report on the laboratory experiments of emotional responses

Deliverable Number	D5.2	Lead Beneficiary	8. UOXF
Deliverable Name	Data set and report on the laboratory experiments of emotional responses		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	25	Work Package No	WP5

Description
Data set and report on the laboratory experiments of emotional responses

Deliverable D6.1 – Paper on the commonalities between and variation among the policies of illiberal actors in power

Deliverable Number	D6.1	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Deliverable Name	Paper on the commonalities between and variation among the policies of illiberal actors in power		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	15	Work Package No	WP6

Description
Publication on the commonalities between and variation among the policies of illiberal actors in power

Deliverable D7.1 – Paper on the forms of co-operation among authoritarian forces

Deliverable Number	D7.1	Lead Beneficiary	4. SNS
Deliverable Name	Paper on the forms of co-operation among authoritarian forces		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	20	Work Package No	WP7

Description
Publication on the forms of co-operation among authoritarian forces

Deliverable D7.2 – Data set on the forms of international co-operation among authoritarian forces

Deliverable Number	D7.2	Lead Beneficiary	4. SNS
Deliverable Name	Data set on the forms of international co-operation among authoritarian forces		
Type	DATA — data sets, microdata, etc	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	21	Work Package No	WP7

Description

Data set on the forms of international co-operation among authoritarian forces
--

Deliverable D8.1 – A qualitative analysis of the antecedents of current ideological alternatives

Deliverable Number	D8.1	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Deliverable Name	A qualitative analysis of the antecedents of current ideological alternatives		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	28	Work Package No	WP8

Description

A qualitative analysis of the antecedents of current ideological alternatives

Deliverable D8.2 – Workshop and report on placing contemporary illiberalism into historical context

Deliverable Number	D8.2	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Deliverable Name	Workshop and report on placing contemporary illiberalism into historical context		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	28	Work Package No	WP8

Description

Workshop and report on placing contemporary illiberalism into historical context

Deliverable D9.1 – The integrated and validated map of illiberalism

Deliverable Number	D9.1	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Deliverable Name	The integrated and validated map of illiberalism		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	28	Work Package No	WP9

Description

The integrated and validated map of illiberalism

Deliverable D10.1 – Workshop and report on the normative boundaries of interventions aiming to safeguard the liberal order

Deliverable Number	D10.1	Lead Beneficiary	8. UOXF
Deliverable Name	Workshop and report on the normative boundaries of interventions aiming to safeguard the liberal order		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	26	Work Package No	WP10

Description
Workshop and report on the normative boundaries of interventions aiming to safeguard the liberal order

Deliverable D11.1 – Report on the Ideological Opponents' Forum, with policy recommendations

Deliverable Number	D11.1	Lead Beneficiary	3. CUNI
Deliverable Name	Report on the Ideological Opponents' Forum, with policy recommendations		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	34	Work Package No	WP11

Description
Report on the Ideological Opponents' Forum, with policy recommendations

Deliverable D11.2 – Report on the Professionals of Democracy Forum, with policy recommendations

Deliverable Number	D11.2	Lead Beneficiary	3. CUNI
Deliverable Name	Report on the Professionals of Democracy Forum, with policy recommendations		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	34	Work Package No	WP11

Description
Report on the Professionals of Democracy Forum, with policy recommendations

Deliverable D11.3 – Report on the Citizens' Forum, with policy recommendations

Deliverable Number	D11.3	Lead Beneficiary	3. CUNI
Deliverable Name	Report on the Citizens' Forum, with policy recommendations		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	34	Work Package No	WP11

Description
Report on the Citizens' Forum, with policy recommendations

Deliverable D11.4 – E-learning platform

Deliverable Number	D11.4	Lead Beneficiary	3. CUNI
Deliverable Name	E-learning platform		
Type	DEC — Websites, patent filings, videos, etc	Dissemination Level	PU - Public

Due Date (month)	34	Work Package No	WP11
-------------------------	----	------------------------	------

Description			
E-learning platform			

Deliverable D12.1 – Communication strategy & dissemination/exploitation plan

Deliverable Number	D12.1	Lead Beneficiary	6. TF
Deliverable Name	Communication strategy & dissemination/exploitation plan		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	SEN - Sensitive
Due Date (month)	2	Work Package No	WP12

Description			
Setting up and launching project website and communication channels, designing a strategy for communicating with a variety of target audiences throughout the lifetime of the project, creating a plan for disseminating and exploiting results/foreground			

Deliverable D12.2 – AUTHLIB Newsletter

Deliverable Number	D12.2	Lead Beneficiary	6. TF
Deliverable Name	AUTHLIB Newsletter		
Type	DEC — Websites, patent filings, videos, etc	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	6	Work Package No	WP12

Description			
Launch of the project quarterly newsletter, regular issues throughout the lifetime of the project, M6 - M9 - M12 - M15 - M18 - M21 - M24 - M27 - M30 - M33 - M36			

Deliverable D12.3 – Policy papers and recommendations on the impact of illiberalism on specific, ideologically charged issues such as gender equality, integration of immigrants, and citizens' engagement

Deliverable Number	D12.3	Lead Beneficiary	6. TF
Deliverable Name	Policy papers and recommendations on the impact of illiberalism on specific, ideologically charged issues such as gender equality, integration of immigrants, and citizens' engagement		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	33	Work Package No	WP12

Description			
Policy papers with recommendations on the impact of illiberalism on specific, ideologically charged issues such as gender equality, integration of immigrants, and citizens' engagement			

Deliverable D12.4 – Country-specific policy papers with policy recommendations

Deliverable Number	D12.4	Lead Beneficiary	6. TF
Deliverable Name	Country-specific policy papers with policy recommendations		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	33	Work Package No	WP12

Description
Country-specific policy papers covering all project countries with policy recommendations

Deliverable D12.5 – Report on online launch events for the issue – and country-specific policy papers

Deliverable Number	D12.5	Lead Beneficiary	6. TF
Deliverable Name	Report on online launch events for the issue – and country-specific policy papers		
Type	R — Document, report	Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Due Date (month)	36	Work Package No	WP12

Description
Online launch events for the issue – and country-specific policy papers

Deliverable D13.1 – OEI - Requirement No. 1

Deliverable Number	D13.1	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Deliverable Name	OEI - Requirement No. 1		
Type	ETHICS	Dissemination Level	SEN - Sensitive
Due Date (month)	6	Work Package No	WP13

Description
The project will expose data subjects to specific ideational, rhetorical, and emotional elements of the current illiberal discursive strategies that will be obtained from WP3. This task may enable profiling activities (Part B, page 23). Also machine learning technology will be used (Part B, Task 2, page 24). Ethics check in M6

Deliverable D13.2 – OEI - Requirement No. 2

Deliverable Number	D13.2	Lead Beneficiary	1. CEU
Deliverable Name	OEI - Requirement No. 2		
Type	ETHICS	Dissemination Level	SEN - Sensitive
Due Date (month)	5	Work Package No	WP13

Description
Ethics Documents for Check/Review

LIST OF MILESTONES

Milestones					
Grant Preparation (Milestones screen) — Enter the info.					
Milestone No	Milestone Name	Work Package No	Lead Beneficiary	Means of Verification	Due Date (month)
1	Project launch and establishing internal structures and external connections	WP1, WP12	1-CEU	Public website and communication channels, project announcements of each partner, setting up an International Advisory Board	3
2	Finalisation of the preparatory stage and embarking on empirical research	WP2	5-SWPS University	Guidelines for empirical data collection	6
3	Completion of the text analyses		2-Sciences Po	Integrated data set of text analyses	25
4	Finalisation of the survey-based data collection	WP4	5-SWPS University	A data set that integrates information on the social characteristics of neo-authoritarianism with the ideological configurations that emerged from WP3 and a data set on the reactions of citizens in experimental setting	25
5	Connecting the various databases into a multidimensional map of ideological alternatives	WP9	1-CEU	The integrated and validated map of illiberalism	28
6	Educational outreach	WP11	3-CUNI	E-learning platform	34
7	Closing conference and project wrap-up	WP12	6-TF	Convening a final project conference and discussing/disseminating results	36

LIST OF CRITICAL RISKS

Critical risks & risk management strategy <i>Grant Preparation (Critical Risks screen) — Enter the info.</i>			
Risk number	Description	Work Package No(s)	Proposed Mitigation Measures
1	Failure of a project partner to deliver its tasks (Likelihood: low; Severity: medium)	WP5, WP6, WP11, WP4, WP1, WP7, WP8, WP10, WP12, WP2, WP3, WP9	Although the consortium consists of carefully chosen partners who have proven their high level of responsibility, there is always a risk that certain partners, due to unforeseen circumstances, might fail in delivering their task(s). The division of tasks and responsibilities within the project has been created in such a way that it ensures that if one partner fails to deliver the task it will be covered by others. As a general rule, a project partner must inform the coordinator of any changes in personnel or delay of work as soon as possible. If this causes any serious problems which cannot be resolved, the contingency plan is to shift the task leadership to another partner organisation or to recruit additional staff from the partners already involved in the respective tasks. The project's management structure is designed in such a way so as to constantly monitor progress and allow for flexibility. In case of withdrawal of a partner, which is very unlikely given the history of successful co-operation, the consortium would seek an appropriate replacement and ensure an effective and efficient hand-over.
2	Failure to engage citizens in citizens' arenas and project results (Likelihood: Low;Severity: High)	WP11, WP12	Previous examples suggest that both ordinary citizens and professionals are willing to join deliberative and dissemination events, but we will use material incentives and the inclusion of prestigious individuals to make our events more attractive. Enhanced co-operation with the network of journals and journalists, as well as intense presence on social media, will keep the level of dissemination high. Periodic impact evaluations of the Work Packages will mitigate this risk by updating and re-framing messages as necessary throughout the duration of the project.
3	A partner leaves the project (Likelihood: Low;Severity: High)	WP6, WP5, WP11, WP4, WP1, WP7, WP10, WP8, WP12, WP9, WP3, WP2	The partners in the project have a very good relationship which was established long before the start of the project. Therefore, the risk of a partner leaving the project is minimal. However, if this does occur, the partners will discuss whether the tasks of the partner that leaves the project can be distributed amongst the remaining partners. If the amount of work to be divided is too much, the partners will use their combined networks to find a suitable replacement for the departing partner.

Critical risks & risk management strategy <i>Grant Preparation (Critical Risks screen) — Enter the info.</i>			
Risk number	Description	Work Package No(s)	Proposed Mitigation Measures
4	Global pandemic restrictions (Likelihood: Medium;Severity: Medium)	WP6, WP5, WP11, WP4, WP1, WP7, WP10, WP8, WP12, WP9, WP3, WP2	If containment measures are enacted and they are short in duration, the partners will co-operate via digital means to take the project work forward, and certain project events might be rescheduled to a later date. If the duration of containment measures is longer, the Coordinator would explore the feasibility of moving more completely to a virtual environment, using resources saved on travel and venue spaces to cover the eventual technical costs for managing project event(s) virtually.
5	The planned action cannot be reached within 36 months (duration of the project) (Likelihood:Low;Severity: High)	WP6, WP5, WP11, WP4, WP1, WP7, WP10, WP8, WP12, WP9, WP3, WP2	The project will be continuously monitored to ensure that milestones and deliverables are met. If there is the threat of a delay, the project manager will contact the partner to discuss the delays and mitigating actions. If this is not possible, the work will be distributed across the different partners.
6	The cost will be higher than budgeted or a partner requires more/less funds of the budget than originally planned (Likelihood:Low;Severity: High)	WP6, WP5, WP11, WP4, WP1, WP7, WP10, WP8, WP12, WP9, WP3, WP2	The project manager, together with research administrators and finance personnel based at partner institutions, will monitor the costs spent by the partners. If there is over-spending, the beneficiary will contact the project manager to discuss the reasons behind the over-spending and they will discuss mitigating actions. If a redistribution of funds between partners is necessary during the project (e.g., if final eligible costs of one partner appear to be lower than expected, while those of another partner exceed the level initially planned), an amendment proposal will be prepared by the Project Manager in discussion with the Project Coordinator and submitted to the EC Project Officer for approval.

PROJECT REVIEWS

Project Reviews			
Grant Preparation (Reviews screen) — Enter the info.			
Review No	Timing (month)	Location	Comments
RV1	17	TBC	
RV2	36	TBC	