Summer Courses, Barcelona - 4th to 7th July 2017

Workshop Report

**Workshop Title:** Radicalisation

**Moderator:** John Scott

**Leader 1:** Frank Borst (Holland)

**Leader 2:** Maarten van Leyenhorst (Holland)

**Topic Speaker:** Liesbeth van der Heide (Holland)

**Participants:** 21 (13 Countries represented)

**Notes:** John Scott

**Impression:** The workshop was participative from the very beginning with the introductory exercise revealing a very wide range of backgrounds, interests and skills. Concentration levels were consistently high and the atmosphere was one of learning and a willingness to share issues, doubts and problems as well as solutions. The exercises led to lively discussions of definitions and differences between countries. The presentations were well received and worked for participants new to the subject and for those with high levels of experience in the field because the material was relevant and provided illustrations from many different jurisdictions and cultures.

---

**Introduction**

Frank Borst and Maarten van Leyenhorst work together for the Dutch National Agency for Correctional Institutions (DNAC) and brought their experience as trainer and programme manager on Radicalisation and Extremism to the event. The platform speaker, Liesbeth van der Heide from the University of Leiden and a Research Fellow at the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism, The Hague, joined the workshop for two sessions and contributed to the discussions. John Scott had been Head Of Public Protection in the UK’s Home Office and was able to contribute different perspectives. Radicalisation and impact of violent extremism were examined across the full range of motivations from political, religious and other motivations.
Workshop Methods (Detailed programme at Appendix 1)

- Semi-structured, flexible and interactive curriculum
- Trainer presentations, questions
- Scenario exercises, case study exercises and observations to facilitate learning
- Individual, small group and large group exercises and discussions
- Participants to play a key role in sharing their issues, experiences, knowledge and ideas.

Summary of Presentations

Session 1  Focused on: Understanding Violent Extremism and Radicalisation; Definitions, phenomena and models; Violent Extremist Offenders, types, facts and figures, characteristics and motivations.

Session 2  Recognizing Signs of Radicalization in Prison & Probation; Signaling and analysing, mindset about your own beliefs, practice and case studies.

Session 3  Risk Scenario Exercise; Working with risk analyses instruments; exercise in making a risk assessment.

Session 4  Managing Violent Extremism in Prison & Probation Environments; Approach (centralisation and differentiation), challenges, lessons learned.

Session 5  Good Practices in Management, Treatment, and Interventions; RAN paper, UNODC handbook, handbook Council of Europe, lessons learned from experts; Exchange of best practices among participants/participating states.

Summary of Group outcomes

The case, system comparisons and scenario exercises were very important to the process of understanding definitions and attitudes. The confidentiality and sensitivity of the materials and presentations mean that the details of the presentations and outcomes of the exercises cannot be shared publically.

Key Learning Points

The workshop’s key learning points were:

1. Definitions – though not yet fixed across the disciplines and different countries – of extreme violence, terrorism, terrorist offences and foreign fighters - enable clarity about the legal and systemic responses to violent extremism and are particularly important in being objective about the very different ‘causes’ and ‘types’ of violent extremism.
2. Assessment is the vital starting point, but requires regular updating and avoidance of a check-box mentality.
3. Ensuring positive multi-disciplinary contributions (Police, Prisons, Probation, Psychology etc) is crucial to effective assessment and continuing case management.
4. The relationship between activism, extremism and violent extremism is complex and subject to push and pull factors – it is important to avoid linear constructs and remember the secret and public lives of the target group can be very different. Some violent extremist offenders successfully establish a double identity, by appearing ‘westernised’ to outward appearances.

5. Gross figures and per capita figures for foreign fighters need to be compared to ensure proportionality about the scale and threat for a given country.

6. As the key aim of work in prisons is to prevent re-offending – should the focus of programmes and risk assessment prior to release be on behaviour change and/or de-radicalisation?

7. Practice needs to understand the potential of prisons to be:
   - An incubator for transformation
   - A university of crime
   - A deep freezer.

8. Practitioners in the community and the prisons need to draw on proven methods of working with gangs, political/nationalist prisoners, the Mafia, drugs, people traffickers and sex offenders to inform practice and avoid ‘re-invention of the wheel’.

9. Great care needs to be taken over the selection and contribution of outside religious advisors for programmes – for example, an imam can make a vital, positive difference to the credibility of the programme and engagement with the participants, but the opposite can also occur.

10. Great care needs to be taken over the selection and contribution of ‘formers’ – there are risks and media attention can be counter-productive.

11. Assessment tools run the risk of stigmatization and drawing young people unnecessarily into the high risk pool.

12. No one programme has achieved ‘best in class’ status – we can learn from the content and approach of all.

**Key Practice Issues for the Future**

1. Training and regular updating on the assessment tool/s requires investment and commitment

2. Classification of violent extremism and consequent allocation within prison and probation systems requires attention so there is clarity about the issues of placing together:
   - Un-convicted detainees
   - Convicted detainees
   - Followers - vulnerable
   - Leaders – recruiters.

3. Research on effectiveness and evidence about the impact of different programmes is a high priority for development – bearing in mind the difficulty of identifying ‘control groups’ and sufficient time, scale and scope to design evaluation methodologies.

4. Work with Young People must be a future priority for prevention, de-radicalisation and diversion from violent extremism – programme development involving activities, relationship building, education, role models and religious instruction need to be compared and evaluated.
5. The emphasis on emergent good and improving interventions practice and programmes remains vital – the publications of RAN, UN and Council of Europe are a relevant starting point for discovery, not the end of the journey.

6. In custodial settings, practitioners are struggling to determine whether ’specific’ or ’generic’ programmes are the most effective approach – scale and numbers of participants affect what is on offer for violent extremist offenders. Each country is advised to work out in advance of incidents or convictions, exactly how they can implement best practice within the laws and culture of the state – advance planning and positioning can be used to inform decisions.

Appendices

1. References – provided by the workshop leaders – for additional reading:

- How to Survive in the West (google → work computer).