STUDENT FORUM

MAASTRICHT

Policy Proposal on

Preventing Radicalisation Through Local Inclusion

Brussels, April 22nd 2018

Authors: Alessandro Ferrante, Alessia Quartetti, Anastasiya Kuzina, Andrea Van Acker, Cecilia Ivardi Ganapini, Emilia Klebanoski, Florian Falk, Julien Bédard, Laura Agresti, Stefan Koliopoulos

Tutor: Afke Groen

Topic Manager: Andrea Finesso

Student Forum Maastricht Foundation
E-Mail: contact@student-forum.eu

www.student-forum.eu
facebook: /student.forum.maastricht
twitter: #SFM2018

STUDENT FORUM MAASTRICHT 2018

Student Forum Maastricht (SFM) is an annual student conference held at the Maastricht University Campus in Brussels. The conference is organised by students from Maastricht University in cooperation with different partner organisations. The participants are under- and postgraduate students from all over Europe with diverse academic backgrounds. Based on problem statements provided by European Commission representatives, they develop policy proposals for pressing topics within the Commission. In this process the students receive input and insights from experts from NGOs, academia and the business sector relating to the topic. The 2018 edition of SFM took place from April 19th to 22nd. For more information on Student Forum Maastricht, please visit: www.student-forum.eu

Executive summary

Radicalisation as a catalyst for violent extremism is a fast spreading phenomenon. European cities have been experiencing it directly recently, having been the place of dramatic and tragic events. The recent terrorist attacks and the hate crimes related to religion, ethnicity and political affiliation have shown the urgent necessity for tackling the issue of extremism.

Prevention has rapidly emerged as a much necessary solution. Prevention in this sense develops around the idea of inclusion and early integration, which envisages public security and safeguard of shared spaces as a common good, which needs protection. Thus, the acts of violence motivated by hate and ideology represent important underminings to public safety, and start with the formation of cells and secret groups. It is therefore necessary to engage the local institutions and organizations in the elaboration of a strategy aimed at the support of the local community, the close collaboration with formal educational institutions, the building of local networks based on cultural dialogue and solidarity, which will ultimately achieve deradicalisation.

The policy proposal reflects these fundamental issues and builds on existing experiences to develop a network for local communities to tackle radicalisation through inclusion. It revolves around three main fields of action. First, it opens for the creation of a platform, inside the framework of RAN, to promote information sharing and knowledge exchange dedicated to local municipalities across Europe. Secondly, the proposal sees as central the promotion of youth initiatives, and the allocation of funding to grassroots inclusive initiatives, after selection through an application procedure. Finally, the proposal also calls for the inclusion at the level of schools, by fostering cooperation developing school programs and specific training activities for teachers, in order to make them sensitive to the issue of radicalisation.

Table of Contents:

Introduction

Over the past decade, acts of terrorism that were carried out in Member States (MS) of the European Union (EU), underscored the need for preventive strategies against extremism and radicalisation. Initial attempts to answer violent forms of extremism with repression have failed to tackle the root cause of the problem and there is growing consensus that long-term strategies are needed.

Currently, there are mostly state, federal and local initiatives which deal with the issue of radicalisation. At the EU level, the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) brings together practitioners from the different MS to share their experiences.

The past has shown that multi-agency approaches at the local level are most effective in the prevention and detection of radicalisation. What is missing is an EU-wide platform that connects municipalities, offers the opportunity to apply for funds for local projects and provides information on best practices in the prevention of radicalisation. We propose the establishment of such a platform in the form of a website with an integrated forum.

After setting the theoretical framework by contextualizing radicalisation, extremism and preventive strategies, the proposal outlines an organizational structure, that involves municipalities in order to pursue a bottom-up approach instead of a top-down approach. The goal is to implement grassroots measures to prevent radicalisation or detect its early stages before they lead to extremism. Furthermore, youth inclusion, specifically sports and cultural activities as well as social services and other community-based activities, in combination with the involvement of educational institutions are pillars of this policy proposal.

Even though extremism and radicalisation are often used synonymously, a distinction needs to be drawn between these two terms and how they are used in this proposal. Firstly, there is no integrated definition of these two terms in academia. One attempt is the "idea" of extremism being the climax of the radicalisation process. The steps of the radicalisation process are not quite clear, but it is undisputed that it is an evolving process influenced by different factors and their interaction with each other.

The shape radicalisation takes, and which can lead to extremism in the end, can have different forms and this policy proposal suggests answers to the problem of radicalisation and extremism. The answers are based on the principle of local inclusion.

Legal framework

Prevention of radicalisation has been an area where the EU has supported the prevention of radicalisation leading to violent extremism. As highlighted in the Annex[1] to the Commission

---

[1] http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/files/download/082dbcc55cfb3c6f015cfbfbeb350060.do.

Communication COM(2016) 379 of 14.6.2016,[2] several structures are in place to address the issue. The main one is the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN),[3] with the task of supporting Member States in implementing and designing effective measures. This is assisted also by its Centre of Excellence, which provides guidelines for establishing multi-agency structures. Other forums exist and tackle the issue, such as the European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS), which has the objective of supporting local authorities in the creation of security policy. Furthermore, the Alliance of European cities against violent extremism, set up by the Council of Europe and EFUS,[4] is aimed at providing a European forum for mayors to exchange best practices and training programs.

The legal basis of this proposal is Art. 156 TFEU, which establishes that, in order to pursue the objectives set out in Art. 151 TFEU, among which the improvement of living conditions, the Commission shall encourage cooperation between the Member States and facilitate coordination of their action in all social policy fields, particularly in matters relating to, among others, social security. The provision further encourages exchanges of best practices and the preparation of necessary elements for periodic monitoring and evaluation.

1. Organisation

This section delineates a framework consisting of an online platform and of an annual city conference, which can be used to build resilient communities and encourage the formation of a cohesive society. It builds on the conception that, although safety and security can never be guaranteed to an absolute degree, building a culture of social inclusion will mitigate the trends to radicalize (Muro, 2017). Although the drivers of radicalisation are multifaceted and depend on the context, horizontal inequalities, understood as social marginalization, generation of feelings of exclusion and little sense of belonging to the local community, are agreed to push to desires for revenge and radicalism is more likely to erupt (UNDP, 2016).

Covenant of Municipalities to fight radicalisation

Tackling radicalisation in an effective way is possible through intervention at the grassroot level, which is where radicalisation firstly emerges and spreads. Doing so is complex from an EU standpoint, because of the perceived distance between what happens at the ground level and what takes place at the supranational one. To solve this problem, it is necessary to engage with municipalities, the ideal actors mediating between the European Commission and the local level. This is due to the fact that local officials detain a much higher trust than upper levels of government (Muro, 2017). Specifically, city mayors appear to detain more credibility than national authorities because of their proximity with citizens and the feelings of solidarity that they are responsible for (p.17).

Although the Alliance of European cities against violent extremism involves mayors into a network of communication on the prevention of radicalisation, the participation in their annual summits is voluntarily, thus resulting in scarce participation, with only 55 Representatives of 18 Member States local governments to be present at the last Barcelona summit. More efforts should be directed towards the strengthening of forums for mayors, which are conceived as the best suited to tackle radicalisation at the local level. To do so, inspiration could be drawn from the Covenant of Mayors for Climate and

---

[2]http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/library/publications/2016/communication-preventing-radicalisation_en.pdf.
[3] https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network_en.
[4] https://www.coe.int/en/web/congress/alliance-of-european-cities-against-violent-extremism.

Energy, which manages to bring together thousands of local governments voluntarily committed to implementing EU climate and energy objectives.[5]

It does not appear necessary for mayors to be involved in the Covenant for the fight of radicalisation, mirroring the Energy Covenant, as their political positions can play a significant role in the fighting of radicalisation. However, this problem can be overcome by involving municipalities as wholes, and leaving them the discretion to appoint the representative they find most suited for the task.

Although there may be drawbacks to the choice of municipalities as the main protagonists of this policy proposal, they still seem to be the most reasonable figures to whom address it. This is because, if the initiative was directly open to the organizations themselves, a significant number of applications for funding would reach it, and it might prove excessively cumbersome for the Commission to analyse them all.

The objectives of the Covenant will be to:
- Set targets, and implement them in the form of treaties that the cities officials sign and commit to achieve;
- Commit signatories to submit plans outlining the key decisions taken from their cities, in the area of fighting radicalisation, as a start of the process. To incentivise countries to do so, the European Commission will make funds available according to the mechanism explained below;
- Make cities officials aware of the existing RAN platform for the fight of radicalisation, of its functions and sections.

Radicalisation Detection and Prevention platform (RDP)

RDP will be an online platform set up inside the framework of the RAN network, and will be explicitly directed to the fight of radicalisation.
Underlying the RDP is a fund from the European Commission, which is fundamental for the objectives of this proposal, which is mainly that of allocating funding to sustain the building of resilient communities through local initiatives. The funding could be based on the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-20,[6] which contains a section for financing initiatives that protect security and citizenship. Moreover, the section contains a subsection called "Rights and citizenship"[7], which appears to be suitable for the purposes of this proposal. Nonetheless, it is at the discretion of the Commission to establish the most appropriate financing mechanism.

This will be achieved in a threefold way, which is explained below:
a. A section where municipality officials can submit the **applications for funding**.
b. An **archive of the past initiatives** that have successfully fought radicalisation, possible to be searched through a country-based search bar, and the contacts of the municipalities which implemented these measures, to facilitate information exchange.
c. A section containing **educational material**, accessible to schools, which will be explained below.
d. A section containing material to sensibilize social workers to the issue of radicalisation.

---

[5] https://www.covenantofmayors.eu/about/covenant-initiative/origins-and-development.html.
[6] http://ec.europa.eu/budget/mff/index2014-2020_en.cfm.
[7] http://ec.europa.eu/budget/financialreport/2015/expenditure/security/index_en.html.

2. Youth Inclusion

a. Relevance of youth, local and social mixity perspectives

It appears to be relatively consensual amongst radicalisation prevention plans and schemes that young people are a group at risk of radicalisation. For instance, the UNDP's prevention plan dedicates a full section of their prevention building blocks to "Engaging youth in building social cohesion" (UNDP, 2016). Moreover, the European Commission and RAN have specifically identified youth as an age group where preventive actions should be enhanced' (RAN, 2016).

Causes of youth radicalisation can be multifaceted, but the lack of structures of youth participation in society has been identified as a potential driver of radicalisation (UNDP, 2016) as marginalized youth may be more vulnerable to radicalisation. Young people are at a stage where hate tendencies become apparent and where group identification and identity formation take place (Steinberg, Brooks and Remtulla, 2003). Youth is overrepresented in hate crime offenders statistics (Steinberg, Brooks and Remtulla, 2003), and young people have been prominent actors of recent terrorist attacks. In particular, statistics have pointed out that European violent extremism engages young people in their twenties (27 in France, 23,6 in Belgium) (UNDP, 2016). This proposal engages with preventive measures that would take place at an earlier stage of development. Thus, we stress the importance of engaging strongly in prevention initiatives having an impact on youth, such as developed in the prevention guidelines of the DG-EAC (DG-EAC, 2017).

Furthermore, before radicalisation processes are even detected, but where risk-assessment of communities show possibilities of radicalisation, initiatives on youth should provide possibilities of empowerment and help, suited to the variety of interests, beliefs, capacities and personalities of young people. These initiatives should also be localized in terms of socioeconomic and sociocultural conditions and favor social mixity,and they should reach out to the marginalized youth. Ultimately, they should provide possibilities for self-expression, integration to society and positive identification processes.

The process of radicalisation in the globalised world can transcend national boundaries by connecting foreign actors with domestic sympathisers. However, the relevance of the local level cannot be understated. Several risk factors for susceptibility to radicalisation are linked to the meso-sociological phenomena: discrimination in the community, individual's alienation in urban conditions, weak social cohesion, and the negative impact of peer groups (UNDP, 2016). Local actors are in the strategic position to react to said issues due to their community-based knowledge and ability to directly detect and intervene in the radicalisation process, as well as coordinate preventive measures more efficiently (European Forum for Urban Security, 2016). It has to be noted that local officials have a higher level of trust then another level of government and accountability to the local population (Muro, 2017). Detection, prevention, and intervention are carried out by multiple actors, such as local authorities, social workers, youth workers, educators, and health professionals. Therefore, the multi-agency approach needs to be implemented. The most important challenges that need to be addressed preceding its implementation are effective cooperation, establishment of information-sharing, engagement with both local government and civic organisations (Meines, 2017). This policy proposal suggests that RAN practitioners who are familiar with local context shall be employed to act as intermediaries between those organisations with practical materials made accessible via the RDP platform (see Chapter 1). It is crucial to provide the organisations with framework that defines target groups for preventive measures and describes measures that fit within the local setting.

This policy proposal is focused on the prevention of youth radicalisation. While it is important to help youngsters to build cognitive and emotional resilience to radicalisation within the educational system (see Chapter 3), some young people can be difficult to reach for first-line contact persons, such as teachers or social workers at school. Another argument supporting the approach that emphasises local inclusion is that research shows that hate crimes are committed out of prejudicial beliefs and perception of other people as different from themselves and, therefore, 'us vs. them' mentality (Steinberg, Brooks, & Remtulla, 2013). That being the case, it is necessary to develop strategic initiatives on the community level that would lead to inclusion, community-building, and social mixity. Thus, the sense of belonging to the non-exclusionary community can bond different social groups together while promoting diversity (Heinke, 2017). Young people can connect with their peers from other ethnic, socioeconomic, and religious background, and get to know fellow members of their community. These initiatives can also include cooperation with law enforcement in the process of trust-building between the police and young people. This approach could facilitate the prevention of ghettoisation of social groups which is considered one of the risk factors of radicalisation. On the personal level, the inclusive environment assists youth in finding their identity: e.g. by reconciling their religious or ethnic identity with their citizen status. The involvement of non-state actors allows to create a broader range of activities offered for young people who can cultivate their creative or athletic abilities or participate in community-based social action projects.

b. Suggested Practices

i. Psychological services

Given the insufficient evidence for socio-economic indicators of radicalisation among youth, we present a more integrative psychosocial approach. It appears that psychological factors such as depression, social isolation, problematic family history, anxiety and low self-esteem are far more important in assessing the risk of becoming radicalised (Ranstorp, 2016). Henceforth, it is crucial to provide this risk group with ample and frequent psychological support through different means. Examples include, but are not limited to: psychologists, social workers, sports coaches, teachers, artists and law enforcement officials such as local police. These should be provided with educational materials to get acquainted with signs of radicalisation and to tackle it once detected. Suitable strategies for these objectives will be communicated through the RDP platform as presented in Chapter 1.

A team of RAN experts should be appointed to develop a comprehensive set of guidelines for the relevant contact persons. In the materials, various levels of prevention should be included, each representing a step of the de-radicalisation process as executed or lead by the relevant contact persons.

- **Detection** of behaviour potentially leading to radicalisation
- **Confirmation** of the dangerous nature of the development of the individual's thought pattern
- **Addressing** of the individual and techniques to initiate dialogue
- **Monitoring** of the development of ideas and thoughts of the individual.
- **Empowerment** of the individual with their own tools to avoid relapse.

These guidelines will be openly available on the public section of the RDP platform to make not only professionals, but also parents, youth house owners, cultural workers and coaches aware of what they can mean in the fight against radicalising youth. Important to note is the emphasis on open dialogue

with the youth as opposed to more punitive, degrading and often counterproductive techniques. Additionally, the Radicalisation Hotline on the RDP platform will be available 24/7 for questions, suggestions and advice for intermediary contact persons as well as the youth. The presented guidelines are most useful when signs of radicalisation have already presented themselves, but given the extensive and strong academic evidence of community-building initiatives aimed at youth such as sports clubs and cultural activities as very potent techniques to prevent radicalisation, these should receive a prominent role as well in the overall preventative framework.

ii. Sports & Culture initiatives

Numerous studies have demonstrated that sports play a vital role in reducing aggression, promoting social mixity and increasing sense of belonging in a community (Walseth, 2006).
Governments and NGOs all over Europe, such as the National Action Plan for Integration (NAP) in Austria and The SALTO Cultural Diversity group, have already started implementing frameworks for this that have been proven very successful in building community.
Cultural activities and initiatives build on a similar narrative. Cultural activities can facilitate self-expression, increase community-building, enhance creativity and also provide room for intercultural dialogue.
Successful cultural initiatives have been introduced throughout the EU
 Examples of initiatives can include, but are not limited to:

- Art classes, sports events, competitions, scouts, youth camps, etc.
- Visits to different religious and cultural institutions such as churches, mosques, synagogues, museums, libraries, etc.
- Seminars, workshops about democracy, rule of law, individual liberty and core values of European Society
- Debating sessions and think tanks with a focus on peaceful community-building, tolerance, etc.

It is with this in mind that sports clubs and other youth initiatives can apply for funding via the relevant responsible municipality officials on the RDP platform. In order to be eligible for funding, the initiatives should state clearly why their initiative will help prevent radicalisation and prove sufficient social mixity as well as complete political and ideological neutrality. For suggestions, the platform's extensive archive of successful initiatives can be used to provide inspiration for the initiatives. If approved by the European Commission and after the funding has been allocated to the municipality, it is at the municipality's discretion to distribute the allocated funds among the various initiatives, according to what it believes is most urgent. Nevertheless, it is suggested to keep the distribution as equal as possible between the different fields of action.

iii. Social services and other community based initiatives

This proposal stresses the importance that a wide range of social services intending to prevent radicalisation be able to have access to EU funding. This category is less strictly defined, in the intention that it remains inclusive and open to the variety of services and initiatives that could be developed or reinforced in communities. Local services are aware of their populations needs (Muro, 2017) and should be given a degree of flexibility in regards to the range of the solutions proposed. The junction of grassroot initiatives with European Commission funding would be favored by the inclusion of this wide ranging category of social interventions.

Local social services or community based initiatives are also encouraged to contact municipal authorities in order for the municipality to submit an application for funding from the European Commission. On the other hand, municipalities should also be encouraged to reach out to existing local NGOs and private actors involved in communities and seek out prevention oriented existing or future initiatives. Municipalities should also provide awareness of the platform's services to local actors in the community. It would be mutually beneficial for both municipalities and local social services to apply for this proposed funding as it addresses local issues with funding allocated from the exterior of the municipality budget.

One of objectives of such an open category of applications for funding from the European Commission would be to provide prevention orienting services and initiatives to groups that might be left out of the main national services of healthcare or education.. Examples of these populations this proposal wishes to reach could be school dropouts, homeless people, refugees and many others, while not necessarily only targeting them.

A very specific example would be the allocation of funds to the initiatives of the NGO Le Foyer [http://www.foyer.be/?lang=nl], in Molenbeek, Bruxelles. Through the presentation of the activities and objectives of this NGO, who promotes social inclusion through a wide range of services and initiatives, the municipality of Bruxelles could be provided with European Commission funds to prevent radicalisation. The result would be locally effective, passed through the municipality's intermediary, and funded at a supranational level.

Criteria to receive funding

The objective of the fund is to target the most vulnerable cities to radicalisation. When determining where to allocate the fund, two aspects should be taken into account by the Commission:
1. The level of vulnerability of the city;
2. The quality of the projects in the application.

Risk assessments in this field is highly difficult due to the relatively discrete and case-by-case nature of this phenomenon. Nonetheless, several academic studies have tried to identify indicators that could highlight the most vulnerable cities. The National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START) has provided an extensive framework that could help identify such cities. According to the START experts, radicalisation is likely to emerge in cities where there are marginalized communities, the extent of which can be measured by the economic distress felt by a community, indicated by the following variables:
● unemployment rates,
● median household income,
● income inequality,
● data on participation in government assistance programs.
It can also be measured by the extent to which members of a community feel connected or trusting of neighbors and government. This can be done looking at:
● family structure (divorce rates, single parent families),
● the number (or density) of social service organizations,

- civic organizations or arts/sports organizations,
- voter turnout rates.

The extent of political inclusion (turnout, etc..) and social support can also be useful to determine the most vulnerable cities.

When assessing the quality of a project, it should be made sure that it is sound, detailed and concrete and that it corresponds to the purpose of this fund, namely a financial support for community building initiatives involving the youth. Municipalities that have already set up a network of initiatives regarding radicalisation would be more prone to receive the funding, since it shows a real sense of willingness to prevent radicalisation. It should be made sure that the initiatives that receive funding are not politically affiliated or partisan in any way, in order to ensure a neutral and objective outlook on social inclusion.

3. Education

a. Organization

The proposal includes various actors on different levels, starting from the supranational level with RAN practitioners. The current approach used by the working group Education in RAN is taken as a foundation for the establishment of a bottom-up approach reaching teachers and municipalities on a local level. The key is that all relevant actors, from the Commission to the teachers, contribute to the platform ("Radicalisation Awareness Platform").

Firstly, the buttom-up approach needs to be encouraged by RAN. To motivate and instruct teachers and schools to participate in the radicalisation awareness initiative, a bridge must be built between RAN and the local level. **The main aim is that teachers as well as all other involved actors give substantial feedback to the platform, benefiting the RAN.**

RAN should approach the Educational **Ministries of the Member States** at first. The consultation of **RAN experts** with national (in case of big federal memberstates also regional) education ministry officials should discuss the national situation and legal issues. Consequently, the Ministries of Education are responsible to submit their national radicalisation awareness strategy to the platform and to decide which are the relevant municipalities (where risk of radicalisation has been identified) that should also be further addressed by RAN-Experts. The local dimension of the approach should then be directly discussed between the RAN-Experts and the **municipality officials**. In this context the Ministry of Education together with the **Mayors** go on to appoint **local experts** that are equipped with competences to make proposals on the local level.

The local experts are trained by **RAN practitioners** in cooperation with local municipalities in order to provide preparation and training for teachers in detecting and ultimately preventing radicalisation. Undoubtedly, all these actors should have access to the platform. Municipalities should together with the local experts give inputs regarding local approaches and strategies. The local experts should be attending the school conferences where **teachers and the deans of schools** are meeting on a regular basis. During these conferences the schools should be made aware of the programme and the platform. They finally should be motivated to enrich the platform regularly with examples, results and best practice presentations.

b. Platform

The platform, which is mentioned in the first chapter of the proposal, should include a separate section that again is going to be divided into two seperate sections.

The first section ("Officially Approved Section") will be accessible by all involved actors of the educational approach from teachers to RAN-Experts. It should perform the initial ideas of the RAN network and present the findings of the RAN experts that have been evaluating, approving and classifying the feedback of the national Minister of Education, the mayors and municipality officials as well as the local experts, the deans and the teachers. The RAN is charged with the overall management and control. In this section teachers will find information related to radicalisation in the educational field as well as practical material in order to analyse the risks of students to become radicalised and to act accordingly. Thus, the platform is the main source for the teachers to access information and to get ideas for preventive activities.

The second section ("Open Discussion Section") should be made available for multi-level contributions such as opinions, exchanges of experiences and broader communication. Not only teachers but also parents and pupils should be able to contribute under certain rules. The RAN should review the uploaded content and promote (when necessary delete) contributions.

c. Role of Teachers

Teachers should generally be enabled to apply the overall objectives of the RAN and the RAN should be enabled to gain new data, experience, guidelines for its future agenda.
In order to reach students directly, it is important to integrate radicalisation awareness content into school programmes. The content can vary according to the subject area it is integrated in. Furthermore, a distinction between primary, secondary and high school needs to be drawn. For instance, it is more appropriate to use games (e.g. trust building games, community-building games) and practical activities in primary schools to promote friendship and mutual exchange, whereas in secondary schools one could address the issue by stimulating arts and expression (e.g. theatre) to encourage the dialogue between students from different backgrounds. In high schools, contents following the interdisciplinary approach, like workshops, seminars and conferences could be embedded to empower the students in using their rational thinking autonomously.

The local municipalities together with the appointed local experts should make sure that in each school the dean and a certain group of teachers stand available for communication. All teachers should be able to face the process of hospitality, literacy, cultural mediation; to reinforce cultural, linguistic and communication skills and to promote programmes regarding multilingual approach and a modern interpretation to citizenship through community-building games arising the sense of identity.

The concept used in this proposal is the disseminator approach which involves teachers who receive training along by experts in order to deliver what they have been taught to a certain audience and also draw results that serves the purpose of platform enrichment. With this approach, it is possible to reach a bigger audience and to deliver the message in a certain way, that is suitable for the pupils.

Conclusion

This policy proposal has the objective of tackling the issue of radicalisation through prevention in the education sector. To do so, the policy that could be implemented has been described, and revolves around the central idea of setting up an online platform, called Radicalisation Development Prevention (RDP), inside the framework of the Radicalisation Awareness Network. There is no necessity to set up a different venue for the policy, and it would be more efficient if it could be inserted in an already-existing and affirmed context. The underlying logic of the RDP would be a common fund, deriving from the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-20, which would be used to reward municipalities which are proven to be at risk and to engage in social inclusion initiatives of a high quality.

Furthermore, the platform would have the objective of information sharing, and contain an archive of the previously submitted applications for funding, in order to facilitate exchange of information among local communities. Moreover, the platform would contain educational material, which would be accessible only to teachers, and could be used to the ends of sensibilizing them to the issue and providing concrete tools to deal with the issue.

After stressing the importance of local inclusion and youth initiatives, the proposal identified various areas and levels of intervention which are possible, such as psychological support, cultural and sports activities and a wider outlook on social services initiatives. Finally, the proposal has emphasised that RAN should focus its work more on local level especially on schools, using a bottom-up approach, training teachers in order to detect and prevent radicalized behaviours, spreading awareness and exchanges of materials and experiences through the support of the online platform and local municipalities.

References

Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture (2017). 'The contribution of youth work to preventing marginalisation and violent radicalisation'.

European Forum for Urban Security (2016). Preventing and fighting radicalisation at the local level. Retrieved from: https://issuu.com/efus/docs/publication_liaise_en-web

Foyer (2017). *Foyer in brief*. Retrieved from:
http://www.foyer.be/?page=sommaire&reload=baseArticle&id_rubrique=10&lang=en.

Heinke, D. H. (2017). Who leads and who does what? Multi-agency coordination, community engagement and public-private partnerships. In: D. Muro (Ed.), *Resilient cities: Countering violent extremism at local level* (81-91). Barcelona: CIDOB edicions.

Kallis, A., Zeiger, S. & Ozturk, B. (2018). *Violent radicalization & far-right extremism in Europe*, Istanbul: Seta Publications.

McKown, C., & Weinstein, R. (2003). The development and consequences of stereotype consciousness in middle childhood. *Child Development*, *74*(2), 498-515.

Meines, M. (2017). Local strategy: elements of an effective local action plan to prevent radicalisation and violent extremism. In: D. Muro (Ed.), *Resilient cities: Countering violent extremism at local level* (99-105). Barcelona: CIDOB edicions.

Muro, D. (Ed.) (2017). *Resilient cities: Countering violent extremism at local level*. Barcelona: CIDOB edicions.

RAN (2016). Preventing radicalization to terrorism and violent extremism: Collection of approaches and practices.

Ranstorp, M. (2016). The root causes of violent extremism. RAN Centre of Excellence.

Steinberg, A., Brooks, J. & Remtulla T. (2003). Youth hate crimes: Identification, prevention and intervention. *Am J Psychiatry* 160(5), 979-989.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2016). Preventing violent extremism through promoting inclusive development, tolerance and respect for diversity: A development response to addressing radicalization and violent extremism. Retrieved from: http://www.undp.org/content/dam/norway/undp-ogc/documents/Discussion%20Paper%20-%20Preventing%20Violent%20Extremism%20by%20Promoting%20Inclusive%20%20Development.pdf.

Walseth, K. (2006). Sport and belonging. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport,41*(3-4), 447-464. doi:10.1177/1012690207079510

https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-
do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran_collection-
approaches_and_practices_en.pdf.