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Abstract

The development of non-kinetic and non-coercive policy tools in counter-terror, roughly called countering violent extremism (CVE), has been controversial but important. However, an expanded evidence base and “good practices” have begun to enable more effective and nuanced CVE policy, including the development of early intervention programs. To ensure that CVE policies for early intervention in Canada are aligned with Canadian principles, supported by research, and proportionate to the Canadian threat environment, this research provides an overview of the theory, history, and current practice in Canada, and makes recommendations for future developments in the field. Canada’s early intervention policies are well-designed but could be improved by developing safeguards for current programs and supporting parents’ associations and family counseling.
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Executive Summary

Canada’s approach to the counter-terror component of national security includes a policy concept called countering radicalization to violence (CRV). In other countries, and in Canada before 2016, the group of policies and programs under CRV are typically called “P/CVE”—preventing/countering violent extremism. The remit of these programs is unlimited, and they’ve spread across the globe. Governments can lead or fund projects as varied as direct deradicalization/disengagement programs, counter-narrative projects, education and research, and more. As might be expected, this is a contested space of theory and practice.

Divisions in this field range from issues of human and civil rights to the minutiae of radicalization/deradicalization. The existence of these policies is political; the ways in which they are evaluated are political. In Canada, CRV has thus far avoided the legitimate concerns that befell early (and some enduring) iterations of this policy type in other countries. The purpose of this analysis is essentially to answer specific questions that a decision-maker might have about the intervention programs that operate with “at risk” individuals (and in some cases their families) in Canada. First, how unified and actionable is the scholarship as it relates to key issues like root causes, risk assessment, and evaluation? Second, what are the negative unintended consequences associated with early interventions? And third, does the likelihood and significance of unintended consequences in Canada outweigh benefits that early interventions might provide? As a novice to the field, I did my best to convey deep uncertainty where I found it, and also to highlight examples of research and evidence that seems robust.

Canada has made a commitment to using CRV of some type for the foreseeable future. It is the aim of this research to present the broader field in which these programs fit, as well as analyze them on the merits. It was necessary to ask what Canada’s goals are for counter-terror. Extremist violence in Canada is rare. The economic impact of extremist violence in Canada is very hard to calculate. To be glib, is the juice worth the squeeze? Is the uncertain outcome derived from intervening in a potential violent extremist’s long process to violence appropriately valued at $35 million over five years and $10 million a-year after?
This research is an exploration of CRV in Canada with specific reference to the questions above. This research stops short of breaking new ground in CRV in Canada, but it does illuminate the CRV space and provides some useful incremental policy recommendations and support for a framework of understanding CRV in practice. Overall, the purpose of this research is to, however imperfectly, illuminate this aspect of the CRV space in Canada in full detail. I hope other more experienced scholars and policymakers can build off or critique the analysis.
Chapter 1.

Introduction

Concepts

After 9/11 and subsequent attacks in Europe, governments overhauled their security strategies for counter-terrorism. Part of the impetus for this policy change came from the realization that arrests alone would not end extremist violence. That concern coupled with the task of combating “home-grown” terrorism led governments to develop a host of non-coercive counter-terror policies. In the main, those policies are called “countering violent extremism” or CVE. But CVE is less of a series of policies than it is a policy theme. Through CVE, counter-terrorism becomes embedded into sub-national governments, communities, and civil society partners.

The foundational principle of CVE is to address the “symptoms”, early warning signs, or root causes of violent extremism. The central conceit in the field is that there’s a dynamic process by which one becomes a terrorist. That people *radicalize* to commit extremist violence. Conceptually, this makes sense. Few people wake up one day and commit impromptu extremist violence. However, CVE also suggests the process can be recognized and that actions of intervention or prevention along the way can change the outcome. This concept is contested. The research to support it is developing, and some of it is compelling.

Context

Acts of extremist violence in Canada are exceedingly rare. Even in the parts of the developed world afflicted most, namely Europe, acts of extremist violence are rare. The number of individual lives lost and the cost to economies is small when compared to types of quotidian violence like gang-related homicides (Gurski, 2019). Comparatively, however, there are greater federal resources devoted to preventing extremist violence than gang-violence. According to Statistics Canada there were 403 gang-related homicides since 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2018). Reports suggest that, despite decades of policy and programming, gang violence is currently at a 10-year high (Berthiaume,
To combat gang violence, the National Crime Prevention Centre at Public Safety Canada spent roughly $31 million over five years (Public Safety, 2018). Since 2015, six people have been killed as a result of extremist violence (excluding the Danforth shooting). To counter radicalization to violence Public Safety allocated $35 million between 2016-2021, plus $10 million on-going annually after that (Public Safety, 2017).

Elaborated in more detail later (section 3.2), it is clear that there is a disparity between federal funding to avoid damages from extremist violence and funding to avoid damages from more common types of violence.

This analysis does not minimize the issue of extremist violence in Canada. The psychological damage extremist violence has to society is doubtlessly significant, but also hard to quantify. This analysis recognizes the threat and is cautiously supportive of the current policy approach. As an analyst, however, one must weigh the advantages and disadvantages of policies without favor or prejudice. In order to do so, this analysis takes a critical look at the policies and programs seeking to counter radicalization to violence in Canada.

**Purpose of the Research**

The research aims to provide an overview of various elements of CVE policy in Canada generally, with a particular focus on policies and programs for early intervention work. There are two types of early intervention activity in Canada. The first type is holistic case management. Holistic case management involves an inter-disciplinary team working collectively on cases of possible radicalization to violence. The second type is called the multi-agency approach in the literature and often referred to as Hubs or Situation Tables in Canada. Even though the two approaches are different, this analysis groups them together because they both focus on individuals.

The policy problem investigated in this research has two components. First, Canadian CVE policy around early interventions claims to offer an enhancement to the security of Canadians. This claim is accepted by the Government of Canada which made early intervention one of the top three counter-terror priorities in the 2018 national strategy (Public Safety, 2018). The first goal of this analysis is to assess if that assertion can be validated. In particular, if early interventions contribute to Canada’s counter-terror approach. Second, early intervention and CVE generally have a reputation for impacting
the rights and liberties of people in a democratic society. This analysis tries to evaluate these concerns with respect to CVE in Canada.

Reason for Narrow Scope

The determinants of health and risk factors for violent extremism are strikingly similar, per the Public Health Agency of Canada (Weine et al., 2017). However, developing policy to address issues like income, education, and childhood development is outside the scope of this paper. At the societal level, the factors with rigorous research supporting a correlation to terrorism are broad, like youth population bulges and high male/female ratios (Stern, 2016). Those are also beyond the scope of this paper. The policy recommendation portion of this research is intentionally narrowed to focus on Canada’s national counter-terror strategy and early intervention.

Roadmap

There are three questions that guide this research. Do we need to know the causes of extremist violence to combat them? Is there a firmly grounded justification for Canada’s approach to early interventions? If not, what should be done?

In order to address these questions, the analysis begins by (a), introducing the key background, theories, and describing the need for counter-terror policy in Canada. Then (b), the politics, economics, and threat environment that frames CVE in Canada is presented. Next (c), a brief literature review on radicalization, deradicalization, and risk assessment is required to establish the state of scholarship in the field. Following that is (d), a jurisdiction scan of the UK, US, and Denmark to assess the impact of these policies elsewhere. The methods conclude with (e), an analysis of current Canadian early interventions. After this collection of research methods the paper concludes with (f), a discussion and analysis of policy options with key government and societal objectives, informed mostly by a comprehensive review of academic literature and the opinions of experts given through lengthy semi-structured interviews.
Chapter 2.

Key Terminology and Theory Background

2.1. Counter-Terror Concepts

There is no common definition of terrorism, violent extremism, or CVE. Roughly speaking, each country defines these terms individually. However, some clarity can be provided by expert practitioners and the academic community. The typology below was drafted by Daniel Koehler, the founder and director of the German Institute on Radicalization and De-radicalization Studies (GIRDS). There are many different ways of framing the counter-terror space. Koehler’s is the most comprehensive frame discovered in this research.

Generally, counter-terror happens on three societal levels and with three classes of tools (Koehler, 2016). The societal levels are divided between the macro-level, meso-level, and micro-level. Macro-level policies and programs operate on a big scale, like nationwide, province-wide, or city-wide. Meso-level approaches operate in familiar social environments schools, families, and communities (Koehler, 2016). Micro-level approaches focus on the individual and sometimes families. The classes of tools involved include preventative tools, repressive tools, and interventive tools.

Table 1. Counter-Terror Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macro Level</th>
<th>Meso Level</th>
<th>Micro-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Education, research, civil society, youth &amp; social work</td>
<td>Community cohesion programs</td>
<td>Workshops or videos with former extremists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repression</td>
<td>National law enforcement structure</td>
<td>Community policing, group banning</td>
<td>Arrests, detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Counter-narrative projects</td>
<td>Family counseling</td>
<td>Disengagement programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Koehler, D. (2016). Understanding Deradicalization. Chapter 5. Published by VitalSource. The blue highlighted sections are the focus area of this analysis. Green highlighted sections indicate programs discussed in the broader analysis. *These are just some of the possible tools used at every level.
Repressive tools include government methods that people would typically associate with counter-terror like law enforcement and the judicial and legal systems. Preventative tools are ones that try to avoid violent extremist threats before they start. General preventative efforts “[aim] to educate broadly in favor of the established political system” (Koehler, 2016, n.p.). Targeted prevention efforts seek to reduce the appeal of a specific extremist ideology or narrative, like programs targeted at right-wing or Islamist extremism. The direct nature of these preventive efforts, in contrast to general efforts, is why these tools are referred to in the main as countering violent extremism or “CVE” (Koehler, 2016).

The programs that are a major focus of Canada’s strategy to counter radicalization to violence, and the focus of this research, are early intervention programs. Since this research is using the Koehler frame, these are understood as disengagement/deradicalization programs, and on the microlevel. The reason for this classification is that while early intervention programs are closely linked with prevention efforts, they definitionally require a person that is considered to be in the process of radicalization. If the subject isn’t thought to be radicalizing, even slowly, early intervention for radicalization does not make sense.

Canada’s approach, now called Countering Radicalization to Violence “CRV” abandoned the contested and somewhat toxic terminology of P/CVE. Programs that receive funding from the Community Resilience Fund at Public Safety include prevention and intervention programs of all types at all different societal levels. There are also community policing projects funded through Public Safety, which is one of the more positive available repressive tools.

2.2. Use of Contested Terminology in this Research

2.2.1. Terrorism and Extremist Violence

It should be noted that there is a difference between the legal term terrorism and the descriptive term extremist violence. Terrorism typically refers to a violent act motivated by ideological, political, or religious reasons and is defined in law. Violent extremism includes actions that are short of this threshold, including supporting, preparing for, or advocating for acts of terrorism. The purpose of the concept, violent
extremism, is to capture a range of activities along a person’s *pathway* to radicalization to violence—which might not always culminate in violence itself but is still seen as problematic.

2.2.2. CVE, CRV, PVE, P/CVE

This analysis uses the term CRV to describe a host of different programs under the umbrella of Public Safety’s *National Strategy on Countering Radicalization to Violence*. Because CRV is the terminology used in Canada, this analysis uses that terminology when referencing the field of practice and policy in general or in reference to programs in Canada. In other jurisdictions, however, the terms PVE, CVE, and deradicalization/disengagement are the norm. When talking about those concepts in the abstract, or in the context of a particular jurisdiction where those terms are used, I use the term specific to that jurisdiction.

2.2.3. Radicalization, Deradicalization, Disengagement

This research uses the term radicalization to reference the process by which an individual engages in extremist violence—making no claim as to why this happens. The reason for not defining these terms more exhaustively in this research is that the process/pathways of radicalization/deradicalization/disengagement are not comprehensively understood.

---

1 See Appendix D for how Public Safety’s Canada Centre defines these terms. And see Chapter 5 for an analysis of academic theories of radicalization, deradicalization, and disengagement.
Chapter 3.

Politics, Economics, and Threat Environment

3.1. The Politics of CRV

The politics of CRV in Canada are relatively straightforward. It has stakeholders: research community, NGOs, practitioners, and government agencies. The public, however, does not know what CRV or CVE is. The public does not know that there are “deradicalization programs” in Canada. However, 54% of the Canadian public considers Daesh (caliphate in Iraq in Syria) a top security threat (Poushter & Huang, 2019). CRV in Canada, as elsewhere, was fomented by attacks—even if Canada’s Building Resilience Against Terrorism (2012) pre-dated attacks in Canada. Attacks are frequently the impetus for this type of policy. In the political phraseology of Bill Gormley (1998), CRV policy has high technical complexity and low salience. Most Canadians understand that their government is engaged in counter-terror policy, but few know the details and fewer are voting on that issue. Counter-terror policy becomes salient for brief moments in the aftermath of an attack. That is when rapid policy change can happen—and it did in Canada after attacks in 2014. Creating comprehensive counter-terror policy in the aftermath of an attack is probably not wise, but it is how policy windows open in counter-terror. Two experts interviewed for this research suggested that in some ways CRV policy in Canada is an effort by the government to be seen innovating. Critics would suggest that CRV has been exported across the globe uncritically (Kundnani, 2014). In Canada, however, counter-terror policy moves very incrementally.

Given that programs already exist in the status quo and there is a commitment to funding them on an annual basis, CRV is unlikely to go away entirely. However, it is unlikely to receive a windfall of political support above what it enjoys now because politicians would be loath to invest in something like this heavily, only to have one of the program clients be involved in a public incident of extremist violence (Souris & Singh, 2018). On the other hand, the prospect of future attacks also cements CRV in Canada at status quo levels at least, since it would be equally politically disastrous to have removed preventive programs already in place.
3.2. Economic Cost of Terrorism

The threat from terrorism in non-conflict states makes traditional cost-benefit analysis inappropriate. There are few average annual fatalities. Even if all deaths from terrorism in Canada could be stopped, the benefits (economic value) are small when compared to the costs of achieving them. Additionally, from a cost-benefit perspective, aggregation over the entire country may “net out” the impacts one specific area might sustain (Gordon et al., 2008). The US did not sustain enduring economic losses after 9/11—and apart from calculating the value of statistical life (VSL)—identifying terrorism-induced economic losses is challenging (Gordon et al., 2008).

Since 2015, six people have died from extremist attacks in Canada. One tool used by governments to assess policies designed to reduce risk is the value of statistical life (VSL). The VSL in Canada is estimated to be between $6-10 million (Quigley, 2018). VSL does not include those injured in attacks or damage to property. Nevertheless, using VSL alone indicates that extremist violence has cost Canadians between $42-60 million over five years. Spending $35 million over that same amount of time to avoid a cost of $42-60 million seems reasonable. However, spending $35 million on CRV is far from a guarantee against extremist violence. To illustrate the intangible costs of terrorism that may prompt policies like CRV, it is useful to compare extremist violence to other types of violence. Gang-related violence killed 402 people in Canada since 2015. Public Safety dedicated $31 million to combat gang-related violence over those five years. The VSL lost from gang-related violence in Canada since 2015 is between $2-4 billion. Granted, this does not reflect programming at the provincial and municipal levels to counter gang-related homicides. Also, the role of the federal government in countering terrorism is justifiably more pronounced than its role in addressing gang-violence since terrorism it is a national security issue. Nonetheless, as an illustrative exercise it is indicative of the different reactions to different types of violence.

The Global Terrorism Index offers another useful way of understanding the impacts of terrorism. The Index is designed by the Institute for Economics and Peace, a respected Australian think tank, and it uses four indicators to rank 163 countries over five-year increments. The factors include total number of terrorist events, as well as fatalities, injuries and property damage per year. Each factor is weighted between 0-3 as determined by the Global Peace Index Expert Panel. A country can score between 0-10
on the scale, 10 being the worst. This tool is one among many that help gauge the scope of the problem in Canada relative to other jurisdictions. The model used includes direct and indirect costs of deaths, injuries, and property destruction. In the 2018 *Index Canada* scored 3.527, a positive change (meaning the cost of terrorism is getting higher) since 2002 when Canada scored 2.387 (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2018).

### Table 2. Global Terrorism Index, rank & change in score 2002-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>6.006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-1.983</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3.527</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.387</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institute for Economics & Peace, 2018

### 3.3. Threat Environment Overview

To give some balance and establish the scope of the extremist violence problem in Canada, a comparison between the Canadian and foreign threat environments is necessary.

At any given time, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) has a few hundred active counter-terror investigations, and the RCMP likely has a similar figure (Gurski, 2016). In Canada, the current threat level set by the Integrated Terrorism Assessment Centre (ITAC) is “medium”, and the probability of an attack is “could occur” (National Defence, 2018). In comparison, France and the UK have identified orders of magnitude more “radical Islamists” (Atran & Hamid, 2015; Gurski, 2017). Recent reports suggest there are 25,000 persons of concern in the UK and 18,000 in France (Dearden, 2017; ‘The Local’, 2017). In the UK, the Security Service’s national terrorist threat level is “severe” and an attack is considered “highly likely” (Security Service, 2019).

### 3.3.1. Specific Nature of the Threats to Canada

Public Safety reports that the “principal terrorist threat to Canada continues to stem from individuals or groups who are inspired by violent Sunni Islamist ideology and terrorist groups such as Daesh or al-Qaida” (Public Safety, 2018, p 5).

Public Safety “also remains concerned about” the threat of violent right-wing extremism (Public Safety, 2018, p 5). All intervention projects funded by the Community
Resilience Fund through the Canadian Centre for Community Engagement and Prevention of Violence (Canada Centre) are designed to address all forms of radicalization to violence. To what extent this broad mandate bears out in programming is uncertain. Calgary Re-Direct, for example, originated specifically to address Islamist extremism, although it purports to focus on and have the capacity to address all types. The Canada Centre has funded one project focused on right-wing extremism. That project is an environmental scan of right-wing extremism in Canada.

It warrants mentioning that multiple reports find crimes motivated by hatred are on the rise in Canada, including attacks against Muslims (Fagan, 2018; Kirby, 2018). There also appears to be a disproportionate reaction to violence from religious and ethnic minorities when compared to those of right-wing extremists (Cassidy, 2019; Serwer, 2019).

3.4. Public Opinion of Muslim Canadians on Security & the Future

One of the implicit target communities of many CRV programs in Canada is Canadian Muslims. This analysis did not find polling information from Canadian Muslims on CRV specifically. However, a survey from the Environics Institute in 2016 does have some revealing findings. 57% of Canadian Muslims reported thinking that government security agencies like the RCMP and CSIS have about the right amount of power (Environics Institute, 2016). 17% reported thinking the agencies are too powerful.

The Muslim community was divided when asked how they envisioned the future in terms of acceptance of their community and faith. 35% said they believed the next generation will face more discrimination. 29% expected less, and the remainder believed levels of discrimination would remain the same (21%) or had no opinion (15%). Fully 50% of Canadian-born Muslims expect more discrimination in their lifetime. Polling of non-Muslim Canadians adds evidence to this concern, as survey respondents reported more negative feelings to Muslims than to any other group (Waterloo News, 2018).

With that information in mind, it is essential to reiterate that there is a noticeable difference between reactions to CRV in Canada and CVE in other jurisdictions. In the US
and UK, many civil-rights and activist organizations severely criticized the policies. So far, the public has not responded negatively to CRV in Canada.²

3.4.1. Canadian Muslim Life and European Muslim Life

Comparable to Canada, one-third of Muslim respondents to the European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey reported experiencing discrimination (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010). Also comparable to Canada, Muslim immigrants in Europe receive less pay and are more likely to be unemployed than European “natives” (Stern, 2016).

In Canada, Canadian Muslims feel overwhelmingly proud of, attached to, and integrated within Canadian society (Environics Institute, 2016). Muslim immigrants in Canada are also, on average, better educated than Canadian-born citizens. This education statistic is partly explained by the Canadian point system for immigration that gives substantial weight to formal education. However, unemployment is nearly twice as high for Muslims as non-Muslims in Canada (Hamdani, 2015). There is a significant disparity in income between Muslims and Canadians—despite the Muslim workforce being well qualified. In 2015, median income for all Canadians was $34,100 (Statistics Canada, 2016). Although not all Muslims are Arab, and vice-versa, the best proxy for Muslim income in Canada is Arab income. Muslim individuals over 15 who reported income in 2015 had a median income of $19,997 (Statistics Canada, 2016). That figure is just shy of 60% of the median income for all Canadians.

This demographic and biographical data about Muslim Canadians is included for comparison and informational purposes only. There is no comprehensive evidence tying economic wellbeing or education levels with extremist violence.

² There’s a notable paucity of negative press, negative social media, and objection from Canadian-Muslim organizations.
Chapter 4.

Methods

Several methods are used in this research. The first is a literature review on radicalization theories, risk factors, risk assessment tools, and theories of de-radicalization and disengagement (Chapter 5). Next is a jurisdiction scan of CVE programs in the UK, US, and Denmark, with emphasis on early intervention programming (Chapter 6). Then comes a comparative analysis of Canada’s two iterations of counter-terror policy is included (Chapter 7). The methods continue with a preliminary assessment of Canadian early intervention programs based on important program details (Chapter 8).

Semi-structured interviews inform the entire analysis, and detailed summaries are in Appendix B. Among the interviewees for this research were Phil Gurski, a former CSIS strategic analyst; Arun Kundnani, a professor at New York University and critic of CVE; and Benjamin Ducol, leader of the research team at the Centre for the Prevention of Radicalization Leading to Violence (CPRLV) in Montreal.

This research sought evidence with the highest empirical quality: systematic reviews, controlled experiments, and case studies. When available these were given significant weight in the analysis. When unavailable, the research used the opinions of experts and the broader literature. Interview detail is integrated throughout the analysis, but please refer to Appendix B for the full detail. These less rigorous methods were weighted more lightly in the analysis. As will be explored in Chapter 5, however, subjective opinion is impossible to eliminate even in controlled experiments in this field.

The analysis in this research is not definitive. It is a subjective assessment based on limited evidence. For example, much of the data on the activities of planned programs is drawn from media reports and the websites of the relevant organization. This analysis could only independently confirm that three of nine early intervention programs are in operation. In a nascent field like CRV, insights can come from anywhere. It is the sincere hope of this researcher that within this research there are items of use that might help Canada align its policies around intervention with its stated goals and with the “good practices” found in research.
Chapter 5.

Literature Review

5.1. Radicalization

From an extensive review of the literature, it becomes apparent that violent extremism is not a phenomenon. It is a series of phenomena that change in cause, method, and expression, depending on a host of social and individual factors.

To avoid a lengthy discussion of the ouroboros that is radicalization modeling and theories of extremist violence—suffice it to say that most researchers and practitioners from private, governmental, and academic organizations agree there is no one profile or identifiable pathway to violent extremism (Borum, 2011; Department of Defense, 2012; Gill et al., 2014; Hamm & Spaaj, 2015; Horgan 2008; Kruglanski & Fishman, 2006; Richards, 2015; Schmid, 2013; Sedgwick, 2010; Silber & Bhatt, 2007).3

There are roughly four schools of theory on radicalization. The theories are not in competition with each other but complement each other and enhance our understanding. The four schools are psychology, sociology, social movement, and empiricist (Koehler, 2016). Sociologists emphasize structural factors like globalization and disintegration of traditional communities and how these underlying issues lead to identity problems. In response to an identity vacuum, absolutist ideology fills in the gaps for radicalizing people (Dalgaard-Nielsen, 2010). Social movement scholars suggest significant importance for social bonds like friendship, kinship, and broader social networks as the vectors for extremist ideas. Empiricist scholars point to the diversity of different factors and focus on individual processes to radicalization. Psychology scholars generally look for explanations in complex arrangements of social and psychological factors, although they are conflicted over whether or not psychopathology is involved.

---

3 Research into radicalization is developing but has historically been marred by distorted focus (mostly on Islamists), a lack of empirical data (no control group), and a critical inability to tinker with the dependent variable (only those that commit acts).
5.2. Deradicalization/Disengagement

The radicalization process is, if not explained, at least rigorously addressed in scholarly literature. If our understanding of radicalization is developing, our understanding of deradicalization is still in its infancy (Altier et al., 2014; Bjørgo & Horgan, 2009). The debate over the centrality of ideology to these processes and interventions is unresolved. Many scholars find that disengagement is a much more achievable and less controversial goal than deradicalization (Davis & Cragin, 2009; Horgan, 2009), while others claim it leaves the chance of recidivism too high (Rabasa et al., 2010). After lengthy follow-up interviews with former terrorists, Horgan concluded that many could be described as disengaged but were actually “deradicalized” (Koehler, 2016).

Some of the best available information on radicalization thus far come from models developed by Kate Barrelle (2015) and Altier et al. (2017). Both studies involved extensive interviews with former extremists. Barrelle finds that “sustained disengagement is actually about the proactive, holistic and harmonious engagement the person has with wider society” (Barrelle, 2015, p 141). This approach emphasizes trust and social bonds. Altier et al., conclude that factors that “push” people away from engagement are most important, namely disillusionment, feuds with leaders, dissatisfaction, and burnout (Altier et al., 2017).

5.3. Risk Assessment

5.3.1. Overview

Risk assessment is a critical element of the early intervention programs that are the subject of this research. To oversimplify, an assessment tool is a protocol that allows the assessor to interpret client behaviours, attitudes, and history, in connection to established risk factors through pre-set decision rules. Risk assessment tools in this field are supposed to be instructive, not predictive. Risk assessment tools for violent extremism are used in concert with the Structured Professional Judgement (SPJ)

4 Relevant to this analysis, early intervention work sometimes necessitates engaging with key deradicalization components like ideology and psychology. Early intervention is, at the very least, deradicalization light.
approach. This approach is supposed to equip trained professionals with the tools necessary to make discretionary judgements in an “evidence-based” way (Hart et al., 2017).

The tools used in post-conviction criminal justice contexts are comprised of a series of empirically tested indicators validated through years of follow-up with individuals on probation, parole, or supervised release. However, the same risk assessment tools for more quotidian types of crime are not effective when applied to terrorism-related offences (Neumann, 2012; Pressman & Flockton, 2012). Extremist violence has fundamentally different motives than ordinary violent crime, so new tools had to be developed.

Importantly, the intervention programs in Canada that are the focus of this research fall in the “pre-crime” space. This analysis examines the effectiveness of risk assessment tools for violent extremism in general, with specific reference to one developed in Canada.

5.3.2. Risk Factors, Risk Assessment, and Early Intervention

The need to identify people “at risk” of radicalization to violence for care is self-evident. The core concept of interventive care (and CRV in general) is tied to developing an understanding of warning signs or risk factors. There should be signs of the “informal but related activities” that foment an act of extremist violence (Roberts & Horgan, 2008, p 4). Importantly for this analysis, early intervention programs are founded on the importance of “socio-biographical” determinants of radicalization to violence like education, employment, and mental health (Koehler, 2016). These factors combined with individual psycho-social factors, like specific grievances, ideologies, and affiliations, form the comprehensive risk assessment picture for early intervention.

Much more research needs to be done to validate risk factors and assessment protocols, operating at the individual and community levels. First, although there are many risk factors suggested in the literature, no study has established a causal connection between any risk factor, or even a cluster of risk factors, and violent extremist offenses. At this time, there is no Risk-Needs-Responsivity model for extremist violence assessment. Reasonable theories supported by casework and some large
sample research of different profiles/histories are what amount to evidence-based
approaches. Researchers are typically severely restricted from access to data and
subjects. Further, the sample size of people who engage in extremist violence in a
particular context will likely never be large enough to use statistical methods that might
establish a reliable risk estimate (Monahan, 2012). There will never be a case where
governments find it appropriate to release 500+ violent extremist offenders into the
public to monitor their behaviour in order to test the risk assessment tool, and interviews
with convicted terrorists are challenging. While SPJ legitimates the contemporary tools
for violent extremism, these tools will never provide a mathematically supported “risk
score”.

Historically, risk assessment tools measured “static” risk factors—things about a
person’s background that are unchangeable like nationality, religion, and criminal
history. These factors are derived from group-level characteristics, based on historical
data, and applied to individuals. The validity of mapping group-level characteristics onto
individuals is contested in the literature. More recent tools use dynamic factors that are
often attitudinal (e.g. worldview), social (e.g. relationships), or behavioural (e.g.
substance abuse). The importance of dynamic factors is that they are changeable and
can theoretically be impacted by intervention. To complicate matters, the static variables
often have robust predictive power. However, the inability for change means that risk
levels stay constant overtime, which makes using these tools to assess the impact of
interventions is impossible. Static factors have been criticized for targeting race, religion,
and unfairly stereotyping. John Monahan (2012) contends that the discriminatory nature
of static factors should be investigated further but that the factors should not be
immediately eschewed given their predictive quality.

5.3.3. Violent Extremism Risk Assessment

Of particular interest to this analysis are the tools that purport efficacy for
individuals in the “pre-crime” space. The Canadian-developed Violent Extremism Risk
Assessment protocol (VERA/VERA 2) claims to be useful in that space.5 There have
been several studies that try to evaluate the effectiveness of these tools (Beardsley and

5 VERA-2 contains indicators associated with 25 risk factors and 6 protective factors. The main
areas of focus are: Beliefs and Attitudes, Context and Intent, History and Capability, Commitment
and Motivation.
Beech, 2013). Unfortunately, none have been able to confirm whether these tools measure what they are designed to measure (Herzog-Evans, 2018).

VERA was designed to be a probabilistic tool that can assess “the propensity of [an] individual to engage in acts of violent extremism” (Pressman and Flockton, 2012, p 329, cited in Herzog-Evans, 2018). The tool’s developers suggest it can be used predictively. That is a very strong position. In addition, the creators suggest that the tool can be operated by a computer algorithm using a Bayesian Framework from medical diagnostics. Unlike medical diagnosis, however, proclivity for extremist violence cannot be diagnosed in a truly empirical way.

5.4. In Support of Individual Risk Factors

As described above, there is a myriad of issues surrounding risk assessment tools, especially when used in the pre-criminal space. However, there is definite progress being made identifying risk factors. One example of progress comes from a study sponsored by the National Institutes of Justice in the United States (Jensen & LaFree, 2016). The ambitious research sought information on “the demographic, background, and radicalization differences between and within the different ideological milieus…[the] contextual, personal, ideological, or experiential differences between radicals who commit violent acts and those who do not,” as well as whether or not pathways to violent extremism can be identified, and whether or not the causal mechanisms currently identified have any basis in empirical evidence (Jensen & LaFree, 2016). The researchers built a US database on radicalization with 1,473 violent and non-violent extremist profiles. Each profile was described by 147 variables covering “demographic, background, group affiliation, and ideological information” as well as 56 “life course narratives…analyzed using fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis” (Jensen & LaFree, 2016).

This research analyzed supposed risk factors for lone-actor and group-based extremist violence. The research results featured a number of key preliminary findings. First, all other factors held constant, the most significant risk factors associated with
violent outcomes among radicalized individuals were “pre-radicalization criminal activity and post-radicalization clique membership” (Jensen & LaFree, 2016). The research also demonstrated that the mix of psychological, emotional, material, group-based, and a host of other factors combine in non-linear ways on many pathways to violent extremism. The rough radicalization pathways offered from the research findings are the familiar lost significance and grievance-based models. While the research generally affirmed the importance of collective and personal psychology, the analysis failed to account for 15 of 35 cases of radicalization to violent extremism.

However promising, like all research in this field it still suffered from a lack of complete data, novel criteria of analysis, and subjective option. Critically, the research could only “control” for radicalization and extremism by using publicly available data to build individual profiles based on “individuals’ criminal activities and/or violent plots, their attachment to ideological milieus, and their demographic[s]” (Jensen & LaFree, 2016).

In addition to Jensen & LaFree (2016), one of the most compelling assessments of risk factors and the difficulties validating them comes from John Monahan (2012). Monahan’s systematic review found that while almost no risk factors for terrorism were validated, there are roughly five types of factors that could prove useful. The factors are (a) ideology, (b) affiliation, (c) grievances, (d) moral emotions, and (e) identity. Because risk assessment tools for violent extremism cannot be validated in the same way tools for quotidian violence can be, Monahan recommends the use of SPJ. In order to validate risk assessment tools, Monahan finds that analyzing individual risk factors through group validation is the best course. This process involves measuring risk factor prevalence in an offending group and non-offending group and looking for disparity. However, this tactic only measures correlation, and cannot determine if the risk factor was present prior to offense.

Using risk assessment tools to prevent terrorism is difficult because of the inability to identify the correct dynamic factors at play in a given case. This task is made doubly challenging by then requiring that practitioners identify what programming can meet the needs associated with those factors (RTI International, 2018).
Chapter 6.

Jurisdiction Scan

The purpose of this jurisdiction scan is to learn from relevant jurisdictions that have gone through the policy cycle more times than Canada—specifically as it relates to early intervention programming. The UK was chosen because of its role as first-actor and because it had, at first, uniquely negative experiences. The US was chosen because, like Canada, intervention-based work is relatively novel there. Denmark was chosen because of its unique experience with a law-enforcement-integrated multi-agency approach.

6.1. The United Kingdom

The UK is used in this jurisdiction scan because it was the “first actor” in CVE. It has experienced some of the real negative unintended consequences associated with counter-terror, but also had some unique achievements. However, as referenced earlier, the UK has a markedly different threat environment than Canada does. In the UK there are thousands of “subjects of interest” in relation to violent extremism at any time, and the chance of attack is “highly likely” (Security Service, 2019).

History

Prime Minister Tony Blair’s government developed the UK’s post-9/11 counter-terror strategy (CONTEST) in 2003 (HM Government, 2009). CONTEST has four pillars, Prevent, Pursue, Protect, and Prepare. After the 2005 London bombings, the UK government launched its PVE/CVE programs through a fund which provided £6 million to 70 local authorities to develop networks between police, religious organizations, and schools (Romaniuk, 2015). The official Prevent strategy debuted in 2008 and funding rose to £140 million in 2009 (Briggs, 2010). The UK government’s intervention program, Channel, began in 2007 and increased in prominence after 2011 when the government began to address behavioral radicalization.
**Programming**

As referenced above, the Channel program is the UK’s primary early intervention program. Channel works through referrals from the public and staff in organizations in contact with the public. Specifically, “local authorities, schools, colleges, universities, health bodies, prisons, probation organisations, and the police” are statutorily compelled to report (Home Office, 2017). Within this program, members of the public are also encouraged to refer suspected radicals to their local authorities. Upon referral, a Channel panel and local authorities collaborate to design a tailored intervention program for an individual.

**Philosophy**

Early versions of Prevent in the UK were preoccupied with cognitive radicalization. To some extent that still appears accurate. In 2011 the role of Prevent expanded to cover even non-violent extremism (Home Office, 2011). A key part of the definition of extremism provided by the Home Office was “…views opposed to Fundamental British Values” (Home Office, 2011, p 34). Substantial evidence suggests that preventing or countering cognitive radicalization is extremely difficult (Romaniuk, 2015; Horgan, 2014).

**Results and Reactions**

**Negative Reactions to Channel**

The Channel program has been criticized for basing interventions on illegitimate science and for pathologizing dissent (Kundnani, 2014; Qureshi, 2016). In 2015, the voluntary referral process for Channel changed to a legally compelling duty. This change was criticized for securitizing teachers, healthcare workers, and social workers. One of the central criticisms of Channel is that it warps the missions of the Prevent and Pursue components of CONTEST. The distinction between the two pillars is that Prevent is non-kinetic whereas Pursue is the disruptive element of CONTEST led by police and intelligence. Particularly after the 2015 statutory duty to report, the public is concerned that civil society is being instrumentalized to feed information to law enforcement. This concern is found in many different analyses of the program (Dudenhoefer, 2018; Heath-Kelly, 2013; Kundnani, 2009; Thomas, 2009). Even though the fears of intelligence gathering are largely unfounded, negative perceptions are hard to improve. Between
2015-2016, 65% of cases were referred for “Islamist extremism,” and only 10% were referred for signs of right-wing extremism (Home Office, 2017). Troublingly from a program effectiveness standpoint, one-third of all referrals in 2015-2016 came from teachers (Home Office, 2017). Programs are more effective when involving “key gatekeepers” like friends and family.

The UK government hired Waterhouse Consulting Group to evaluate the original Prevent strategy in Birmingham in 2008. One of Waterhouse’s findings was many in the community felt that “PVE funding is driving attention away from the real causes of extremism, which are the Government’s foreign policy that is anti-Muslim” (Waterhouse Consulting Group, 2008, p 12).

There is a substantial amount of evidence, in the form of polling, interviews, content analysis, and evaluation research, that finds Prevent programming stigmatized Muslim communities in the UK (Briggs, 2006; Kundnani, 2015). Evaluations from programs in the UK found that program staff believed the focus on Muslim communities contributed to losses in social cohesion, which is a “‘race relations’ policy priority” (Thomas, 2008). A 2011 program review admitted that Prevent policy had given the impression that Muslim communities were more suspect than others (Home Office, 2011).

Positive Reactions to Channel and Other Programming

Subsequent iterations of Prevent have been more well-received, culturally sensitive, and grounded in lessons learned from previous failures (Romaniuk, 2015). For example, concerns related to Islamist extremism in 2017-2018 accounted for only 44% cases reviewed and 45% of cases that received support. In 2017-2018, Islamist extremism and right-wing extremism were roughly at parity in both the referrals and cases taken (Home Office, 2018). In addition, Prevent has programs other than Channel that are more positively perceived, like the “Strategy to Reach, Empower, and Educate Teenagers” (STREET). This program pairs youth generally at risk of anti-social behaviour with credible mentors from their own communities. STREET uses a holistic method where interventions can take any number of shapes—including challenging ideology, improving self-belief, engaging in debate, and building an individual’s “social capital” through education and vocational training (Ranstorp et al., 2016). This program operates on self-referrals, and not on statutory requirements to report. Much of the
contemporary criticism of Prevent and Channel is likely misplaced (Ducol, 2019, personal communication; Wallace, 2016). Through three policy cycles of trial and error, Prevent has created a roadmap for other jurisdictions to understand the successes and pitfalls of CVE policy. Most importantly, Prevent demonstrates the importance of transparency and precision in policy design.

6.2. The United States of America

The US is included in this jurisdiction scan because it is new to intervention-based programs and, like Canada, is heavily influenced by the UK’s Prevent policy. In addition, much like Canada, the United States is a late arrival to early intervention programs domestically despite supporting them internationally (Muro et al., 2017).

History

The history of early interventions in the United States begins in 2011 with the White House CVE Strategy and accompanying White House CVE Implementation Plan (White House, 2011). CVE garnered more attention after the 2013 Boston Marathon bombing when the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC), the Department of Justice (DOJ), and the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), began engaging Muslim communities. Although they claimed to be addressing “all forms” of terrorism, even a cursory look at the programs funded make it clear that “jihadi violence” was the target (Rosand, 2017). This strategy was revised in 2016 before Donald Trump became president. Once Trump assumed office in 2017, the rhetoric and funding that characterized CVE under the Obama administration changed markedly. Whether or not the programming changed substantially is a matter of debate (Hughes and Ingram, 2019).

Programming

Like the UK, the American strategy under the Obama White House used intervention programs, capacity building and development grants for Muslim communities, and a very limited effort at counter-messaging (Koushik & Patel, 2017). Intervention programs piloted through the DOJ exist in Boston, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and Montgomery County. The Boston program, euphemistically named “Promoting Engagement, Acceptance and Community Empowerment” (PEACE) is a
dual-purpose community engagement/intervention program. After a review in 2016, PEACE altered their programming slightly. PEACE ended its Channel-style referral program in favour of a program that solicits “spouses, parents, guardians or caretakers who are concerned that a child in their care or custody, or adult…may engage in violence” (Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Human Services, 2016, p 4).

For the focus of this research, one important past initiative in the US is the FBI’s Social Responsibility Committees (SRCs). The UK Channel program directly inspired SRCs. However, any support for the SRCs was quickly scuttled when a report leaked to The Intercept showed that SRCs allowed for broad information sharing of individual cases among intelligence agencies (Currier and Hussain, 2016). SRCs are considered to have been “dead on arrival” more so because of the secrecy surrounding their rollout than the program design itself (Rosand, 2017).

**Philosophy**

It appears that the US was inspired by Prevent in the UK, although the US placed less overt emphasis on cognitive radicalization. America’s reticence to get involved with CVE at all is an indication that the government believed (a) Muslim integration in America served as a salve to radicalization, (b) that traditional repressive measures were effective, and (c) that a host of issues surround separation of church and state and the First Amendment made CVE uniquely un-American (Vidino, 2017).

**Results and Reception**

Reception of CVE policy overall in the United States has been mainly negative. A host of American-Muslim organizations condemned the policies from inception. The rollout of the SRCs cast a pall over the role of the federal government in CVE generally. Serious concerns about civil liberty violations generally torpedoed public perception of the policies. CVE remains a very unpopular policy theme at the federal and local levels in the United States. However, not all CVE programs in the US received universal condemnation. Programs in Boston (now family counseling focused) and Minneapolis are not entirely disapproved of by CVE’s harshest critics at The Brennen Center for Justice (Kouhsik & Patel, 2016).
6.3. The Kingdom of Denmark

The Danish approach to counter-terror interventions is worthwhile to consider because (a) it is fundamentally very different from the approaches in North America and (b) it is widely regarded as successful within a very complex and fraught threat environment. It is also a good case-study for why successful strategies in one jurisdiction might not apply to others. Denmark’s success is dependent on a very infrequent occurrence in government: a deeply integrated network of free-flowing lateral cooperation.

History

The contemporary Danish approach has roots to the 1980s and the SSP (school, social services, and police) model of community policing. SSP was particularly well-established in the city of Aarhus, and the Danish approach is often referred to as the Aarhus model. The Aarhus model itself began in 2007 when SSP Aarhus began research and programming designed to counter radicalization (Agerschou, 2014).

Programming

The core of this multi-agency approach is within police departments where teams of police and social workers occupy an “info house” where information on possible radicals is shared laterally between all SSP participant agencies. Programs developed from this structure range include everything from early intervention programs to reintegration and rehabilitation programs for returning fighters. A mentorship program for at risk individuals is central to Aarhus programming. The compelling part of the Danish model isn’t the programming that reaches people, it’s the structure of the system itself. The system is integrated into social life, there are few barriers to communication between agencies, and there is little of the ubiquitous inter-agency fighting that plagues other jurisdictions including Canada.

Philosophy and Family Counseling

The core of Denmark’s approach is a concept called “Life Psychology”. The aim of Life Psychology is to develop “solution-focused” tools to aid in building strong pro-social connections and provide support to friends and families of extremists (Ranstorp et al., 2016). One type of early intervention Denmark’s system provides is family support.
and counseling. Family support programs help families of foreign fighters or other extremists with social services and family counseling is an approach to early intervention that focuses on developing partnerships with friends and family and supporting them, instead of targeting the radicalizing individual directly. There is substantial support for a family counseling approach to early interventions in the literature because of the importance pro-social bonds and trusting relationships have to prevent and reverse radicalization (Koehler & Ehrt, 2018).

**Results and Reception**

The Danish model is widely regarded to be effective at determining whether law enforcement or social services should handle a case (Koehler, 2016). However, the broader Aarhus model had trouble being exported to other jurisdictions even within Denmark. It did not, for example, find success in Copenhagen (Tammikko, 2018). However, the failure in Copenhagen was the result of a botched effort at engaging a “radical” community, not from the early intervention work. In addition, SSP had become integral to policing before the Aarhus model for municipally-led CVE was grafted onto it. This structural factor is one that other jurisdictions should consider before applying this model directly.

From a practical standpoint, lateral institutional cooperation and use of targeting interventions worked for Denmark. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark learned fundamental policy lessons following their experience with “CVE”. The ministry suggested that:

While there is room for policy work on CVE and exchanges of lessons learned, we should be realistic about its impact unless action plans etc. are matched with implementation mechanisms and the human and financial resources required. *Thus, it would be useful if these policy initiatives were accompanied by a focus on “what it takes” as well as “what works”.* (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, 2015; emphasis mine).
Chapter 7.

CVE to CRV Policy in Canada

7.1. Canada’s First Counter-Terror Strategy

7.1.1. Strategy

Public Safety published Canada’s first comprehensive counter-terror strategy, *Building Resilience Against Terrorism*, in 2012. Prior to this strategy Canada’s approach had been traditional repressive tools or interventive tools characterized by RCMP-led community outreach and elite roundtables. The 2012 report detailed an approach and objectives heavily influenced by the UK’s CONTEST strategy. CONTEST was developed with four pillars: Prevent, Pursue, Protect, and Prepare. Canada’s strategy had four pillars as well: Prevent, Detect, Deny, and Respond. However, the similarities between UK Prevent and Canadian Prevent were mostly superficial, as minimal resources were devoted to the Canadian program. Fundamentally, this first strategy was indicative of a response more devoted to Pursue and Protect than Prevent and Prepare.

Radicalization, which is the precursor to violent extremism, is a process by which individuals are introduced to an overtly ideological message and belief system that encourages movement from moderate, mainstream beliefs towards extremist views. This becomes a threat to national security when individuals or groups espouse or engage in violence as a means of promoting political, ideological or religious objectives (Government of Canada, 2013, p. 15).

As is evident from this definition, the federal government understood radicalization to be a direct precursor to violent extremism. This strategy had not distinguished between radicalization and violent radicalization. Different from CONTEST, however, Canada’s strategy supported the notion that behavioural radicalization was what mattered, as opposed cognitive radicalization which is an even fuzzier concept.

7.1.2. Programming

For the first three years of *Building Resilience Against Terrorism*, Canada’s Prevent policies consisted of a Cross-Cultural Roundtable on Security that aimed to
bring “leading citizens” to share perspectives on national security, and the RCMP’s National Security Community Outreach, which led local initiatives to engage communities. This approach, community engagement to countering violent extremism approach, was the first tack chosen by UK Prevent as well. Results from evaluations spurred a change in these efforts, however, and the UK largely abandoned community engagement programming after 2011. The policy community, and subsequently Public Safety itself, regarded Canadian first efforts at Prevent as inoffensive but ineffective. The 2013 document made only passing reference to research—which would come from a program called the Kanishka Project. The Kanishka Project enabled Canadian researchers to generate Canadian-specific literature on terrorism and radicalization.

The involvement of sub-national law enforcement in radicalization prevention/intervention programming has been relatively common in other countries, particularly in Europe (Koehler, 2016; Romaniuk, 2015). In Canada, this is a new policy tool. Traditionally these issues were framed as national security and were put under the remit of relevant federal agencies. When CRV in Canada was strictly the bailiwick of the RCMP—which changed in 2015—the role of sub-national law enforcement bodies was limited to contributing to the RCMP’s Integrated National Security Enforcement Teams (INSETs).

7.1.3. Risk Factors and Indicators

The 2013 strategy document made only passing mention of risk factors, noting “a focus on individual motivations, and other factors...that make individuals susceptible to violent extremist ideologies” (Public Safety, 2013, p 13). This quote indicates an official position on the understanding of radicalization. Namely, that vulnerabilities lead to ideologies linearly.

An RCMP document from 2016 provides a detailed list of indicators that were supposed to guide the public to identify radicals in their midst. Among these indicators were: changes of interests, change in the way of thinking and interacting with others, rejection of state (politics and social values), and change in appearance and dress style. Indicators like these, ones that reference appearance and behaviour common to almost
everyone at one point in their lives, are considered invalid in recent publications from Canadian intervention programs (CPRLV, 2016; Calgary Re-Direct, n.d.).

7.2. Canada’s Second Counter-Terror Strategy

7.2.1. Background

The Canada Centre became the new home for Canadian CRV within Public Safety when it received its first funding in 2016 and launched in 2017. The remit of the Centre is primarily to provide leadership, resources, and coordination for civil-society led efforts. One of the Centre’s tasks was to revise the national strategy. In 2018 the Centre released the National Strategy on Countering Radicalization to Violence. This new strategy presents a nuanced approach to CRV and is a useful document for policymakers and the public. The Centre received $35 million for five years and $10 million ongoing annually. $7 million of that $10 million will support research and various programs discussed below. The other $3 million presumably operates the Canada Centre itself.

7.2.2. Policy & Programming

Important to the focus of this research, one of the most significant changes in policy between 2013 and 2018 is the focus on supporting early interventions. Supporting interventions is one of three key priorities identified in the strategy. The other two are building/sharing knowledge and addressing radicalization online. For a detailed description and analysis of each early intervention program see Chapter 8.

The policy emphasizes a whole-of-government approach, prevention, early intervention, research, coordination, and capacity building. In particular, building the capacity of practitioners and intervention professionals is recognized as effective practice by IMPACT Europe, an EU-funded evaluation methods and knowledge database. It is the beginnings of a resilient strategy to CRV. The strategy details a model

---

7 For a more detailed explanation of risk factors, see: pg. 20. Or, for a risk factors identified in the 2018 strategy, see pg. 33
of support for the municipality and civil society led approach to targeted programming through grants from the Community Resilience Fund.

First Steps to the Public Health Approach

In many ways, this strategy represents the first steps to a framework for CRV that the literature calls “the public health approach”. At its core this approach supports a broadly distributed practitioner base. Instead of police being the primary practitioners, this approach aims to allow development of programs in health, social services, and civil society organizations and applies the “Ten Essential Public Health Services Framework” to the problem of extremist violence. The evidence of this approach written into the 2018 strategy include: support for organizations doing risk factor research in the health system, support for organizations doing early intervention in the “pre-criminal” space, support for education campaigns for communities, developing community partnerships and mobilizing civil society, developing training and tools to support community CRV efforts, and support for scientific research. The public health approach is not fully embraced in Canadian government yet. If it were, there would be more support for mainstreaming psycho-social early interventions across civil society and social services throughout Canada and limiting the role of law enforcement agencies. However, the 2018 National Strategy is definitely influenced by public health concepts.

Multi-Agency Approach and Holistic Case Management

First, it has been shown that early interventions can be successful (Koehler, 2016; Ranstorp, 2016). While it is difficult to effectively evaluate programming, available evaluations combined with ex-extremist reports suggest a few key factors in early interventions. Usually successful interventions include a “social and motivating” element, the development of “new social networks and education and employment”, the strengthening of existing pro-social bonds, and sometimes an ideological component (Ranstorp, 2016). Like everything in counter-terror this policy design is not unanimously approved of and requires further validation. Nonetheless, early interventions are an important tool, since it is easier to intervene and avert the solidification of radicalization than to fully deradicalize/disengage a committed individual.

---

8 See Appendix E for a detailed discussion of the ten essential public health services and their application to CRV
Multi-Agency Approach

Numerous cities across Canada use a multi-agency model, often called hubs or situation tables, to handle cases of radicalization. This model functions by receiving referrals from the public, law enforcement, or non-law-enforcement officials, depending on the program. Hub partners typically include representatives from the medical community, religious community, education, social work, and police. These partners receive referrals, convene regular meetings, and decide which at-risk cases go to which participating organizations. These hubs are either established anew or built onto existing service architecture. Although they are important as an information sharing platform between public, private, and civil society, it remains unclear whether or not the interventions associated with this approach are effective. Proponents of the approach in Canada concede that its effectiveness is linked to high levels of lateral cooperation on all levels of engagement (Ranstorp et al., 2016). This is a very challenging standard to meet. Canada’s 2018 National Strategy finds that multi-agency intervention programs are “recognized as good practices for countering radicalization to violence for individuals who show potential for imminent harm to self or others” (Public Safety, 2018, p 33). The standard of “imminent harm” does appear to be a possible weak point in the theory, if not the practice. It seems doubtful that individuals radicalized to extremist violence deeply enough that they present “imminent harm” would participate in a voluntary deradicalization program led by law enforcement. One of the factors critical to Canadian CRV success has been healthy relationships between local police and communities. Those relationships have enabled the multi-agency approach to avoid missteps and stigmatization (Ottis, 2016). However, the small scale and scope of these programs also may help contribute to that success.

Holistic Case Management

Holistic case management teams, which are different from hubs, are rare in Canada. Case management teams are inter-disciplinary groups that handle casework collectively. Instead of delegating to a specific agency or partner, like the multi-agency approach, a team of psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers assess cases, develop a timeline, and execute collectively on intervention plans. Usually, those plans

---

9 Either the standard of “imminent harm” is not used in practice, or only effective for individuals with peace bonds/already involved in the criminal justice system.
involve some combination of counseling, mental health services, vocational aid, mentorship, and spiritual counselling. The advantages of holistic case management approaches are two-fold. First, psycho-social interventions are the most supported way to counter early radicalization (Souris & Singh, 2018). Second, as entities separate from law enforcement, unlike the multi-agency approaches, holistic case management teams are more approachable for the family and friends of radicalizers. Family and friends are often able to perceive signs of radicalization but do not have the tools to address it.

Risk Factors

The risk factor categories for individuals suggested in the 2018 strategy are social networks, grievances, vulnerabilities, sense of belonging, and inclination towards violence. There is also recognition paid to both protective factors and factors in group mobilization to violence. In contrast to the first strategy, second strategy risk factors do not imply a linear relationship between extremist ideology and extremist violence.
Chapter 8.

Preliminary Analysis of Canadian Early Intervention Programs

8.1. Importance of Actors

The purpose of describing each program in a typology is to create a way to compare the many different programs that Public Safety identifies as interventions (which includes multi-agency hubs and holistic case management). In this analysis, both are referred to as early intervention. There are nine early intervention programs funded through the Canada Centre. It is likely that there are, or soon will be, many more early intervention programs with a CRV component through the Global Network of Community Safety (GNCS). The GNCS is an organization that aids municipalities with multi-agency strategies. However, for clarity, this analysis only addresses programs identified on Public Safety’s website. This analysis will not recommend direct changes to the programs examined in this chapter. That would be poor analysis and contrary to the community-led approach of CRV. This research had limited access to information on program details, many are still in development, so this section is a heuristic for thinking about early intervention programs in Canada and how they appear based on findings from literature and practices in other jurisdictions.

8.2. Canadian Early Intervention Programs

8.2.1. Descriptive Factors Identified

This analysis identifies aspects of program content and design that might impact efficacy and ethics. Primarily, this portion of the analysis is concerned with how closely aligned early intervention programs are with law enforcement, and whether the programs also feature community engagement efforts with CRV components. Additionally, the

10 Global Network for Community Safety has over 100 confirmed partner sites in Canada: It is unclear if they all will have a CRV component but FOCUS Toronto (associated with GNCS) is in partnership with CVE Toronto (led by Toronto Police Service).

causal mechanism or “approach” of the intervention is assessed for efficacy and possible knock-on effects. However, this analysis was only able to find reliable information on the causal mechanism for three of the nine programs examined below in section 8.3. This analysis recognizes that CE is not a part of early intervention as defined within this paper. However, the research suggests that CE can impact program effectiveness overall.

This analysis focuses on the role of law enforcement and delimits this into three categories of alignment: maximal, medial, minimal. The **maximally** aligned programs include those that are “led” by law enforcement agencies as described by Public Safety and the programs themselves. The **medially** aligned programs are those that indicate they are a “collaboration” between several actors including government/law enforcement. The **minimally** aligned programs are those that do not publicly align with law enforcement. See **Appendix A** for the full detail breakdown of program alignment.

### 8.2.2. Alignment with Law Enforcement

This factor matters most in its relation to the other descriptive factors identified above. However, the alignment itself is important in one respect. As referenced in section 7.2.2., the ability of these programs to impact their target group of radicalized individuals posing “imminent harm” is uncertain.

Local law enforcement is an improvement over the federally implemented community engagement for CRV programs like the RCMP’s Public Engagement Units (PEUs). Local efforts, even by law enforcement, are generally received more positively. Additionally, law enforcement and security agency involvement in intervention programs designed to target individuals suspected of, charged with, or convicted of a crime is a necessity. As a matter of practical reality, it is clear that law enforcement will remain involved in early intervention and CRV generally. This claim is evidenced by prominence of the four multi-agency approaches led by police identified in 8.3. The role of law enforcement as a critical provider and broker of information on suspected radicalizing individuals is what makes the multi-agency approach a valuable addition to counter-terror, despite its drawbacks. Simply put, law enforcement is going to know the most about the cases reviewed, so their place at the multi-agency table is permanent.
8.2.3. Causal Mechanism or “Approach”

It is essential to understand the theoretical approaches of each intervention to gauge its effectiveness or possible knock-on effects. Without knowing exactly what type of intervention programming these services provide, it would be irresponsible to estimate effectiveness based on causal mechanism alone. For example, when evaluating multi-agency approaches, the effectiveness of any particular partner dealing with cases of possible radicalization to violence is unknown. Nonetheless, three case management programs self-identified with the psycho-social intervention approach including programs in Quebec and Edmonton. For these programs, there are a number of practices that can aid the effectiveness of that program. Namely: (a) the connection between mental illness and terrorism is contested. Some studies reject it (Post et al., 2003; Sageman, 2005; Horgan, 2005) and others suggest it may be correlated for specific types, e.g. lone actors and schizophrenia (Corner & Gill, 2015; Corneer et al., 2015; Gruenewald et al., 2013), (b) the role of mental health professionals in intervention work should be to provide expertise on trauma, counseling, and debiasing, not to pathologize radicalization to violence (Koehler, 2016), (c) theological/ideological debates are a questionable approach especially when the implementing agent is the government (Braddock, 2014), and (d) disengagement efforts are most effective if grounded in an individual’s motives and values (Koehler, 2016).

8.2.4. Community Engagement (CE)

One finding from the analysis of CRV interventions planned or in-progress in Canada is that several law enforcement led programs are still running “CE-to-CVE” programs.12 Without knowing the exact nature of community engagement by law enforcement in Canada for CRV, what follows is based only on community engagement efforts in other jurisdictions. UK government research on Prevent suggested there is no evidence that any program can change community-level attitudes (Pratchett et al., 2012).

12 Most problematically, the RCMP still operates Public Engagement Units (PEU) which appear to have a confusing mandate. In an RCMP document, a strategic analyst with the PEU in the Greater Toronto Area suggested that “we don’t talk about political violence” (Government of Canada, 2018). However, in that same document, the federal government suggests that “now that the PEU has accomplished their initial goal of connecting to the community, they’re homing-in on preventing radicalization in youth” and focused on “prevent[ing] youth from engaging in political violence down the road” (Government of Canada, 2018).
As reported in a government-funded evaluation of community-level Prevent programs, there is a very minimal evidentiary basis for any prevention effort (Christmann, 2012). Also, misguided programs can lead to unintended negative consequences. In the case of Denmark’s Aarhus program, there was evidence that targeted community engagement for CVE undid the progress of other critical social policies, like social integration and anti-discrimination (Ottis, 2016).

The reason “CE to CVE” programs are particularly of concern is that law enforcement-led community engagement on counter-terror has been linked to a loss of trust in the “target” community and stigmatization (Home Office, 2011; Koushik & Patel, 2016; Ponsot et al., 2018). Negative interactions with authorities could conceivably become risk factors through generating a grievance and contributing to an “us versus them” worldview. More details of the negatives associated with poorly implemented community engagement to CVE are detailed by Romaniuk (2015).

8.3. Tables & Alignment Typology for Intervention Programs Under Community Resilience Fund

The purpose of the tables is two-fold. First, the tables offer a representation of early intervention programs in Canada according to factors identified as important in the analysis above. Second, this typology allows the analysis to focus on potential problem areas, like maximally aligned programs with CRV-relevant community engagement programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Holistic Case Management (HCM)(^{13})</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>Intervention Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quebec 1, HCM</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Psycho-social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec 2, HCM</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Psycho-social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton, HCM</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Psycho-social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, HCM</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) As of March 30, 2019, this analysis can only confirm that the Quebec 1 HCM, Quebec 2 HCM, Calgary MA, and Toronto MA programs are operational. Ottawa MA, is active but it is not clear if their early intervention program is. The other case management/multi-agency programs received funding between 2016-2018, but no public information is available as to operation.
Table 4. Multi-Agency (MA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>Intervention Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton, MA</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, MA</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary, MA</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, MA</td>
<td>Maximal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia, MA</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.1. Law Enforcement Led Multi-Agency Approach

This analysis does not suggest that community safety programs like Ottawa MA, Toronto MA, and others, are ineffective. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that for certain problems, community safety and law enforcement led multi-agency approaches are very effective. Some believe those approaches are a prerequisite to more nuanced CRV (Ranstorp et al., 2016; Silk, 2012; Weine et al., 2017). The involvement of law enforcement in early intervention programs is often a practical necessity. Nonetheless, it is necessary to maintain a critical distance because of the unique set of ethical and practical problems associated with this programming for CRV.

The program can quickly lose the trust of potential participants when the line between assistance and intelligence gathering is blurred. The experience of Channel in the UK resulted in precisely this outcome. As a result, 90 percent of referrals to that program come from individuals legally required to do so (police, schools, National Health Service) as opposed to “key gatekeepers” in the community (Hamilton, 2015). This analysis does not suggest Channel is destiny for Canada’s early intervention or community safety programs. However, without robust protections and safeguards in place, some of the same negative knock-on effects are possible.

Equally important to the multi-agency approach as maintaining a trusting relationship with clients is achieving true lateral cooperation, decision-making, and information sharing, with other partner agencies. The role of law enforcement at the “head of the table”—always able to control a case if need be—can undermine this unique advantage of the multi-agency approach.
Chapter 9.

Criteria and Measures

The overall goal for any counter-terror policy is to reduce harm. There are two fundamentally different types of harms that counter-terror policies must balance. The first is harm from an act of extremist violence. The second is the potential harm from the policy itself. The need to balance these two goals is illustrated by the potential benefits and harms associated with early intervention programming. With these goals in mind, criteria and measures have been developed to evaluate policies for early intervention programming.

This chapter includes the policy objectives to consider when evaluating policy options in Chapter 10. There are a number of important trade-offs between policy options that these criteria will demonstrate.

9.1. Criteria

The primary societal policy objective for this analysis is protection and security. Early interventions have the potential to improve the security of all Canadians against extremist violence. The secondary societal policy objective is rights and freedoms. The damage that early interventions can do to rights and freedoms is the most significant possible harm associated with counter-terror policy. Governmental goals, budgetary cost and ease of implementation are evaluated as well. A number of criteria and measures explains each objective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Policy Specific Measures</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection &amp; Security</td>
<td>Reduced death and harm from terrorism or extremist violence</td>
<td>Projected ability to reduce death and harm from terrorism or extremist violence</td>
<td><strong>Policy 1:</strong> (a) number of early intervention programs after 2022; (b) number of referrals to the programs; (c) number of cases terminated as a “success”  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Policy 2:</strong> (a) number of rights protections built into programs; (b) number of resources altered after peer-review, (c) changes in public trust  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Policy 3:</strong> (a) number of family counseling programs; (b) number of referrals to the programs; (c) number of cases terminated as a “success”; (d) number of and numbers of members in parents’ assocs.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Policy 4:</strong> (a) number of early intervention programs in CHCs; (b) number of programs led by non-law-enforcement actor; (c) number of cases taken; (d) ratio of cases referred to cases passed on to law enforcement; (e) number of cases terminated as a “success”</td>
<td>Low-High  &lt;br&gt; Higher is better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected ability to avert knock-on protection and security impacts from CRV intervention-based programs</td>
<td>Policy 1: (a) number of programs led by law enforcement; (b) number of law enforcement led programs featuring ideological component; (c) number of rights protections in status quo  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Policy 2:</strong> (a) number of safeguard policies (see Option 2) implemented  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Policy 3:</strong> (a) number of family counseling programs, (b) number of evaluations that confirm families not being securitized/used primarily as intel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-High  &lt;br&gt; Higher is better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Objective</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Policy Specific Measures</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights &amp; Freedoms</strong></td>
<td>Ability of Canadians to exercise rights and freedoms</td>
<td>Projected effect on ability of Canadians to exercise the rights and freedoms established in the <em>Canadian Charter</em> and in case law</td>
<td><strong>Policy 1:</strong> (a) content analysis of support/opposition from civil rights associations, (b) number of CRV-related complaints from the public, (c) analysis of program evaluations for pathologizing radicalization</td>
<td>Low-High&lt;br&gt;Higher is better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgetary Cost to Government</strong></td>
<td>Cost to government</td>
<td>Theoretic NPV for Community Resilience Fund distributions to CRV interventions for the projected lifetime of the policy (2021+ unknown), 3% discount rate</td>
<td><strong>Policy 1:</strong> Cost to maintain current levels in perpetuity&lt;br&gt;<strong>Policy 2:</strong> Cost to implement safeguards &amp; protections in Policy 2&lt;br&gt;<strong>Policy 3:</strong> Cost of family counseling programs accepted through Canada Centre RFPs ($500,000 maximum per year)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Policy 4:</strong> Cost to scale public health/psycho-social intervention programming nationwide</td>
<td>Low-High&lt;br&gt;Lower is better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Objective</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Policy Specific Measures</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Easy of Implementation | Political viability | Projected acceptability of the policy within government | **Policy 1:** (a) Government acceptance of current policy; (b) number of years current policy continues  
**Policy 2:** Government acceptance, including: Canada Centre, Public Safety, and funded organizations within government  
**Policy 3:** Government acceptance, including: Canada Centre and Public Safety  
**Policy 4:** Government acceptance, including: MPs, Public Safety, Canada Centre, RCMP, provinces, municipalities, health and social services | Low-High  
Higher is better |
| Administrative operability | Projected ability to coordinate laterally between various agencies at various levels of governance and with the private sector | **Policy 1:** (a) ability of status quo policy to maintain Canada Centre, (b) ability of Canada Centre to fund sustainable coordination bodies  
**Policy 2:** (a) number of billable hours required to implement Policy 2, (b) perceived level of buy-in from community partners  
**Policy 3:** (a) number of grant applications to do family counseling work  
**Policy 4:** (a) number of coordinating bodies/systems in place, (b) number of participating governments, agencies, and organizations | Low-High  
Higher is better |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Policy Specific Measures</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical feasibility</td>
<td>Projected availability of necessary expertise within relevant agencies and private partners to execute on the policy</td>
<td><strong>Policy 1:</strong> (a) number of practitioners trained by Canada Centre grantees; (b) number of CRV “experts” in any organization doing early intervention</td>
<td>Low-High Higher is better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Policy 2:</strong> (a) number of civil rights officers or attorneys at Public Safety, (b) number of independent experts available to peer-review materials (see Policy 2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Policy 3:</strong> (a) number of organizations that respond to family counseling RFPs, (b) quality of grant applications to that RFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Policy 4:</strong> (a) number and distribution of professionals in CRV-relevant fields, (b) number of CRV training tools available, (c) number of successfully laterally coordinated projects between all levels of government and private sector in the status quo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 10.

Policy Options

This analysis presents four policy scenarios that represent the most plausible alterations a policymaker might consider to the 2018 strategy. One of the policy options, however, is not a change. The status quo should be evaluated as a policy option, not just to serve as a baseline comparison for other policies but also because the status quo for early intervention policy in Canada is less than a year old. Because the community-led approach is universally considered good practice, meaning interference in programs from the federal government is not, the policy options do not include specific programmatic changes to early interventions programs in place (discussed in Chapter 8).

10.1. Option 1: Status Quo

The Canada Centre’s 2018 National Strategy details support for two distinct approaches to early intervention, the multi-agency approach and holistic case management. The policies surrounding early intervention programs in the status quo are enumerated in Chapter 7 and the programs themselves are detailed in Chapter 8. In addition to these tools, the Canada Centre is committed to building capacity of practitioners and developing appropriate resources for training, intervention, and more. Capacity building for practitioners and early intervention programs are linked because early interventions are still in the experimental phase in Canada. The hope is that successes, failures, and “good practices” can be uncovered through research and experimentation.

This research identified five multi-agency units operating with a CRV element in Canada. There are likely many more in development. In addition to the multi-agency units, there are four early intervention programs in the status quo, or in development, that this analysis calls “holistic case management”. The Canada Centre refers to these as intervention efforts, but also ties their merit to research, the development of validated risk factors, and design of appropriate intervention techniques. To maintain the status quo of early intervention programs in Canada, the Canada Centre has dedicated less
than $7 million per year after 2021. This is indicative of the locally-led approach to CRV that Canada practices.

10.2. Option 2: Status Quo + Mandatory Safeguards

Safeguards for citizens who participate in early interventions should not be an afterthought. There should be safeguards built into the design and implementation of programs that receive federal funding. For example, as of 2019 the Community Resilience Fund does not require grant applicants to describe potential impacts on civil rights and freedoms (Public Safety Canada, 2019). It does not suggest that applicants propose ways to mitigate or prevent those impacts. Mandating something to this effect is a bare minimum needed to protect the rights and freedoms of Canadians.

To go further Public Safety should provide civil safeguards that cover all early intervention programs. As described in Koushik & Patel (2017), these protections should include (a) complete information on all programs and activities available publicly online; (b) evaluation of all intervention programs by civil rights officers or attorneys at Public Safety using a public methodology (c) public access to non-sensitive portions of evaluations; (d) peer review and publication of early intervention training tools, data and privacy protocols, and evaluation tools; (e) development of specific protocols to protect client information; (f) creation of a hotline for intervention-relevant complaints, (g) peer review of all risk assessment tools used by programs doing early intervention work.

10.3. Option 3: Status Quo + Family Counseling and Support

Although a top-down approach to program design is inadvisable in CRV, the Canada Centre should issue an RFP for family counseling programs based on data indicating that they represent a uniquely promising approach to early intervention. Family counseling programs engage the families of people potentially radicalizing to violence almost exclusively, instead of the person thought to be radicalizing. Family counseling programs are able to focus on families of individuals particularly early in the radicalization process, aim to temper that process, and engage families as partners in disengagement. Families are included in the design of all strategies and are equipped with tools to help them throughout the process. These partnerships are based on trust and are not exploited for intelligence gathering.
In addition to the role of families and friends in the counseling process, there is compelling evidence that establishing support groups for the families of radicalized individuals and violent extremists can aid in the early intervention process.

10.4. Option 4: Maximal Early Intervention Through the Public Health Approach

The public health approach to early intervention advocates that practitioners should be primarily in health, social services, education, and youth development. Given maximal resources and institutional support the public health approach would mainstream early intervention for radicalization nationwide by embedding it into the routine work of Community Health Centres, clinicians, social workers, while still supporting private organizations dedicated to early intervention. This approach is in contrast to the status quo and to typical “CVE” in which police and security establishment officials are the most common and most prominent practitioners. That is not to say that police involvement is anathema to the public health approach, only that it is not the preferred form of early intervention. The status quo is, more or less, a minimal application of the public health approach to CRV and early intervention. For example, the Canada Centre priorities include support for civil-society led practitioners running targeted programs and support for research.

However, the support for these efforts in the status quo is far short of what would be required to scale this approach nationally. To succeed at scaling up the approach, there would need to be a greater commitment of funding, as well as institutional and political support. The support element is critical because creating lateral partnerships across levels of government and civil-society is necessary for the maximal public health approach. With status quo levels of support, the aim of the public health approach is to create resiliency in the field of CRV by building broad-based informal networks between relevant agencies, organizations, and individuals. The goal of these networks in the status quo is to become endogenous to current structures—essentially mainstreaming CRV early interventions “on a budget”.
Chapter 11.

Analysis of Policy Options

11.1. Option 1: Status Quo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection and Security</th>
<th>Rights and Freedoms</th>
<th>Budgetary Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protection and Security**

The status quo early intervention programs can impact protection and security in two ways. Through successful intervention, these programs can increase the safety of Canadians from extremist violence. However, through misguided practical application these interventions could provide a radicalizing individual with a grievance against the state, which would decrease the safety of Canadians.

A review of the literature and conversations with experts leads this analysis to surmise that overall, early interventions offer a positive impact on protection and security. Multi-agency approaches are good at discovering and delegating responsibility for cases, and holistic case management teams are good at actually doing the psychosocial intervention.

However, current funding commitments will restrict the expansion of holistic case management teams. Because there are very few of these programs nationally, their contribution to the safety of Canadians in the status quo is limited. Holistic case management programs in Canada that rely on calls from the public have also been criticized for missing their target audience (Koehler, 2016). For example, Koehler concludes that since only 2% of the CPRLV’s referrals in 2015-2016 were passed on to police, that 98% of referrals were for information or early intervention purposes (Koehler, 2016). Additionally, these types of programs are criticized for having idle phone lines from a lack of referrals. Koehler understands this as a sort of failure. However, this analysis does not concur. These “third door” programs that lower the barriers to contact for friends, relatives, and self-identified radicals, don’t exist to funnel cases to police,
they exist to do psycho-social interventions for early radicalizers. So, simply looking at the number of cases referred is an insufficient metric.

The shortcomings of holistic case management programs are balanced by the strengths of the multi-agency approach, and vice versa. For example, the multi-agency approaches have greater access to client information and receive cases from a variety of governmental and civil partners. This increases the scope of the program in a positive way. The shortcomings of the multi-agency approach, namely the effectiveness of various government and civil partners at conducting interventions, can be overcome by partnering with a holistic case management service. This is the model currently in development in Edmonton between Edmonton Police Department’s ‘The Resiliency Project’ and an intervention/research-based non-profit called the Organization for Prevention of Violence.

Although early intervention programs in Canada are a recent creation and represent “good practice” overall, the current approach can be described in ways that allow for a thoughtful reaction. For example, many of the practitioners in the current approach are police and security establishment officials. Through a review of the literature and interviews this analysis concludes the law enforcement led approach has a mixed impact on protection and security. The positives associated with information sharing and the multi-agency approach should be tempered by the unresolved issue of exactly who the multiagency programs in Canada are designed for. Recall the imminent harm discussion from earlier (pg. 32). It is unclear that this standard could be met for programs that refer people voluntarily who are in the early stages of radicalization. Also, it is unclear how effective the early interventions from multi-agency partners that do not have holistic case management teams will be at improving the safety of Canadians.

For the reasons enumerated above, the protection and security rating for the status quo is “low/medium”. This does not mean that these programs are ineffective, or that they have made Canadians less safe. Instead, this rating reflects the fact that status quo implementation of early intervention programs is extremely limited, and that protection and security could be readily bolstered by other policies in this analysis.
Rights and Freedoms

At the moment, there is little evidence to indicate that the rights and freedoms of Canadians are being infringed by early intervention programs. First, there are a very limited number of these programs in operation. Second, the programs that are operational have not been accused of any significant wrongdoing when it comes to rights and freedoms of Canadians.

However, if the status quo policy were to continue a few things seem likely to happen. First, the independent holistic case management programs may buckle under lack of funding or institutional support. The CPRLV, which does holistic case management in Montreal, is generally well-received. However, its merit has been questioned by some in the provincial and city governments, and its mandate is under review. Without institutional support, the prospect of these programs spreading is bleak. In their stead, the already expanding multi-agency approaches would become the main early intervention method nationwide (see pg. 34). While nothing particular to Canada is available, law enforcement led multi-agency approaches in other jurisdictions have been identified as potentially problematic for rights and freedoms. Additionally, in the status quo there are a lack of explicit protections for rights and freedoms in early intervention programs like the ones detailed in Option 2.

For the reasons above, the status quo rates “low” for rights and freedoms.

Budgetary Cost

All of the early intervention programs identified in the status quo receive funding from more than one source. However, this analysis views early intervention from the federal jurisdiction. Public Safety’s Community Resilience Fund allocated $35 million over five years to establish the Canada Centre and fund CRV programming. Although it is unclear how much funding exactly went to each program, some information is available. Individual grants are limited to $500,000 per year. Reports indicate that apart from establishing the Canada Centre itself, the bulk of the Community Resilience Fund’s allocation goes to supporting intervention. $35 million is less than a tenth of Public Safety’s national security budget of $400 million over five years. Some in government recommend that counter-terror funding should be in direct proportion to the harms posed by violent extremists. As discussed in section 3.2., Canada’s spending on early
intervention, and counter-terror generally, is in excess of the predicted value of damages.

For these reasons, and to set a baseline by which to compare the other policies, the budgetary cost of early intervention programs is assessed as “medium”.

**Ease of Implementation**

The ease of continuing status quo policies is high. The political will to allow early interventions to operate on the margins exists and it is unlikely to change. The Canada Centre is now an established entity within Public Safety and its plans are already forecasted until at least 2022. Continuing with the methods currently in place represents a minimal implementation challenge from the federal perspective. For the reasons supra, ease of implementation for Option 1 is considered “high”.

11.2. Option 2: Status Quo + Mandatory Safeguards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection and Security</th>
<th>Rights and Freedoms</th>
<th>Budgetary Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protection and Security**

Implementing the safeguards identified in Option 2 would not have a direct impact on protection and security. However, Option 2 can indirectly impact this objective in a few important ways. First, increased transparency and acknowledgement of potential hazards to rights and freedoms will build trust with communities. Community buy-in is crucial, particularly if there is ever a problem or controversy associated with a program. Second, publishing more evaluation data, tools used, going through peer-review, et cetera, will bring about improvements to the methods already in place. One of the shortcomings in CRV historically has been a lack of public evaluation data. Similarly, one of the main lessons learned from CVE in the US and UK is that public perception of the programs is crucial to avoid backlash. By being more transparent with the program methods, tools, and results, Public Safety will build trusting relationships with the public.

Canada has managed to avoid many of the negative experiences that other jurisdictions have had with CRV and early intervention by learning from first-actors, having a small and experimental rollout of these initiatives, and by having competent
public officials, academic experts, and practitioners. However, Canada is not immune from the knock-on effects that can accompany these programs, particularly as more of them begin operating.

Because this policy would not have a direct impact on this objective, but is an improvement over the status quo, it ranks “low/medium”.

**Rights and Freedoms**

As referenced above, currently Public Safety does not require grantees to account for possible knock-on effects to rights and freedoms in their RFP guide. Public Safety does not require that grantees make suggestions for how those possible impacts will be mitigated or averted. This omission is a serious oversight. In addition to the RFP issue, the programs run in the status quo should make all relevant documents and methods (see Option 2) public and available for peer-review. Further, ensuring that intervention programs are evaluated by civil rights officers or attorneys at Public Safety is critical for operation in a potentially very problematic space.

Enacting this policy would do the most to protect the rights and freedoms of Canadians through CRV policy. The scathing Brennen Center report that excoriated CVE in the US does not apply to the Canadian context in many ways, but this analysis finds their guidance on building safeguards into existing policies very compelling.

For the reasons listed, impacts to rights and freedoms from Option 2 is “high”.

**Budgetary Cost**

The budgetary cost of adding these safeguards, e.g., independent evaluations, peer-review, and publishing information online, represents a minimal cost. The only incremental cost associated with this would be expanded evaluation, which is expected to be 10-15% of a program budget. Budgetary cost for Option 2 is “low”.

**Ease of Implementation**

The addition of the measures recommended in Option 2 (section 10.2) to Canada’s early intervention policy and practice would be relatively easy. Granted, adding another layer onto the application process for a grant from the Community Resilience Fund represents incrementally more work. However, it is comparatively little
effort, and the benefits of it would be significant. For the other protections in Option 2 (items a-g), there are models of these policies being implemented in other jurisdictions for minimal cost. For these reasons, ease of implementation is considered “high”.

11.3. Option 3: Status Quo + Family Counseling & Parents’ Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection and Security</th>
<th>Rights and Freedoms</th>
<th>Budgetary Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protection and Security**

Family counseling represents an early intervention method that has potentially significant upside for protection and security per the literature (Global Counterterrorism Forum, 2015; Koehler, 2016; Koehler & Ehrt, 2018; Sikkens et al., 2017). There is support in the literature that (a) friends, family, and social milieu are a critical component of understanding the plurality of pathways to violent extremism and (b) that changes in family environments can encourage disengagement from violence (Koehler, 2016). Developing pro-social ties are also critical to “sustained desistance” (Koehler, 2016). Together, friends and family constitute “associate gatekeepers” that are crucial breaking the barrier necessary to begin early intervention assistance. Additionally, while programs have to be careful not to instrumentalize family and friends—potentially driving the individual further away from their pro-social environment—they can be critical partners when it comes to recognizing violent radicalization. Families of twenty-one former Dutch radicals pointed to the need for resources and knowledge about countering various ideologies and worldviews (Sikkens et al., 2017). The role of family is even important in “lone actor” extremist violence—where in “63.9% of cases family and friends were aware of an individual’s intent to engage in terrorism-related activities” (Gill et al., 2014, p 433).

In addition to family counseling, parents’ associations have a number of benefits to protection and security. These groups are often informal associations that can be supported through civil society partners. This type of support group is common. The most notable example is probably “Alcoholics Anonymous”. As Koehler and Ehrt (2018) write, these types of groups are common in the treatment of mental health disorders,
addiction, or other serious conditions. These groups allow families to share experiences, provide support, and act as role models for others experiencing similar challenges. The connection to early intervention programs is that “mutual aid groups” increase participant trust, emotional stability, and participation in other intervention activity (Koehler & Ehrt, 2018). For these various reasons, Option 3 ranks “medium/high” for protection and security.

**Rights and Freedoms**

There are two factors at play here. On the one hand, the rights and freedoms of the “suspected radical” are less infringed here than with programs that focus on their “pre-crime” behaviour. However, there are concerns about family counseling programs being used for intelligence gathering or that they may instrumentalize the parents or family, thereby reducing their rights and freedoms. It is for that reason rights and freedoms are assessed as comparable to the status quo, “low”.

**Budgetary Cost**

Currently, the only government-affiliated programs to do this kind of work are operational in Quebec. The exact cost of this type of program, or the cost to add this service to an existing program, is not known. However, the cost for this program is in line with the funding that the Community Resilience Fund gives to other early intervention programs which is typically a maximum of $500,000 per year (Public Safety, 2019). For that reason, the budgetary cost is the same as the status quo, “medium”.

**Ease of Implementation**

Putting out an RFP for these programs is no more difficult to implement than doing so for any other program. In addition, adding this type of programming onto existing intervention platforms is very achievable. In the past, civil society actors have led these programs, so funding through the Community Resilience Fund is a viable lever. Several years ago there was a non-profit called Hayat Canada Family Centre which operated this type of program in Alberta. However, they have since moved the operation to the US, and their affiliate here in Canada, Muslims Facing Tomorrow, located in Toronto, does not appear to have a family counseling element. From a government perspective the ease of implementation of this policy is “high”.
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11.4. Option 4: Maximal Early Intervention Through the Public Health Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection and Security</th>
<th>Rights and Freedoms</th>
<th>Budgetary Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protection and Security**

There are two important measures for evaluating the level of protection and security against death and harm from extremist violence provided by the maximal public health approach. First, is the extent to which the early intervention approaches can decrease the threat from extremist violence. Second, is the degree to which this approach might increase the threat from extremist violence through negative interactions an individual might have with the intervention.

Until risk factors and risk assessment tools are comprehensively validated, evidence for the positive impact of early intervention on protection and security comes from practitioner and ex-extremist accounts of disengagement and deradicalization, as well as from theoretical models (Ali et al., 2017; Grossman & Tahiri, 2015; Koehler, 2016; Koerner, 2017; Korn, 2016; Ponsot et al., 2018; RAN, n.d.). This analysis concludes that the evidence is robust enough to support the effectiveness of early interventions.

One key advantage of the public health approach is that interventions can occur in places other than hospitals, clinics, or police departments. Enabling civil-society to form non-governmental centres creates a “third door”, like the CPRLV in Montreal. Having “third doors” is critical because many people who might otherwise participate would likely be put off by official government apparatuses like health and police (Ducol, 2019 personal communication).

However, the self-selection problem from the status quo persists here too. People who are profoundly engaged and most likely to commit acts of violence will not participate in voluntary intervention programming. Nonetheless, there is evidence that in some instances, provided that the individual is not “too radicalized”, that intervention can be beneficial.
As it relates to potential negative impacts on protection and security, early interventions through the maximal public health approach does risk negative interactions that further isolate an individual from society and helpful resources. However, this risk is no more pronounced than in the status quo. In fact, the maximal public health approach likely represents an improvement over the status quo, because interventions in the health or social domains are received better by communities and individuals.

Rights and Freedoms

There are two competing issues when it comes to rights and freedoms and the maximal public health approach. First, proponents of the approach suggest that it is the best way to safeguard against security-creep into other aspects of society. Presumably, this is accomplished by having health professionals involved in the process instead of using repressive measures of surveillance or investigation where they might not be necessary. The ability to the public health approach to avert harms from repressive measures is valid.

However, one concept from the approach that deserves further critique in the frame of rights and freedoms is the primary/secondary/tertiary (PST) typology derived originally from psychology and now used broadly in public health. This typology has been suggested by Harris et al., (2015), Rousseau et al., (2017) and Weine et al., (2017) as appropriate to apply to CRV. The typology applied to CRV looks like this: (a) primary prevention programs address the “root causes” of problematic behaviour a large population, (b) secondary interventions target people at risk, and (c) tertiary interventions are designed to intervene in situations with predictably negative outcomes (Harris-Hogan et al., 2015). Whereas Harris-Hogan et al. see this typology as the great advantage of the public health approach, this analysis suggests it is the weakest contribution from public health to this field. At present, there is no definitive evidence of psychological abnormality in most violent extremists. Therefore, as Daniel Koehler points out, it is highly improper to apply a medical typology to this field. This typology oversimplifies the processes of radicalization and implies pathology. Pathologizing radicalization and embedding the “treatment” in the health system is potentially dangerous (Foucault, 1995). Further, it discounts root causes (Kruglanski & Fishman, 2006). Most importantly, as Weine et al. (2016) concede, the value gained from the clinical approach requires
having a defined set of problems, causes, and solutions. Achieving those definitions is still a work in progress.

There are compelling arguments for both a positive and negative impact on rights and freedoms from a maximal application of the public health approach. However, the centrality of actors other than law enforcement to early intervention is seen, even by “CVE” critics, to be a good practice. For these reasons Option 4 represents a modest improvement over the status quo: “low/medium”.

**Budgetary Cost**

The public health approach, in its full implementation, would require substantial funding. Developing systems of lateral cooperation across levels of government and between different agencies is a high-cost proposition. Currently, there are nine early interventions receiving funding from the $35 million Community Resilience Fund. A substantial portion of the $7 million on-going after 2021 will go to fund these programs. In addition to federal funding, most programs receive funding from sub-national governments. A case management program in Montreal reportedly received more than $6 million from the province and city since 2015 (MacFarlane, 2019). Even though those costs are not paid by the federal government, they indicate overall operating costs. Expanding this approach from the relatively small group in the status quo would be a significant budgetary cost. For example, the Channel program in the UK costs £40 million a year. The Channel program received over 7,000 referrals in 2017-2018 and accepted 1,300 cases into Channel panels (Home Office, 2018). In contrast, Montreal’s CPRLV received 349 referrals in 2017 (CPRLV, 2018). Because the Canadian environment is significantly different, a Canadian maximal early intervention effort would likely be less costly, but it is hard to determine precisely. Budgetary cost for Option 4 is “high”.

**Ease of Implementation**

The biggest impediment to the maximal application of the public health approach to early intervention is implementation. In order to maximize the approach, the federal, provincial, and municipal, governments would need to collaboratively create lasting lateral connections between different agencies, institutions, and individuals. Engaging key systems at the provincial level (health, education, social services) demands
immense amounts of political capital and coordination. Lateral cooperation between competing levels of government and agencies is a substantial implementation challenge. This analysis concludes that a maximal public health approach is not going to happen in a diverse federated country like Canada. There are too many competing actors. Ease of implementation is “low”.
11.4.1. **Summary of Policy Evaluation**

Table 6. **Summary**\(^{14}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Status Quo + Mandatory Safeguards</th>
<th>Status Quo + Family Counseling</th>
<th>Maximal Public Health Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection &amp; Security</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and Freedoms</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary Cost</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Implementation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{14}\) The use of this kind of evaluation scheme for a series of nuanced policies addressing a set of complex problems is for illustrative purposes.
Chapter 12.

Recommendations

This analysis presents four different policy options that are somewhat mutually exclusive. In particular, Option 1: Status Quo, is exclusive of the other three. Likewise, Option 4: Maximal Public Health Approach to Early Intervention, excludes choosing the status quo.

Drawing from the evaluation and rankings from Chapter 11, this analysis recommends Option 2: Status Quo + Mandatory Safeguards and Option 3: Status Quo + Family Counseling and Parents’ Associations. Given that these two options are not mutually exclusive, they should be separated by a timeline for implementation. Because of the potential knock-on effects from status quo programming without the safeguards in Option 2, this policy should be implemented immediately. Because Option 3 offers an improvement in both societal objectives over the status quo, and an improvement in the primary objective over Option 2, Option 3 should be implemented when feasible. Option 4, Maximal Early Intervention Through the Public Health Approach, performed the best in the primary objective category. However, its serious deficiencies for both governmental objectives are disqualifying. Policy Option 1: Status Quo, is not preferable in any objective over the two “status quo +” options. However, it is conceivably an alternative to Option 4 considering the trade-offs between governmental objectives.

12.1. Recommended Policies

Policy Option 2 is recommended primarily because it completely fulfills the second societal objective. In addition, Option 2 is predicted to have a modestly positive effect on the primary societal objective, while also being the least costly and least challenging policy to implement. This policy has the benefits of (a) protecting the clients of early intervention, (b) improving early intervention through peer-review, and (c) protecting the practice of early interventions in Canada from legitimate criticism regarding potential impacts to rights and freedoms.

Policy Option 3 is recommended because it offers a substantial increase in protection and security over the status quo without incurring the significant budgetary
costs and impediments to implementation that Option 4 incurs. It is true that Option 3’s budgetary costs are equal to or greater than the status quo. However, the predicted value from Option 3 comes from its unique ability to genuinely increase protection and security at a low level of cost and institutional anguish compared to a nationwide policy like Channel or Option 4 in this analysis. This ability is evidenced in the literature and in practice. Recall that the PEACE program in Boston changed their Channel-type referral program to a family counseling approach because family counseling produces intervention results without the dangers of referral programs tied into schools, hospitals, and other public spaces. Having trusting relationships and building prosocial bonds are among the two most universally accepted factors to prevent radicalization and aid in disengagement. For this reason, the family approach is extremely auspicious.

12.2. Policies Not Recommended

Policy Option 1: Status Quo is not recommended in this analysis because it delivers a middling increase in protection and security—compared to not having early interventions at all—for a not insubstantial budgetary cost. In addition, Option 1 scores the lowest in the rights and freedoms criteria because of the integral role of law enforcement in early intervention. The discussion about VSL and quotidian violence versus extremist violence can, admittedly, apply to any of the policies in this analysis. However, that argument is most compelling as a reason against Option 1 because this policy provides the most limited benefits and some of the most serious possible knock-on effects, all at a fairly high relative cost.

Policy Option 4: Maximal Early Intervention Through the Public Health Approach is not recommended. At scale, this option would provide the capacity and human capital necessary to do early interventions for radicalization in a variety of health, social services, and NGO settings. Therefore, this represents a significant increase in protection and security. However, this policy option also performed the worst on both governmental objectives. As detailed on page fifty, the status quo already represents an outsized expenditure when compared to the VSL from extremist violence in Canada. Allocating substantially more resources to a policy that is already arguably overfunded is unjustifiable. Further, the biggest obstacle to the maximal approach is implementation. The political and organizational challenges that government would incur to implement this policy at scale are staggeringly forbidding.
Chapter 13.

Conclusion

CRV in Canada might have found its ceiling, and that is probably fine under current circumstances. Maximal early intervention through the public health approach is not justified by the Canadian threat environment or the economic impacts of terrorism in Canada. As detailed in the analysis of Option 1, the argument that even current levels of funding are in excess of any possible benefits is compelling. Or, more accurately, there is a huge disparity between the appropriations and focus given to issues that routinely claim the lives of Canadians, and extremist violence, which nevertheless has carved out a permanent place in the minds of Canadians.

CRV and early intervention are here to stay in some form. That is why Options 2 and 3 are recommended. Left unattended, the status quo will not create civil rights safeguards for Canadians participating in the current programs. Similarly, the status quo will not generate as efficacious programming as can be found using family counseling. Instead, multi-agency approaches led by law enforcement are primed to proliferate in the status quo. These programs are beneficial because they generate leads for other programs to design interventions for. However, in the status quo not all multi-agency approaches are connected to a holistic case management program. On their own, multi-agency approaches to CRV do not represent the best “good practices” available.

Canada has been fortunate to avoid the pernicious knock-on effects that PVE wrought in the UK and that many feared CVE would in the US. Canada’s experience with CRV is unique, in part because of scale and timing. However, Canada presents a unique case on the merits as well. Canada has benefited immensely from being a second actor and learning from foreign policy cycles and program results.

The first question this research asked was, “do you need to know the causes of extremist violence to be able to stop it?”. This question, in my opinion, is mostly a matter of epistemology. What can be known? There will never be a definitive single profile, pathway, or cause of terrorism. But this is not a failure. It is result of the dynamic nature of extremist violence. Within certain contexts though, there are correlational factors that can help trained people to intervene. The second question that guided this research
was, “is there a grounded justification for Canada’s approach to early intervention?”. The theories of radicalization and deradicalization will remain disparate, but the knowledge-base around effective interventions is increasing and compelling. Risk assessment in this area offers a similar situation—it presents problematic potential as an actuarial tool that can predict outcomes but is progressing as a tool that can aid professionals in the application of SPJ. Rigorous scientific evaluation of CVE programs is unlikely to be satisfying, but structural, process, and formative evaluations can prove sufficient. As far as the potential for CVE to do harm, in Canada CRV does not present bad design or poor implementation. However, there are actions that can be taken so that Canada can improve its chances of avoiding harm from CRV. These include like continuing to de-securitize early interventions and installing protections in the way Canada funds CRV programming.

The third and final question posed in the introduction of this research was, “if there is not a grounded justification for Canada’s approach, what should be done?”. Reflecting on counter-terror more generally, I’m reminded of what the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs concluded about its own “CVE” efforts and about how policy and programming in this area is often captivated by “what works”, instead of focusing on “what it takes”. Are we doing what it takes? That depends on what it is. If it is money for research, adopting a reasonably empirical approach to CRV, and mainstreaming the multi-agency approach to intervention over a period of many years, then yes, it appears Canada is doing what it takes. In order to really push the needle on CRV, however, it may require a much greater investment of resources, political will, and lateral cooperation between agencies and levels of government than is possible or reasonable at this time. Even if Canada did embrace CRV completely and elevate the public health approach to early intervention nationwide, whether that would result in less extremist violence in Canada is, after all this, still a matter of opinion.
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Appendix A:

Canadian Interventions and Alignment with Law Enforcement

*Programs that Maximally Align*

1. Calgary MA\(^{15}\): Led by the Calgary Police Service, this is a partnership between the City of Calgary Community & Neighbourhood Services, the Calgary Police Service (CPS), and “other professional partners”. Model: Multi-Agency

2. Ottawa MA\(^{16}\): Led by the Ottawa Police Service. Model: Multi-Agency

3. Edmonton MA\(^{17}\): A partnership between Edmonton Police Service, City of Edmonton, and the Edmonton HCM. Model: Multi-Agency

4. Toronto MA\(^{18}\): A collaboration between the Toronto Police Services, the City of Toronto, and the United Way, as well as local community organizations. Model: Multi-Agency.

*Programs that Medially Align*

1. Edmonton, HCM\(^{19}\): A non-governmental organization that is partnered with Edmonton Police Service’s “The Resiliency Project”. Model: Case management

---

\(^{15}\) Calgary Re-Direct, “About Us.”

\(^{16}\) Ottawa Police Service, “MERIT - Community Safety and Wellness Model.”

\(^{17}\) Neufeld, “Edmonton Police, Anti-Violence Organization Receive $3.5M to Target Radicalization in Alberta | CBC News.”

\(^{18}\) City of Toronto, “FOCUS Toronto.”

\(^{19}\) Organization for the Prevention of Violence, “About the OPV.”
**Programs that Minimally Align**

1. Quebec 1, HCM\textsuperscript{20}: Quebec 1, HCM, is funded by the City of Montreal and the Government of Quebec but it “has total operational independence”. Model: Case management

2. Quebec 2, HCM\textsuperscript{21}: Health centres, CISSS, provide specialized interventions with an inter-disciplinary team. Model: Case management

3. Ottawa, HCM\textsuperscript{22}: A project led by a civil society partner that uses referrals from justice partners including court officials and police services. Model: Case management

**Unknown**

1. British Columbia MA\textsuperscript{23}: Civilian-led program in partnership with local governments, stakeholders, and law enforcement. Funding to the B.C. Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General. Goals: “Developing intervention strategies tailored to the person” and "aims to establish and support multi-agency hubs”. Model: Multi-Agency

\textsuperscript{20} CPRLV, “Annual Report 2017 - CPRLV.”
\textsuperscript{21} Public Safety Canada, “Intervention Programs in Canada.”
\textsuperscript{22} Public Safety Canada, “Intervention Programs in Canada.”
\textsuperscript{23} Public Safety Canada, “Funding Project Descriptions.”
Appendix B.

Semi-structured Interview Reports

The purpose of interviews for this research was to obtain insider opinion and expertise from a range of different actors within the CRV space. The interviews were used to learn and gather high-level insight. They were semi-structured and not used to confirm previously held beliefs or manufacture consent behind any position. Included in the interviews were: Phil Gurski, a career intelligence analyst with 15 years at CSIS; Arun Kundnani, a professor and critic of “CVE”; and Benjamin Ducol, research manager at Montreal’s CPRLV. Each interview offered a different perspective into CRV.

Phil Gurski

Phil Gurski is the President and CEO of Borealis Threat and Risk Consulting and has over 30 years of experience as a strategic analyst in the Canadian intelligence community including 15 years at CSIS. He is also the author of numerous works on radicalization and terrorism including The Threat from Within: Recognizing Al Qaeda-Inspired Radicalization and Terrorism in the West (2015), and An End to the War on Terrorism (2018).

Perspective on CRV in Canada & Fundamental Issues

1. Gurski expresses skepticism around CRV in Canada, including posing the counter-factual to CRV—what if CRV went away tomorrow? It isn’t clear that the benefits from this program in a country with a threat environment like Canada is worth $35 million over five years and $10 million a year after.

2. Raises fundamental questions like, what are these programs trying to measure and can you measure what is intangible. How do we tell if someone no longer is a threat? You can measure behaviours, but whether or not you can sufficiently measure attitudes is unclear.

3. The problem of small sample size in Canada plagues research. Small sample size data is not necessarily robust enough to justify the policies.

4. Government funding has created programs that might not be able to do what they claim in terms of evaluation of impact.

5. As a practitioner, theory has limited usefulness. Applying academic theories and practice recommendations is often not possible in real life case work. There is an uneasy tension between the academic research and practice.
6. A lot of CRV is a desire from government to be seen doing something. There is pressure to fund projects that might not have the strongest foundations. Govern is reactive. After the attack on Parliament Hill, money became available for all kinds of counter-terror projects. The audience for CRV in Canada is the government itself.

7. Sixty years of gang-prevention schemes have led to what? What makes us think CRV is any different?

8. CRV is going to happen in Canada. So, the right question to be asking is, who should lead it and what approach works best? The answers to this are not clear.

9. Radicalization and terror are legitimate areas for academic inquiry. But without access to classified data, and with small sample sizes, it might not generate useful information for practitioners and policymakers.

10. How radicalization turns into violent radicalization is unclear. And at what point does the state have grounds to interfere in a way that isn’t a violation of civil liberties/rights is unclear.

11. Radicalization might not warrant programs specific to it, but folding it into other programming that deals with asocial behaviour of all types is possibly the most effective and reasonable way forward.

12. Need to abandon the search for causality here. 30 years of research has not led to a cause-effect understanding of terrorism, and doubtful it ever will.

13. Community engagement to CRV might improve education around the topic, but whether or not it increases trust, buy-in, etc., is unclear.

**Policy and Programs Gurski Supports**

14. Networks of practitioners, policy makers, and academics is a good idea.

15. From practitioner perspective, Gurksi supports programs like FOCUS Rexdale and other programs in the intervention space. Need for more case work on the ground and less pure study.

**Role of Law Enforcement**

16. Law enforcement involvement is tricky because they’re “damned if they do and damned if they don’t”. Law enforcement wants to get involved with problems as soon as possible to have lead time. So, if law enforcement is at the table, they might get lead time that could help prevent a problem. But, if law enframement is involved others assume the operation is just a surveillance program and become skeptical of it. Law enforcement “can’t win” with this issue. From the law enforcement perspective, they don't want to have cases taken away from them and then dumped in their laps 6 months later when whatever agency/organization was managing the case gives it back after being unable to address it. However, a person is participating in an
intervention program is unlikely to continue if they know they’re being monitored by law enforcement.

17. To the public and government, you’re only as good as your last failure. No one wants CSIS and RCMP to have files on people until something bad happens, then the outcry is “why didn’t you have a file?”

Counter-Terror Priorities

18. If Phil had $100 to spend on counter-terror in general, $99.50 is going to law enforcement and security and intelligence agencies. 50 cents goes to research.

Arun Kundnani

Arun Kundnani is a professor of media, culture, and communication at New York University and teaches terrorism studies at John Jay College. He has written extensive criticism of “CVE” including his 2014 book The Muslims are Coming! Islamophobia, Extremism, and the Domestic War on Terror.

On Recent Developments

1. On the decreasing importance of radicalization models as a justification for “P/CVE” programming, Kundnani first alerted me to the fact that he no longer systematically monitors the big picture of “P/CVE”. Despite his disclaimer, his thoughtful response was: “I would say that one of the key things about the big picture is the globalization of CVE to almost every region of the world, and that this has happened in a very uncritical way. So even if officially, in Canada, Britain, and the US, radicalization models are less commonly presented as rationales for P/CVE, the policies that are associated with them remain firmly in place in those places and are being expanded to cover most of the world. The paradox of P/CVE has always been that the intellectual flaws in the analysis that ostensibly underpinned the policies were always recognized and yet the policies were still introduced and disseminated globally”.

On the Public Health Approach

2. When asked about the public health approach, Kundnani replied: “I haven’t looked at these public health arguments so I can’t really answer this but I would say that in Britain, with the Prevent duty and multi-agency information sharing, there isn’t much difference between friends and family informing a health professional and informing the police. I would support a much stronger separation between the obligations of health professionals and police officers but the current context does not tend to allow for that. One of the things P/CVE policies tend to do is take values associated with “public health” and “community participation” and appropriate them to enable unwarranted surveillance, so unless we first acknowledge that, there is a danger in using such terms to advocate “reforms”.”
On Alternative Narratives

3. When asked about whether or not the concept of “alternative narratives” and the role of government in creating or funding them, Kundnani wrote: “The alternative narratives already exist at community level and don't need government support. Governments need to honor principles of democratic process, community development, and freedom of expression to allow communities to strengthen themselves in order to reduce the risk of political violence”.

On Policy Learning

4. When asked about whether or not the lessons from academic literature make their way onto policymaker decision tables, Kundnani wrote: “University scholarship has very little relationship to policy development in this space. I don’t think there is “learning” among policy-makers in this area”.

Benjamin Ducol

Benjamin Ducol is the research manager at the CPRLV in Montreal and a research associate at the International Centre for Comparative Criminology. Benjamin and I spoke about the referral, intake, and intervention processes at the CPRLV and briefly about various concepts and debates in the field.

CPRLV Intake and Intervention Process

1. The process at the CPRLV is fundamentally a psycho-social intervention that involves (a) initial screening, where an individual is assessed and it is determined whether or not radicalization to violence is an issue, (b) if radicalization to violence is already too developed or there are mental health issues, the case gets passed to relevant actors, (c) if early stages radicalization is identified, the case is then considered for what factors are causing the radicalization, (d) at this point an inter-disciplinary team composed of sociologists, psychologists, social workers, etc., will develop an individual plan, (e) this process is similar to other social services plans—developing a timeline and a mustering a variety resources, just with CRV expertise added, (f) after the intervention tools are used (clinical treatment, mentorship, employment, housing, education, etc.) there is a follow-up period of 3 months.

2. The CPRLV initially used VERA and HCR 20 for risk assessment, but have since developed their own tools which focus on: belief, relationships, family, legitimation of violence, etc. Structured professional judgement (SPJ) is used.

3. The goal of the CPRLV and their interventions is to allow a person to be functional and live with greatly decreased risk of radicalization to violence. Comparable to drug addiction services, the goal is not to turn the person into some concept of “model citizen” but to improve behaviour and decrease risk.
4. To evaluate, a baseline of factors is taken initially and compared to exit results 3 months later. There is no formula to decide when to end the program, it is a process of professional judgement.

On the Public Health Approach

5. Public health approach is good, but there needs to be space for “third door” institutions like CPRLV because people radicalize against mainstream institutions. Having as many “doors” available to people maximizes the chance of participation.

6. The multi-agency Hubs/Situation Tables are good in principle and a good solution to the problems associated with inter-agency information sharing. However, the involvement of law enforcement could complicate people’s willingness to participate in the intervention. Also, the mandate of law enforcement to protect “national security” could tilt the balance of power at hubs/tables in a disproportionate manner.

On Prevent in the UK

7. Prevent in the UK has been tarred as a failure, because the rollout was somewhat disastrous, but later iterations of the programming have been more effective and well-received.
## Appendix C.

### Risk Factors

Table C.1. Potential Risk Factors for Radicalization to Violent Extremism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Radicalization</th>
<th>Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing identity conflict/being a loner</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling there is a lack of meaning in life</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting status</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to achieve aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to belong/trouble with platonic relations</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble in romantic relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having experienced trauma/abuse</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiring action or adventure/military experience</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being naïve or having little knowledge of religion/ideology</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having mental health issues or being emotional unstable</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having strong religious beliefs/extreme ideology</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having grievances</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling under threat</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having an “us versus them” world view</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying violence or illegal activity as a solution to problems</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having engaged in previous criminal activity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with a gang or delinquent peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressors (family crisis, being fired, etc.)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal discrimination or injustice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to violent extremist groups or individuals</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to violent extremist belief systems or narratives</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members or friends in violent extremist network</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D.

Definitions

Definitional clarity around key terms has been a serious impediment to rigorous research into extremist violence. To simplify a bigger problem, this analysis will only consider “defining” the most critical terms: terrorism, radicalization, radicalization to violence, and extremist violence. Of these four terms, only terrorism has a legal definition—albeit one that varies across the world and is highly disputed.

If the definition of terrorism (83.01 Criminal Code) is contested, the definitions of the other three key terms are even more so. As outlined in Canada’s 2018 National Strategy, radicalization is defined as:

A process by which an individual or group gradually adopts extreme positions or ideologies that are opposed to the status quo and challenge mainstream ideas. (Public Safety Canada, 2018)

Radicalization to violence is defined as:

The process by which individuals and groups adopt an ideology and/or belief system that justifies the use of violence in order to advance their cause. (Public Safety Canada, 2018)

And violent extremism is defined as:

A term describing the beliefs and actions of people who support or use violence to achieve extreme ideological, religious or political goals. (Public Safety Canada, 2018)[emphasis mine]

Lack of definitional clarity is not just a semantic concern, it impacts the progression of theory, practice, and evaluation. Inconsistent definitions make systematic and even simple comparison studies very challenging. It also makes communication among government, the public, and the practice/research communities hard. The definitions around radicalization, radicalization to violence, and violent extremism are still too vague to be useful.
Appendix E.

Public Health Approach

While there is some debate in the literature over exactly what the public health approach to CRV should entail (Rousseau et al., 2017; conversely Aggarwal, 2018) there is also agreement that its process centres around promoting healthy behaviours and environments through a framework like the US Centers for Disease Control’s Ten Essential Public Health Services. This list describes core concepts for community leadership.

US CDC Ten Essential Public Health Services\(^{24}\)

1. Monitor health status to identify and solve community health problems
2. Diagnose and investigate health problems and health hazards in the community
3. Inform, educate, and empower people about health issues
4. Mobilize community partnerships and action to identify and solve health problems
5. Develop policies and plans that support individual and community health efforts
6. Enforce laws and regulations that protect health and ensure safety
7. Link people to needed personal health services and assure the provision of health care when otherwise unavailable
8. Assure competent public and personal health care workforce
9. Evaluate effectiveness, accessibility, and quality of personal and population-based health services
10. Research for new insights and innovative solutions to health problems

\(^{24}\) (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2019)