Università degli Studi di Siena
Dipartimento di Scienze Sociali, Politiche e Cognitive

Corso di Dottorato
Apprendimento e innovazione nei contesti sociali e di lavoro
XXXVI°CICLO

Perspectives on Radicalization and Violent Extremism:
Critical Pedagogy, Psychoanalysis and Transcultural Psychiatry

Tutor   Candidata
Prof. Claudio Melacarne   Dott.ssa Marina Slavutzky
Co-tutor
Prof. Vivek Venkatesh

A.A. 2022-2023

ABSTRACT ITA

L'obiettivo di questa ricerca è quello di riunire diverse prospettive per analizzare la radicalizzazione e l'estremismo violento e, allo stesso tempo, contribuire alla discussione sui modi per prevenire questi fenomeni. Vengono presentate alcune idee utili provenienti dai campi della Pedagogia Critica, della Psicoanalisi e della Psichiatria Transculturale, al fine di riflettere su come tre diverse discipline possano essere utili per interpretare la radicalizzazione e l'estremismo violento.

La ricerca empirica è stata realizzata attraverso uno studio di caso in Québec (Canada) da aprile a luglio 2022 e da metà aprile a metà maggio 2023. La località è stata scelta per i suoi importanti centri di prevenzione della radicalizzazione e anche per la Cattedra Unesco sulla prevenzione della radicalizzazione e dell'estremismo violento. Creata nell'autunno del 2017, la Cattedra mira a fungere da centro di eccellenza per sviluppare, condividere e promuovere la ricerca e le azioni nel contesto della prevenzione primaria, secondaria e terziaria della radicalizzazione e dell'estremismo violento. Assicura una stretta collaborazione tra i ricercatori e le comunità di pratica in una prospettiva comparativa, multidisciplinare e nord-sud. La creazione della Cattedra Unesco-Prev è il risultato di una stretta collaborazione tra l'Università di Sherbrooke, l'Università del Québec a Montréal (UQÀM) e l'Università Concordia.

Poiché nella letteratura scientifica non esiste una definizione universalmente accettata di questi fenomeni, è stato dedicato un certo spazio alla loro comprensione. Sono stati sintetizzati gli studi più importanti sulla radicalizzazione sviluppati negli ultimi due decenni e sono state descritte alcune attività e strumenti di prevenzione.

Il focus teorico è partito da coloro che sono considerati da molti i padri dei due primi campi di studio scelti: Paulo Freire per la Pedagogia Critica e Sigmund Freud per la Psicoanalisi, e ha poi utilizzato approfondimenti sia da studi che da interviste a pensatori contemporanei. Per la Pedagogia Critica, Tião Rocha, un pedagogista brasiliano che lavora su progetti educativi da quasi 40 anni e ha collaborato con Paulo Freire; per la Psicoanalisi, Isildinha Baptista Nogueira, una psicoanalista brasiliana di colore che ha scritto molto sul razzismo e un libro intitolato "Il colore dell'inconscio". Per la Psichiatria Transculturale, dopo un'introduzione generale sul campo, viene presentata la Divisione di Psichiatria Sociale e Transculturale della McGill University, sia attraverso articoli che attraverso le interviste realizzate con il Prof. Laurence Kirmayer, il Prof. Jaswant Guzder e la Prof.ssa Cécile Rousseau.

I risultati della ricerca empirica qualitativa sono presentati insieme ai capitoli teorici. L'obiettivo principale è quello di analizzare come le teorie, le pratiche e le ricerche contemporanee possano essere utili per coloro che vogliono comprendere meglio i fenomeni di radicalizzazione e di estremismo violento e desiderano pensare alle pratiche di prevenzione.

Parole chiave: Radicalizzazione, Estremismo Violento, Prevenzione, Psicoanalisi, Pedagogia Critica, Psichiatria Transculturale

ABSTRACT ENG

The aim of this research is to bring together different perspectives to analyze radicalization and violent extremism and at the same time contribute to the discussion about ways to prevent these phenomena. Some useful ideas brought up by the fields of Critical Pedagogy, Psychoanalysis and Transcultural Psychiatry are presented in order to reflect on how three different disciplines can be insightful to interpret radicalization and violent extremism.

The empirical research was realized through a case study in Québec (Canada) from April until July 2022 and from mid-April until mid-May 2023. The location was chosen because of its important radicalization prevention centers and also because of the Unesco Chair on Prevention of Radicalization and Violent Extremism. Created in the fall of 2017, the Chair aims to act as a center of excellence to develop, share and promote research and actions in the context of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention of violent radicalization and extremism. It ensures close cooperation among researchers and communities of practice in a comparative, multidisciplinary and north-south perspective. The creation of the Unesco-Prev Chair is the result of a close partnership between Université de Sherbrooke, Université du Québec à Montréal (UQÀM) and Concordia University.

Since in scientific literature there is not a universally accepted definition of these phenomena, some space has been dedicated to their understanding. The most important studies on radicalization developed in the last two decades have been synthetized and some prevention activities and tools have been described.

The theoretical focus started from those considered by many as fathers of the two first chosen studying fields: Paulo Freire for Critical Pedagogy and Sigmund Freud for Psychoanalysis and has then used insights both from studies and from interviews to contemporary thinkers. For Critical Pedagogy, Tião Rocha, a Brazilian pedagogist who has been working on education projects for almost 40 years and has collaborated with Paulo Freire; for Psychoanalysis, Isildinha Baptista Nogueira, a black Brazilian psychoanalyst who has written extensively about

racism and a book entitled "The colour of the unconscious". For Transcultural Psychiatry, after a general introduction about the field, the Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry at McGill University is presented both through articles and through the interviews made with Prof. Laurence Kirmayer, Prof. Jaswant Guzder and Prof. Cécile Rousseau.

The results of the qualitative empirical research are presented together with the theoretical chapters and the frameworks chosen. The main goal is to analyze how theories and contemporary practices and researches can be insightful for those who want to better understand the phenomena of radicalization and violent extremism and would like to think about prevention practices.

Key words: Radicalization, Violent Extremism, Prevention, Psychoanalysis, Critical Pedagogy, Transcultural Psychiatry

To Sara, Sonia and Abrão

Table of contents

INTRODUCTION

The idea of this research was born out of the will of bringing together different perspectives to analyze radicalization and violent extremism and at the same time contribute to the discussion about ways to prevent these phenomena. It derives partly of my work as project manager of *Forward* at University of Siena between 2021 and the beginning of 2023. The project, developed between 2019 and 2023, was financed by the Italian Ministry of University and Research and focused on training, research and development of community-based strategies to facilitate and support practices in multi-ethnic contexts. As it will be explained later, it was also highly influenced by my previous experiences and by my final Master Psychology research on perinatal mental health.

In the first chapter, I will introduce the qualitative research and its methodology. The empirical research was developed through a case study in Québec (Canada) from April until July 2022 and from mid-April until mid-May 2023. I have done n. 45 interviews; N. 3 focus groups and I have had the opportunity to take part of many activities developed in the Universities and other institutions. In this chapter, I'll present the research and explain about how the qualitative data was gathered and analyzed.

The location for my empirical research was chosen because of its important radicalization prevention centers and also because of the Unesco Chair on Prevention of Radicalization and Violent Extremism. Created in the fall of 2017, the Chair aims to act as a center of excellence to develop, share and promote research and actions in the context of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention of violent radicalization and extremism. It ensures close cooperation among researchers and communities of practice in a comparative, multidisciplinary and north-south perspective. The creation of the Unesco-Prev Chair is the result of a close partnership between Université de Sherbrooke, Université du Québec à Montréal (UQÀM) and Concordia University.

Since the main interest of this research is to develop an interdisciplinary reflection on approaches to radicalization and violent extremism, the interviews were focused on the subjects that idealize, organize and lead research and also prevention activities in this field. The sample has been composed of directors, coordinators and staff of the three Universities (Université de Sherbrooke, Université du Québec à Montréal (UQÀM) and Concordia University) and also the chair's partners - Centre for the Prevention of Radicalization Leading to Violence

(CPRLV), Canadian Practitioners Network for the Prevention of Radicalization and Extremist Violence (CPN-PREV), Actions Interculturelles (AIDE), Montreal Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies (MIGS), Recherche et Action sur les Polarisations Sociales (RAPS). Moreover, I have interviewed some important thinkers related to the three disciplines chosen as theoretical frameworks, as it will be explained later.

The next chapters will introduce theoretical concepts and will bring together examples of the thematic analysis of interviews and focus groups. This choice is motivated by the following reasons: a) when dealing with radicalization and violent extremism, there is no homogeneity in scientific literature, so it is interesting to compare what can be found in articles and books to what people who work in the field think; b) a similar principle can be applied for prevention activities: if there is no universal definition for the phenomena, accordance about how to prevent them is missing and there are few scientific studies about efficacy; c) since the studying and working background of those who work in this field is extremely varied, it is interesting to reflect on their practices; d) the three theoretical fields chosen are not frequently applied to radicalization studies, so interviewing contemporary thinkers was a way of complementing available scientific material and reflect about their usefulness to future research.

In the second chapter I'll present a synthesis about radicalization studies. Online databases such as EBSCO, PubMed, Torrosa, Scopus and Google Scholar have been used for the literature review, as well as books and articles indicated by different professors I had during the last years. It is important to mark that it is not meant to be a systematic review, since the focus of the present research is to analyze how theoretical approaches that are not frequently cited in these studies can be useful to interpret these phenomena. First of all, I'll try to clear the definition of terms like radicalization, violent extremism, terrorism. Unfortunately, in literature there is no definition accepted universally, so this first step is quite important. After that, I'll present some studies on radicalization developed in the last two decades, mostly with a critical approach. Some radicalization models proposed in scientific literature will also be cited.

In the third chapter, different classifications of prevention activities developed in the last years will be presented. Due to the gradual shift from security to educational approaches, space will be dedicated to the ideas of the interviewees about capacities to promote in these activities. Subsequently, a chapter will be dedicated to working practices in prevention. Starting from studying backgrounds and motivations to engage in prevention, the section will also introduce ideas gathered to improve prevention activities.

In the following chapters, I'll analyze how three different disciplines can be insightful to interpret radicalization and violent extremism: some useful ideas

brought up by the fields of Psychoanalysis, Critical Pedagogy and Transcultural Psychiatry will be presented. For obvious reasons, linked also to the space, I will not be able to present these fields 360 °, so I have made a choice. My focus will start from those considered by many as fathers of the first two studying fields: Sigmund Freud for Psychoanalysis and Paulo Freire for Critical Pedagogy and will then use insights both from the studies and from interviews to contemporary thinkers. For Psychoanalysis, Isildinha Baptista Nogueira, a black Brazilian psychoanalyst who has written extensively about racism and a book entitled "The colour of the unconscious" – this choice is motivated by the fact that many interviewees have mentioned racism as a concept linked to radicalization and it seemed interesting to have a psychoanalytic point of view on the issue. For Critical Pedagogy, Tião Rocha was interviewed, a Brazilian pedagogist who has collaborated with Freire and has been working on education projects for almost 40 years. For Transcultural Psychiatry, after a general introduction about the field, the Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry at McGill University is presented both through articles and through the interviews made with Prof. Laurence Kirmayer, Prof. Jaswant Guzder and Prof. Cécile Rousseau.

The results of my qualitative empirical research are presented together with the theoretical chapters and the frameworks chosen. The main goal is to analyze how theories and contemporary practices and researches can be insightful for those who want to better understand the phenomena of radicalization and violent extremis and would like to think about prevention practices.

Although radicalization has increasingly been subjected to scientific studies, a universally accepted definition of the concept is still to be developed. Schmid (2013) affirms that radicalization is related to advocating any kind of sweeping change in society, since the status quo seems to be unacceptable, but the means advocated to bring system-transforming radical solution may be non-violent and democratic or violent and non-democratic.

It has been estimated that more books were published on the subject of radicalization in the five years following the September 11, 2001 attacks than in the 50 previous years combined (Silke, 2008), and that the use of the term 'radicalization' in English-language press more than doubled between 2005 and 2006 (Sedgwick, 2010). On the one hand, this growth on the number of studies is understandable, but on the other hand it has increased the risk of producing research based on cognitive and methodological biases. It has also stimulated in many cases meta-stereotypes (Koomen, Van der Pligt, 2016). The concept of radicalization has led to the construction of Muslim populations as 'suspect communities', and sometimes has led also to civil rights abuses (Kundnani, 2012).

The tendency to confine radicalization into the religious (and most of all Islamic) sphere has left aside the possibility of studying the several precursory phenomena

of radicalization from an educational perspective. In the last years, the focus of this field of study has been shifted from macro-readings of the processes of political, cultural and religious radicalization to the study of contextual and micro situations (Bailey, Edwards, 2017; Caramellino, Melacarne, Ducol, 2022).

In order to explain my choices during my PhD research and the structure of the thesis, it is useful to take a step back to my experiences and my studying path. I was born and I lived in Porto Alegre, Brazil, until the age of 22. I took my first degree in Languages and Literature at the *Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)* and after my graduation I moved to Italy. Here I needed to take some exams and write a new final paper in order to recognize my Brazilian degree. After that, I've started a series of post-graduation courses and different working experiences – from tourism management to international business, from the organization of cultural events to conflict resolution techniques and transcultural psychiatry. Sometimes I have worked as a translator and I have had some experience with teaching. I have decided to start studying again when I was almost 34 and after a long path of studying and staging, I became a Psychologist in March 2020, just when Covid-19 pandemics was starting.

I had already decided that I did not want to take a psychotherapy specialization to do clinics. I had started collaborating with Franco Cocchi, who teaches Industrial and Organizational Psychology at Università di Perugia, and I was fascinated by the idea of teaching in college and putting together somehow my parents' paths: my father is a Psychoanalyst and my mother a Professor of Social and Preventative Dentistry. I think I heritage from him an endless will to read and study and from her a utopic desire to change the world through education and prevention.

The idea of dealing with radicalization and violent extremism prevention is somehow linked to my research about promoting perinatal mental health, developed during my Master degree. I believe that psychologists along the decades have invested too little time to prevention of disturbs and promotion of wellbeing research. I have somehow switched fields, from perinatal health to adult learning, but the conviction about the important role of prevention to improve life's quality is always the same. Even though I have changed my research field and approach, there are some important points in common that will help me to illustrate the present work.

One of the first courses I took at University of Perugia was about building a research project. We had to work in groups and the final task was to develop a real research project that could be eventually concretized. I did a project about perinatal mental health promotion, which served me as a starting point to my thesis two years later. The words of Markin (2013) are still echoing, after many years, in my head:

The psychological experience of pregnancy is akin to a spider web, everything sticks. Conflicts from the mother's past that were previously acknowledged as merely flying around the periphery now stick like glue, as they are embedded into her web of experience. Creating a new life reopens the door to early attachment experiences in one's own life. This reawakening of unresolved conflicts often leads to much psychic pain and disequilibrium for the mother, which if left unresolved, can color the way in which she thinks about and relates to herself as a mother and to her unborn child. However, this challenge also represents the unique opportunity that psychotherapy offers mothers-to-be. Psychotherapy may help the expecting mother to reflect on, or mentalize, her early attachment experiences, enhacing the well-being of the mother and eventually the mother-infant dyad (Markin, 2013, p.364).

My first instinct was saying: "What an extraordinary chance we have to improve people's lives! Why aren't there more people around the world studying and organizing researches, meetings and courses on this topic? It could be a real lifechanging thing!" And that is the reason why I decided then to deepen my knowledge about perinatal mental health.

During an interview to Murphy Paul (2010, p. 233), DiPietro declared: "the fetus has the biggest environmental contaminant of all, which is maternal physiology. You are never more closely integrated with your environment than when you are a fetus."

Mrazek and Haggerty (1994) wrote a text that has become a benchmark for mental illness prevention studies, *Reducing Risks for Mental Disorders: Frontiers for Preventive Intervention Research*. Almost 30 years later, their proposals remain relevant today, and unfortunately not much has been done to put broad public policies for prevention into practice, despite the fact that even economic studies show that they are worthwhile. Mental illness causes tremendous suffering not only to the individuals who are affected, but also to their families and society. While many strides have been made with clinical and research, much of mental disorders prove difficult to recover completely and become chronic, so the role of prevention would be of paramount importance. Despite this, efforts to prevent mental illness have always been far less than prevention of illness in general. Mental and physical health however are closely related and influence each other, and it is important to emphasize that one cannot talk about health and well-being without there being mental health.

One of the greatest difficulties associated with mental health research is the nature of the etiopathogenesis of disorders. While we know the precise bacterium that causes throat inflammation such as streptococcus, mental illnesses rarely have a single, unambiguous causative factor, and even diagnosis is not straightforward via a "gold standard" test. Mental illnesses are usually defined by the description of

a series of symptoms associated with clinical dysfunction, and this makes the approach to prevention more complex.

A fundamental concept in prevention research is that of risk reduction. Risk factors are those characteristics and variables that, if present, increase the likelihood that an individual will develop a given disease - in the case of perinatal mental health these factors are well recognized. Not only that, risk factors and any development of mental disorders in the perinatal period can cause direct and indirect harm to multiple individuals: mother, father, unborn child, and other family members. Having a parent with a mood disorder is the main risk factor for the onset of depression in childhood and adolescence, and genetic and psychosocial risk factors are intertwined. Both clinical and research show that in the perinatal period there is a marked intertwining of psychological and physiological problems and how these influence each other. While it is clear to everyone the importance of following pregnant women and helping them prevent disorders and promote their health and that of the unborn, less clear is how important psychological support is and how prevention strategies could positively affect society.

Increasingly in recent years, economists are applying their sophisticated statistical techniques and experimental designs to phenomena such as preterm birth, low birth weight, and fetal exposure to toxic substances in order to calculate the lifetime cost of these perinatal problems to those directly affected and to society. The resulting equation, which might seem simplistic, is that if pregnancies have a good outcome, the benefits are shared by all, whereas if prenatal conditions are poor, the price paid by society can be very high. (Murphy Paul, 2010). One of the reasons that has drawn economists' attention to the fetal origins hypothesis is that it carries important implications for the human capital development model. Adverse situations in the womb and at birth are correlated with various parameters, such as level of schooling, goals achieved in the world of work, marital status, and use of treatment for mental and non-mental illnesses (Almond et al, 2017).

Amartya Sen, a Harvard professor and 1998 Nobel laureate for his studies on global poverty, argues that when women are deprived of education and opportunities, the whole society suffers; on the other hand, when women are supported, children get a better education, families are healthier, household income is higher, and civil society is stronger. The consequences of gender inequality are amplified in the perinatal period: on the one hand, there are correlations between gender inequality and maternal deprivation; on the other hand, the future health of unborn children, of both sexes (Osmani & Sen, 2003, Murphy Paul, 2010).

One of the speeches that made me reflect the most at the World Association of Infant Mental Health Congress in Rome, in 2018, was that of Jay Belsky, a quite important American scholar. In the Master Class given on differing susceptibility to environmental factors, especially stress and development, Belsky argued that we

are all mosaics of plasticity, and that susceptibility can be considered as a trait. In different responses to stressful situations, different aspects matter, such as: personality and tendency toward negative emotions, stress physiology, and different conformation of certain genes, such as 5-HTTPLPR (the serotonin transporter), DRD4 and BDNF. He used a story at the end of his talk that I had borrowed for my thesis conclusion and now I borrow for my thesis introduction. The different streams of studies and thoughts that approach development and try to create unambiguous rules for its success or failure are like a group of blind people trying to figure out what an elephant looks like: the one who hugs the leg will say the elephant is like a tree, the one who grabs the tail will say it is a small snake, the one who touches the trunk will be frightened because he will think it is a big snake. Finally, the one who touches the side of the belly will be convinced that the elephant is like a wall.

My final paper was conceived and executed with the understanding that depicting the whole elephant in a three-dimensional model is still a long way off and may never really be possible, but the elements made available by the clinic and research are providing more and more pieces of this immense puzzle. Researchers already know that the perinatal period is critically important to the lives of more than one person, primarily that of the unborn child but also of caregivers and those around them, and that any problems or failures have very long-term effects. It is critically important to disseminate this information, to continue research in the area to seek more answers, and to promote more and more perinatal mental health promotion actions. The costs of doing all this are very small and the benefits can be shared by society as a whole.

My approach to radicalization and violent extremism prevention is the same cited by Belsky. Everyone should have in mind that we are dealing with an elephant, but unfortunately it is quite hard to demonstrate to blind people that there are other parts of it. Yes, you are touching the belly and you are right when you affirm that it is a wall, but there are other truths. We can apply this image to radicalization prevention field: those who adopt a security approach are frequently convinced that it is the only way, those who believe in community education sometimes are so convinced that the belly must be ignored that refuse to talk to police forces, and so on.

Starting from the conviction of the multi-faceted nature of radicalization and violent extremism, this thesis will not even try to depict the whole elephant. It is not my intention to describe with details the elephant's trunk as a big snake either, even if I'm quite aware that a PhD thesis should be done with extreme will to deepen a concept. My intention here is to put together notes on important researches and tools that were developed in the last two decades, and at the same time try to check which inputs three different fields can offer to better understand these phenomena

and plan prevention activities: Critical Pedagogy, Psychoanalysis and Transcultural Psychiatry. I am aware that there are also many other fields that contribute to prevention, such as Sociology or Political Sciences, but for organizational reasons I had to make a choice, and I based it on the inputs emerged in the empirical research and on my personal studying path. It is important to highlight that Psychoanalysis and Transcultural Psychiatry were chosen not because there is an evident link among radicalization and mental health issues, but because of the interesting inputs that these disciplines can offer to this study field.

Chapter I.
RESEARCH DESIGN

1.1 Biography of a research

As mentioned in the introduction, this research derives partly of my work as project manager of *Forward* at University of Siena between 2021 and the beginning of 2023. The project, developed between 2019 and 2023, was financed by the Italian Ministry of University and Research and focused on training, research and development of community-based strategies to facilitate and support practices in multi-ethnic contexts.

The Forward project, in line with the principles of the Strategy for the Promotion Abroad of Italian Higher Education 2017/2020, was funded to understand the phenomenon of radicalization and develop strategies to improve multicultural integration in the Italian territory. Within a precise theoretical framework, which is in the tradition of adult learning studies and specifically the transformative theory (Mezirow, 1991), the formal mandate was translated into a more circumscribed object of work, focused on the implementation of training activities and research actions aimed at the development of "Community Based" strategies to facilitate and support coexistence practices in multi-ethnic contexts.

During the first year of the project, 6 executive actions were developed, which can be associated with macro objectives of research and training: on the one hand, research allowed to study the processes of (micro)radicalization and (micro)culturalization emerging within living contexts; on the other hand, the area of initial training of education professionals was strengthened, in order to provide basic skills to manage high-density multiethnic contexts, and the area of continuing education of professionals engaged in the health, detention, security, and third sector. An international research network was built involving a plurality of universities and research organizations.

In the second year, the main actions of the first year were developed and deepened, both in terms of research, teaching and continuing education. Despite the significant difficulties created by the health crisis due to the pandemic situation of COVID-19, the network of international partnerships built in the first year was consolidated and expanded, fostering collaboration in study and research for the topics addressed within Forward.

In the third year of the project, there were two actions developed in depth: Development of the Center for the Study and Prevention of Radicalization (Cespra) and Development of multimedia artifacts and training courses. One of the final products of the project was the Open-Access book *Understanding Radicalization in everyday life* (Fabbri & Melacarne, 2023), published with McGraw-Hill, which collects reflections developed by the various professors and researchers from both the University of Siena and other national and international institutions. There was also an activity that was particularly enriching by its interdisciplinarity and openness to students and professors from a variety of Institutions. A Summerchool on Prevention of Radicalization was held in Siena at the end of September. Some international professors, such as Vivek Venkatesh, Benjamin Ducol and Fahrrad Korroshkavar and other national partners such as Maria Striano, Stefano Oliverio, Loris Vezzali, Sandrone Dazieri, Alberto Bradanini, Michele Brunelli were invited and it was a special occasion to reinforce the network and exchange ideas. All the participants were quite enthusiastic about the summer school.

When I started the PhD course, at the end of 2020, my idea was to do research related to my previous experience with Industrial and Organizational Psychology and study training needs in local organizations. Some months later, I started collaborating on Forward as project manager, and the field interested me deeply. Even if there are various critical issues, starting from the definition of radicalization and other related concepts, it seemed important to extend research and try to gather more information about on field practices. I decided then to focus my studies on radicalization and violent extremism, and I chose a territory in which many programs have been developed in the last years.

The empirical research was developed through a case study in Québec (Canada) from April until July 2022 and for a month starting from 19th April 2023. This location was chosen because of its important radicalization prevention centers and also because of the Unesco Chair on Prevention of Radicalization and Violent Extremism. Created in the fall of 2017, the Chair aims to act as a center of excellence to develop, share and promote research and actions in the context of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention of violent radicalization and extremism. It ensures close cooperation among researchers and communities of practice in a comparative, multidisciplinary and north-south perspective. The creation of Unesco-Prev Chair is the result of a close partnership between three Universities

and has four co-chairs: Prof. David Morin and Prof. Marie-Ève Carignan (Université de Sherbrooke), Prof. Vivek Venkatesh (Concordia University) and Prof. Ghayda Hassan (Université du Québec à Montréal - UQÀM). Even if I was mainly hosted by Concordia University during my field research, I had the opportunity to interact more than once with all of them and get also many interesting inputs and suggestions for my research and for the interviews.

During my first stay in Montréal, my Italian supervisor, Prof. Claudio Melacarne, came in an exchange trip with other professors and in one meeting he had the idea of asking Prof. Vivek Venkatesh to be my co-supervisor. He accepted right away and I was quite honored and enthusiastic. Having two quite different supervisors, both as professional backgrounds, experiences and approaches, was an enriching aspect of my research.

When the empirical research was started, the main idea was to study Project Someone, that brings together several projects developed in the area of Arts, Critical and Innovative Pedagogy at the Centre for the Study of Learning and Performance (Concordia University). I had attended to a webinar in which Prof. Vivek Venkatesh presented these activities and it had struck my attention. I arrived in Montréal in mid-April 2022 and I was lucky enough to take part of a meeting of Unesco-Prev (the first held in presence, after two years of Covid-19 pandemics). After that, I decided to widen my research: instead of doing the case study specifically about Project Someone, I based it on the whole Unesco-Prev structure, in which it is included. Later on, something similar happened to my theoretical frame: instead of using specifically the ideas of Paulo Freire to reflect about radicalization and violent extremism, I decided to add other two fields: Psychoanalysis and Transcultural Psychiatry.

It is important to highlight that these three fields are brought as special sources, as defined by Dewey (1929). According to him, when we have an educational problem, we have primary sources (educational practices-ground of hypotheses of intervention, beginning and end of the process) and special sources - all those disciplines that can be useful not to give us pedagogical prescriptions, but to give us insights to interpret the phenomenon and to formulate hypotheses. In this case, the three disciplines serve as special sources, since they can be used to have insights and inputs regarding prevention, radicalization, violent extremism.

1.2 A qualitative study

This research is based on a qualitative approach (Creswell, 2012; Silverman, 2008; Trinchero, 2004), which is characterized by its ability to examine questions of description, interpretation and explanation. Qualitative research can be conceived as inductive and participatory, it enhances individuals' accounts and

refers to vocabulary and interviews to construct descriptive texts of the processes under study (Scaratti, 2021). It is oriented toward the study and understanding of phenomena, the definition of the purpose of the research itself remains - along the way - general and related to the experience of the participants and cannot be circumscribed through literature analysis.

Qualitative research is characterized by: (1) the reality of the setting, which represents a natural space for research processes; (2) the involvement of professionals and their listening, as privileged witnesses and holders of situated knowledge; and (3) the reflexive characteristic of the research process, in the face of the transformation of the research design and data analysis and the flexibility of analysis techniques (Lee, Mitchell & Sablynski, 1999). Moreover, it is distinguished by being a situated activity, which places observation in reality and is formed by interpretive and factual practices through which reality gains visibility (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

To conduct this research, a case study was used (Creswell, 2012; Trinchero, 2004) with convenience sampling. A case study is a method that is characterized as an in-depth exploration of a bounded setting (activity, event, process or individuals) based on data collection (Creswell, 2007). Creswell (2012) defines various types of case studies:

▪ the "case" can be represented by one or more individuals (either separately or in a group), activities, events or program;

▪ the "case" can represent a process that consists of a series of practices that form a series of activities;

▪ the "case" can be chosen for study because it has value in and of itself. When the case is interesting in itself it can be called an intrinsic case. In contrast, an instrumental case serves the purpose of bringing a particular issue to light.

Finally, case studies can include multiple cases, called collective case studies (Creswell, 2012).

In a qualitative study, the research design is the result of a recursive process of successive approximations, trial and error, and conceptual experimentation that originates return information. The researcher configures and chooses objects in the process, negotiating with the situation. Peculiarities are considered particularities of the research itself, which is created through the practice of reflexivity. The research process used was the circular and recursive process described by Creswell (2012; 2019): identifying the research problem; literature review; specifying the purpose of the research; data analysis and interpretation.

As it was just mentioned, the research design was circular and recursive, having the last discipline of the theoretical framework (Transcultural Psychiatry) been included during the last months of research. Moreover, the idea of interviewing contemporary thinkers of each discipline grew from there – since I had already

interviewed two professors who are an important piece of contemporary history for Transcultural Psychiatry, I decided to add interviews to contemporary practitioners, who could help me having insights about how their fields are useful to analyze radicalization and violent extremism.

The following chapter starts with a brief literature review about radicalization studies. A literature review involves a summary writing of journal articles, books, and other documents that describe the state of the art of present and past information; organizes the literature into topics; documents the need for further study (Creswell, 2008). The goals of the literature review are to substantiate how it is possible to contribute to the development of the literature with one's own research and to show evidence of the need for a study. The protocol established to carry out the literature review study was based on a qualitative and comparative analysis of different studies: 1. choice of topic, delimitation of the research problem and formulation of the question; 2. identification of articles; 3. organization of articles and development of an outline of main concepts); and 4. selection of citation modes. National and international databases (EBSCO, SBN On-Line, SCOPUS, PubMed, Google Scholar) were consulted for the literature review. The keywords used at the beginning were: radicalization, violent extremism, prevention, polarization. The search was filtered by including monographs, volumes, and peer-reviewed articles in scientific journals. The criterion for selecting studies was adopted from the titles and abstracts by ascertaining that elements relevant to the research topic were present. All contributions that were not national or international scientific publications were excluded (Creswell, 2012).

The literature review also served to define the research questions and establish the indicators. The data collection tools were basically the semi-structured interview and the focus groups. The interview can be defined as an asymmetrical verbal exchange between two or more with different roles and tasks in order to gather information from more than one person, i.e. interviewer or interviewee, or opinions on a given issue (Lucisano, & Salerni, 2002). In the semi-structured interview, open-ended questions are asked so that respondents can express their answers without being constrained by the researcher's perspectives (Creswell, 2012). The order of questions differs as the interview progresses, depending on the answers the interviewee gives. The outline presents guiding questions to gather information on topics deemed central (Lucisano & Salerni, 2002). The advantage of this type of interview is the collection of data that the researcher obtains in a systematic way (Choen, Manion & Morrison, 2011), linking the need to derive certain information programmed in the outline and the flexibility required by the type of interview.

During my last stay in Québec, I was able to organize also three small focus groups, because I wanted to add a different and more collective reflection to my empirical data.

1.3 Method

The interviews and focus groups were based on convenience sampling, which is non-probability sampling. In other words, the design that the researcher constructs when choosing units of analysis based on what he or she has available (Lucisano & Salerni, 2002). Participants are selected because they are: a) willing to take part in the study; b) convenient; c) possess characteristics that the researcher wants to study the participants themselves will provide useful information to answer the research questions (Creswell, 2012).

Since the main interest of this research is radicalization and violent extremism approaches, the interviews were focused on the subjects that idealize, organize and lead research and activities in this field. The sample has been composed of 45 interviewees - directors, coordinators and staff of the three Universities (Université de Sherbrooke, Université du Québec à Montréal (UQÀM) and Concordia University) and also the chair's partners - Centre for the Prevention of Radicalization Leading to Violence (CPRLV), Canadian Practitioners Network for the Prevention of Radicalization and Extremist Violence (CPN-PREV), Actions Interculturelles (AIDE), Montreal Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies (MIGS), Recherche et Action sur les Polarisations Sociales (RAPS) and one of the international partners of Unesco-Prev, Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles. During my last stay in Québec, the sample was widened to better approach the three disciplines chosen. In Montréal, I have interviewed professors and researchers who are linked to the Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry of McGill University, in particular its director, Prof. Laurence Kirmayer and Prof. Jaswant Guzder, who has collaborated with it for the last 40 years, and Prof. Cécile Rousseau, who is also the coordinator of RAPS.

While I was attending a seminar at Université du Québec à Montréal (UQUAM), I met a French professor who studies complot theories and radicalization, mostly through a work with prisoners in France. I interviewed him, who is a social psychologist, and he gave me the contacts of other two psychologists and psychoanalysts who work with him precisely on my study field. My convenience sample was completed with two extremely meaningful thinkers: Isildinha Baptista Nogueira, a black Brazilian psychoanalyst who has written extensively about racism and a book entitled "The colour of the unconscious"; and Tião Rocha, a Brazilian pedagogist who has been working on education projects for almost 40 years. Not only he has gotten inspiration of Paulo Freire's theories, but he had the

occasion to meet him personally and to collaborate with him on a couple of educational projects.

The semi-structured interview track was built on three different thematic topics: 1) Working practices learning; 2) Representations of the radicalization concept; 3) Prevention practices. To each topic a maximum of five open questions were defined, and this division was useful to define both the codes and the themes.

The first part of the interview began with a brief description of studying and working experiences, then explored the initial collaboration at that specific organization, the beginning of the engagement in prevention and finally the person was asked to describe one critical episode of his/her work.

The second part of the interview was focused on radicalization and contained the following questions: 1) In your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization? 2) Which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization? And 3) Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? (if yes, Could you tell me more about it?). The first two questions were structured because of the lack of homogeneity in scientific literature, as it was demonstrated in the first chapter. As it will be exposed bellow, the interviewees had different ideas on the definition of radicalization, and this diversity of points of view is consistent with the scientific literature on the subject.

The third and last part of the interview was about prevention activities. The first question was related to political and /or scientific collaboration in the projects and their strength and critical points. About critical aspects, some answers were in line with the scientific literature – for example, the lack of solid evidence on efficacy and on methodology. Some talked about the need of more collaboration among different institutions and stakeholders, the need to work on school's curriculum and also to introduce prevention in working spaces. Others reflected about the need to create context specific activities and also more experience based, instead of content-based practices, with more flexibility and with less assumptions. Furthermore, the need of the academic and the research worlds to be more open and to do more efforts to communicate with the community was brought up.

The interviewees were also asked about things they would like to do differently and about the most important capacities to promote in primary prevention activities. Critical thinking, pluralism, resilience, empathy, dialogue, digital literacy, understanding and accepting diversity and different opinions, and cognitive complexity were among the most cited. The last question was "How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?" and the answers can be divided into two main themes: the financial aspect and the socio-educational content.

Even if the sample was not extremely large and was composed mostly by people who in some way collaborate or at least know each other, the answers given were

not homogeneous at all. The first interviews were made in English, but after a while I understood that it was necessary to translate the interview track also to French and I did it. At the end of the process, there were also two interviews in Portuguese and one in Italian. The citations will be done in the original language of the interview and the translation to English will be included in footnotes. While I was working on the transcriptions, I realized that I should have given the opportunity of choice between English and French right away, since I could notice that some people have answered in English but were not really comfortable to express all their ideas.

In May 2023 I have organized three focus groups: two with practitioners and researches from different institutions in Montréal and one with researchers from Université de Sherbrooke – the first two were held at the Centre for Study of Learning and Performance, at Concordia University, and the last one was held online, because of a last-minute problem of two participants. They were not classical focus groups, but I have merged actually two different techniques: Focus group and expressive writing.

A widely used tool in social research, a focus group can generally create the opportunity and stimulus for members of a group to articulate those rules and assumptions that normally remain disjointed. The use of focus groups has several advantages, including the fact that they are social events, that they are time-limited, and that they require no technical skill from participants. Predetermined questions can be asked, but the main objective is not so much the specific answer but the stimulation of discussions in order to understand the meanings and norms underlying the group's responses. Whereas in a group interview the interviewer seeks answers, in focus groups the facilitator seeks to analyze the interactions in the group. Focus groups should not be controlled or directed, but they do require extensive preparation and planning for their success, especially with regard to the choice of participants and location (Bloor et al, 2001).

The Expressive Writing method was first proposed by Pennebaker in 1986, and since then several studies and possible applications of the method have been carried out. The basic idea of this American social psychologist was that expressing deep thoughts and emotions through writing could increase the capacity for self-observation and reduce the negative effects of stress. Writing is also a widely used method in recent years within organizations and can promote deeper reflection and sharing than just oral sharing - writing often helps organize and give accomplished form to thoughts and emotions. In recounting our work experience and in doing so according to the rigor that the rules of written communication impose, we discover between one thought and another that seemed consequential to us there are actually gaps that we need to make explicit - first of all, to ourselves just as we become aware of connections that we had not guessed or understood at the moment when two, apparently, independent sentences appear close together revealing hitherto

unthought of ties of relationship.   Writing then becomes a tool capable of transforming fragments of awareness into "an organized whole" (Tulli, 2012, p. 81-83).

The idea of mixing writing exercises to the focus group discussion came because in my previous field experience, I had noticed that frequently in a focus group there are power dynamics and other elements, such as shyness and fear of sharing strong ideas, that may interfere with the spontaneous discussion. I had used writing in other settings and I thought it could be a useful tool, as it has been demonstrated in the three occasions in which it was used.

The first writing exercise was a typical opening of Expressive and Auto-biographical writing encounters. I've asked the participants to write "I am…." / "Je m'appelle" … and gave them some minutes to freely write. Some of them wrote an ordinary presentation, some used humor to think about their identity / identities, others wrote about the origins of their names and / or last names. They were not registered, to respect the participants' privacy. The task was used only as a warm-up and to allow participants to present themselves to the others.

For the second exercise, I have asked them to write the word "Radicalization" and then write whatever they wanted. Some gave their definitions; others wrote mainly questions they still ask themselves in their practices; someone wrote about the personal encounters with radicalization. An interesting example:

> "Ma première rencontre avec la radicalisation c'était en 2001. Dans ma classe on nous a annoncé qu'un avion avait frappé les tours gémelles. (…) Ma deuxième rencontre avec la radicalisation c'était au Cegep, en 2012 (…). Ma troisième rencontre s'appelait féminisme… C'était radical, semble-t-il, de lutter contre les oppressions sexistes. Ma quatrième rencontre c'était à l'université, quand j'ai découvert l'IRA et son histoire qui m'ont profondément intéressé. Ma cinquième et dernière rencontre à ce jour, c'est le centre où je travaille, son approche communautaire, empathique, scientifique et éducatif de la radicalisation. Qui décide de ce qui est radical, qui est radical ? Qu'est-ce que c'est être radical ? Autant des questions sans réponses finales sur lesquelles mes collègues et moi nous penchons chaque jour. Je n'ai pas de réponse à offrir, je suis moi-même radicale dans certains sens de ma vie. Je pense que nous le sommes tous et toutes un peu."[1] (FG 2, P. 1)

---

[1] My first encounter with radicalization was in 2001. In my class we were told that a plane had hit the Gemel Towers. (...) My second encounter with radicalization was at Cegep, in 2012 (...). My third encounter was with feminism... It was radical, it seemed, to fight against sexist oppression. My fourth encounter was at university, when I discovered the IRA and its history, which deeply interested me. My fifth and final encounter to date has been with the center where I work, and its community-based, empathetic, scientific and educational approach to radicalization. Who decides what is radical, who is radical? What does it mean to be radical? So many questions without final answers that my colleagues and I ponder every day. I don't have any answers to offer; I myself am a radical in certain aspects of my life. I think we all are to some extent.

The third and last exercise was: "Thinking about Radicalization and violent extremism, please write the following title: *If I had a magic wand…*" During the interviews, I had asked what practitioners and researchers would have done differently if they could. The results will be analyzed in the following chapter together with some answers got from this exercise. Obviously using the idea of the magic wand gave participants more freedom of thought, so some gave rational answers and others felt free to dream quite high – some examples:

"Si j'avais une baguette magique… je l'agiterais pour faire disparaitre les inégalités, celles qui oppressent, celles qui étouffent, celles qui tuent, celles qui radicalisent les esprits les plus doux, les plus pacifiques. Si j'avais une baguette magique, je l'agiterais pour faire le silence, pour que ceux et celles qui ne se voient pas, qui ne m'écoutent pas, qui ne m'entent pas puissent enfin se regarder et s'écouter. Pour que la polarisation et les conflits qui d'enracinent dans cette incompréhension mutuelle puissent se régler dans le dialogue et le respect de l'autre."[2] (FG 2, P.1)

"- I would ensure that the fight against oppression, discrimination and stigmatization is not only fought with words, but also with action.
- I would improve the life and social conditions of those less fortunate so that they don't find solace in violent, radical groups and ideas.
- I would ensure that all have a roof over their heads." (FG 2, P.6)

Other data from the focus groups will be analyzed in the following chapters together with interviews' data. In general, the writing exercises allowed participants to express themselves with freedom and the discussions that followed were quite interesting. The space for expression among them was divided with much equity, without the need of moderating efforts. Here are some comments of the participants at the end of the meetings:

"I'm not very sharp in the mornings and, um, just being in the group and doing the exercise actually woke me up and I really enjoyed taking part in it. And I'm also a person that has maybe an easier time structuring my ideas by writing than by talking. So having done the interview like last year with you and then being in an exercise where I first write my train of thought and then explain it, I was like, Oh, that's that is more structured. So if you thought that my previous interview was kind of muddled, that is why so, so, so I actually enjoyed having the time to think, put some points by writing." (FG 2, P.6)

---

[2] If I had a magic wand... I'd wave it to make inequalities disappear, those that oppress, those that suffocate, those that kill, those that radicalize the gentlest, most peaceful spirits. If I had a magic wand, I'd wave it to create silence, so that those who don't see each other, who don't listen to me, who don't hear me can finally look and listen to each other. So that the polarization and conflicts rooted in mutual incomprehension can be resolved through dialogue and respect for others.

"(…) with free writing, you can kind of go on a tangent and go wherever you need to go and then you can kind of clean it up after. So, I appreciated that a lot. Yeah, I really enjoyed this. (…) And yeah, I, I realized that this is such a complicated topic and we really do need to have an interdisciplinary approach, because everyone is coming from a different lived experiences and professional experiences. So we have to have like a wider range of specialties in order to deal with such a complex problem and deal with the root and not the symptoms. So yeah, I would love to continue these conversations. I think that just even to be able to appreciate that the complexities of the issue." (FG 2, P.2)

The focus groups have overcome my expectations - I had imagined I would have gotten different feedbacks from the interviews, but particularly the second and the third group discussions were really interesting and productive. The first one was slightly more difficult, basically for an organizational reason: three participants cancelled last minute, so we were only in four. It was anyway a critical situation that I had to deal with and at the end the result was not so bad, it was a moment of growth.

Thematic analysis (TA) has its roots in the 1970s and has taken on multiple meanings since this term appeared (Clarke, Braun & Hayfield, 2015). Holton (1973) had identified TA as a methodology for studying the concepts underlying scientific knowledge; for Winter and McClelland (1978) it was a quantitative measure of cognitive complexity. Moreover, over the years it has often been used interchangeably with terms such as "content analysis" to name multiple things: from methods that allow quantification of qualitative data to more interpretive forms of analysis based on identifying recurring themes or patterns in the data (Dapkus, 1985).

Over the past 15 years TA has increasingly become a recognized methodology used in psychology, social and health sciences (Clarke, Braun & Hayfield, 2015). Our focus is on the "systematic" and "sophisticated" approach developed by Braun and Clarke (2006), where thematic analysis refers to a methodology for identifying and analyzing patterns in qualitative data. TA is used to systematically identify, organize and offer information about themes across a dataset. It is characterized by accessibility and flexibility - it is accessible because even researchers with little experience can use TA, flexible because it can be used in multiple ways.

Thematic analysis can be (Braun & Clarke, 2006):

- inductive: the analysis is based primarily on data rather than on theories or concepts; with the inductive method, the researcher aims to stay as close as possible to the meaning of the data;

- deductive: data are examined through a theoretical lens so that existing theoretical concepts characterize the coding and development of the topic (analysis moves toward meaning of the data);
- semantical: the analysis focuses on the surface meaning of the data, the things that are explicitly stated;
- latent: the researcher focuses on meanings that lie beneath the surface of the data, hypotheses or expressions that support semantic meanings;
- descriptive: the analysis describes the meaning modeled in the data;
- interpretive: analysis goes beyond description to decode deeper meanings in the data and interpret their significance. This flexibility allows thematic analysis to be used in a variety of forms; it can range from relatively simple descriptive methods to more complex readings of the data.

TA consists of six steps: becoming familiar with the data; generating initial codes; researching themes; reviewing potential themes; defining themes and sub-themes; and processing and writing the report. Becoming familiar with data is first stage, in which the researcher is immersed in reading the collected data. Reading data does not mean understanding the meaning of the word or phrase, but rather reading the words actively, analytically and critically by beginning to reflect on the meaning of that particular data. The researcher is called to question how the participant makes sense of his or her experience, under what assumptions he or she interprets it, and what kind of world is revealed through his or her stories. It proves useful to annotate the data set and individual transcripts; at this stage such annotation is not systematic and inclusive but is entirely observational and casual.

The second phase is based on generating initial codes. Codes can be defined as the building blocks of the analysis: they identify and provide a label for potentially relevant data for research purposes. Coding can be done at the semantic or latent level of meaning: codes that describe the content of the data are called descriptive or semantic, generally remaining close to the content of the data and the meanings of the participants; codes that go beyond the meanings and provide an interpretation of the content are called interpretive or latent, generally meanings that lie beneath the semantic surface of the data are identified. What is important is that the codes are relevant to answering the research question. Once a data extract to be coded has been identified, it is necessary to write the code and mark the text associated with it. As coding progresses, changes can be made to existing codes to incorporate new material.

Braun and Clarke (2006) state that a theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set. Theme research is an active process,

meaning that the researcher constructs and generates themes rather than discovering them. This third stage can be compared to the work of the sculptor in that the researcher chooses how to shape the piece of stone (raw data) to construct a work of art (the analysis). The coded data need review to identify any areas of similarity and overlap between codes.

In the fourth stage, the researcher is asked to review themes, check whether these themes work in relation to coded extracts (level 1) and within datasets (level 2) by generating a thematic map of the analysis. Specifically, if you have a distinct and consistent set of themes that work in relation to the extracts the second stage of the review process is undertaken. It is very important to create a set of themes that capture the most relevant elements of the data.

 At the stage of defining themes and sub-themes, it is important to identify the essence of each theme as a whole and of the themes as a whole. In a good thematic analysis, themes: a) should have a singular focus, b) should not overlap, c) address the research question. In certain cases, there may be sub-themes within a theme; these are useful if there are one or two general patterns within the data in relation to the research question.

In the sixth and final step, the researcher writes a report that provides a convincing story about the data based on the analysis he or she has conducted. To write a coherent report on the data, the themes should be linked together in a logical and meaningful way. This is not an easy task – during the writing process of the present study, for example, the order of the chapters was changed more than once and the decision to present the theoretical inputs together with empirical data, instead of dividing them like we usually do in a PhD thesis, arrived at the very last moment.

The analysis of the data was based on the division of the interview track (Working practices, radicalization, prevention). One of the steps was to divide the different answers to each question in separate files, in order to compare them, and to define themes and sub-themes. Since the data is presented along with the theoretical part, the results are brought up in a different way than the classical division just described. Following these steps was useful anyway in order to do the initial analysis of the data gathered with interviews and focus groups and helped me in the path of structuring the present study.

Chapter II.
RADICALIZATION STUDIES

As explained in the introduction, this and the following chapters will present data from scientific literature together with the empirical data, since one of the goals of the present study is to promote a reflection on how they can be complementary. It is interesting to underline that the interviewees had extremely different studying paths – such as Pedagogy, Political Sciences, Statistics, Arts, Sociology, Psychology, Psychiatry, Anthropology, Law, Criminology, Communication. Not only the educational, but also the professional experiences of the subjects were quite heterogeneous. Some of them had wide experience with violent radicalization and prevention, others were experts on the subject only through research and had never met a radicalized person. More than half of the sample have stated that they have learned to do what they do on the ground, through informal learning and through exchanges with more experienced colleagues or directors. Around one quarter of the sample was composed by PhD and post-doc candidates, who were whether doing research directly about radicalization or collaborating in projects on the subject.

2.1 Radicalization: the journey of a concept

The literature on radicalization is huge and fragmented, with different research groups and disciplines taking a range of sometimes conflicting perspectives on the issue. In order to discuss later about radicalization prevention, it is important to start reflecting about the meaning of the word and also about the main studies and researches published on this field recently. Even though it is not our intention here to do a systematic literature review on the topic, some important characteristics and critical issues of radicalization studies will be summarized in this chapter.[1] This

---

[1] The theoretical review developed in this chapter originates both from a thematic literature review, undertaken in 2021 and the beginning of 2023, using the databases such as Scopus, Pubmed and Google Scholar, and from the research material derived from the Project Forward (ID 859019), realized by the University of Siena between 2019 and 2023.

initial concept mapping will be a useful departure point and will also be rediscussed later on the thesis, when data from the empirical research will be analyzed. In this section, several different definitions will be listed, without the intention of finding a definite answer to the question about radicalization's meaning. As it will be explained, frequently other terms, such as violent extremism or terrorism are used both together in definitions and in preventive studies and activities.

The word radicalization derives from the Latin term *radicalis* and refers to "root". It has been used therefore in the past as a botanical metaphor, in order to name a process that takes towards the roots and causes of a concept or a thing. During the last decades, the word has been used in many different ways and frequently also as a synonym of violent extremism or terrorism.

As a political expression, "radical" was used for the first time in 1797 in Great Britain, when Charles James Fox made a speech about the need to proceed with "radical reforms", meaning to go straight forward to the root causes of social problems and act to develop a profound change (Antonelli, 2021). During the following decades, and also due to the consequences of French Revolution and of the establishment of industrial society, "radical" has been used in the political world, but since the beginning the use of violence was questioned. In other words, many used to wonder if it was possible to achieve huge social changes in a peaceful way or not. As Schmid (2013) highlights, in the 19th century, many of the radicals, like the suffragettes in the late 19th and early 20th century were mostly non-violent activists. Their demonstrative public direct actions in support of women being allowed to vote were often illegal but not illegitimate. In fact, some of the 19th century radical demands have become mainstream entitlements today. At that time, 'radical' referred primarily to liberal, anti-clerical, pro-democratic, progressive political positions. As Sedwick (2010) points out, who or what is defined as "radical" necessarily depends on an itself problematic notion of what is "normal," "moderate," or "mainstream" as a point of reference and has changed considerably over time.

The term's ubiquity could suggest an established consensus about its meaning, but in fact the current use of the term is of recent origin (Sedwick, 2010). Although radicalization has increasingly been subjected to scientific studies, a universally accepted definition of the concept is still to be developed. While before 2001 the term 'radicalization' had been used informally in academic literature to refer to a shift towards more radical politics (usually not referring to Muslims), by 2004 the term had acquired its new meaning of a psychological or theological process by which Muslims move towards extremist views (Kundnani 2012).

Peter Neumann, one of the founders of the "new radicalisation discourse", observed: "Following the attacks against the United States on 11 September 2001, it suddenly became very difficult to talk about the 'roots of terrorism' […] and so

experts and officials started referring to the idea of 'radicalisation' whenever they wanted to talk about 'what goes on before the bomb goes off.' (Neumann, 2008; in Kundnani 2012, pp. 4–6).

In contrast to the term's earlier use in research on political violence and social movements, which had emphasized relational dynamics in processes of escalation at the collective level, "radicalization" came to be understood predominantly as the gradual adoption of extremist ideas that promote and eventually lead to acts of terrorism, thus focusing attention on processes of cognitive and ideological transformation, mainly at the individual level (Malthaner, 2017). We will focus now on this relation between "radicalization" and "terrorism", following the path of the first period of studies on this field, after the September 11 attacks in the United States and also 2004 and 2005 attacks in Europe.

Bailey and Edwards (2017) point out that in the current dominance of policy and security concerns in the language of radicalization means that the term is almost always associated with a particular undesirable endpoint. In this framework, radicalization is something to be policed and is by definition an undesirable process: radicalization is the process of becoming a terrorist, and so is akin to the evil of terrorism.

Even if "Terrorism" could seem to be an easier concept to define, as Ahmed (2020) highlights it remains a contested concept with over 200 definitions. In the nineteenth century, terrorism was developed as a term to denote violence committed by non-state actors. There are not only different understandings of 'terrorism', but also different types of terrorism, such as regime terrorism, insurgent terrorism, left-wing terrorism, right-wing terrorism, ethno-nationalist terrorism, jihadist terrorism, lone wolf terrorism and cyber-terrorism, so even if we think about radicalization leading to terrorism the issue is still complex (Schmid, 2013).

Some authors, like Doosje and colleagues (2016), define terrorism as an act of violence (domestic or international), usually committed against non-combatants, and aimed to achieve behavioral change and political objectives by creating fear in a larger population. It is pointed out by many that it is generally a group phenomenon. In several studies, radicalization and terrorism frequently occur alongside each other, as one research object, and researchers fail to offer a more precise distinction between the two phenomena (Gaspar et al, 2020).

The associated use of the terms "radicalization" and "terrorism" can be problematic and used to legitimize excessive countermeasures, such as extensive surveillance of the public sphere. Gaspar and colleagues (2020) state that while terrorism is a specific means of action (violence against civilians), aimed at causing an immediate effect (to spread fear), radicalization refers to the development of specific political objectives. In this framework, terrorism is only one possible outcome of radicalization, among many others. Political grievances (both genuine

and imagined), broken political procedures, rivalry, and the possibility of terror groups outbidding are all important considerations when analysing the situation at the group level main factors to examine while figuring out why a group would have chosen to participate in acts of terrorism and political violence (Speckhard, 2007).

One of the interviewees has stated :

“C'est un problème. Parce que quand on pense à radicalisation, on pense toujours à terrorisme. Et on fait, l'association, ce n'est pas le cas. Donc, à mon avis, ce n'est pas le cas. Donc radicalisation, comme indique le nom, c'est un processus et un processus que peut amener ou pas, donc à la violence politique. Radicalisation, pour moi aussi, c'est un processus qui implique nécessairement donc un questionnement politique et des débats actuels autour des notions culturelles, politiques, religieuses. C'est très varié. Ok et qui amène justement… donc à la pensée extrême, ça veut dire qu'il est plus en plus c'est un processus, je dirais des dépluralisation. Dans ce sens-là, tu perds de plus en plus le sens de pluralité de ta pensée, pour adopter une pensée plutôt binaire amis/ennemis, noirs/blancs…” [2] (Int. 33)

Besides “terrorism”, “radicalization” is frequently used together or as a synonym of “violent extremism”. Schmid (2013) tries to distinguish these terms focusing on pluralism – in historical terms, if we think about Fascism or Communism, the author explains that extremists can be characterized as political actors who tend to disregard the rule of law and reject pluralism in society. The author states that extremists want to make society conformist by suppressing all opposition and subjugating minorities and that this would distinguish them from mere radicals who accept diversity and believe in the power of reason rather than dogma.

Another difference brought by Gaspar and colleagues (2020) would be that extremism describes a condition and not a process, like radicalization. Furthermore, they argue that in the academic discourse, extremism is understood to constitute the rejection of the democratic constitutional state and fundamental values, while radicalization, irrespective of political systems, can be conceived as the willingness of actors to increasingly challenge the existing political order.

---

[2] It's a problem. Because when we think of radicalization, we always think of terrorism. And we do, the association, that's not the case. So, in my opinion, that's not the case. Radicalization, as the name suggests, is a process that may or may not lead to political violence. Radicalization, for me too, is a process that necessarily involves political questioning and current debates around cultural, political and religious notions. It's very varied. Okay, and that leads precisely... so to extreme thinking, which means that it's more and more a process, I'd say of depluralization. In this sense, you lose more and more the sense of plurality in your thinking, to adopt a more binary way of thinking, friends/enemies, blacks/whites...

This distinction is not always clear though and the words "radicalization" and "extremism" are frequently used together or as synonyms. Prove of this is some answers to my question about radicalization definitions, such as:

"So to me, radicalization is, you know, is related to extremism, right? So people start to adopt extremist way of thinking and start to support or engage themselves in acts of violence that are that are motivated by extremist beliefs, often of political nature or sometimes, and that often can include religious nature, racial realities." (Int. 14)

"C'est une extrémisation de croyances, qu'elle soit politique, religieuse, sociale, quel que soit le type aboutissant à une non négociabilité de cette croyance. C'est à dire que je tiens tellement cette croyance qu'elle n'est ni discutable ni négociable. Voilà comment très simplement je la définirais."[3] (Int. 42)

The effort to distinguish the concepts with clarity is complicated further by the fact that both terms are relational concepts and need to be assessed in relation to a standard reference, that can change over time and depends also of the context. Sedwick (2010) observes that "radicalization" is also used in three different contexts: the security context, the integration context, and the foreign-policy context, and each of these contexts has a different agenda. The author suggests a distinction among a relative and an absolute meaning of the concept:

"According to the Oxford English Dictionary, one meaning of ''radical'' is ''representing or supporting an extreme section of a party.'' In this sense, the term may be used as a synonym for ''extremist,'' and in opposition to ''moderate.'' It serves the useful purpose of indicating a relative position on a continuum of organized opinion. ''Radicalization'' thus indicates movement on that continuum. The use of the term ''radical'' in its relative sense, then, is unproblematic. It does, however, raise two questions. One is where to draw the line: where does the moderate section of the continuum lie? The other and more difficult question is what continuum should be considered in the first place. If a group is organized around one central issue, as some pressure groups are, it is clear that the appropriate continuum is the one that relates to that issue. (…) The relative sense of ''radical,'' then, is useful so long as it is specified what is meant by ''moderate,'' so long as the continuum along which the line is being drawn is carefully considered, and so long as it is recognized that some other continuum may be more important to the group or selection of groups being analyzed. Very frequently, however, none of these criteria are observed, resulting in what is in effect an absolute use of the term. This may happen because the line between moderate and radical is presumed to be self-evident, and because the continuum (''with-us-or-against-

---

[3] It's an extremization of belief, be it political, religious, social, whatever the type, leading to the non-negotiability of that belief. In other words, I hold this belief so strongly that it's neither debatable nor negotiable. That's how simply I would define it.

us'') is also presumed to be self-evident. If so, these presumptions are erroneous."
(Sedwick, 2010, p. 481)

Therefore, one of the complex aspects of radicalization is that it is an inherently relative concept. Unless the societal norms are established, understood and accepted by all, there are likely to be difficulties in defining what is radical or extreme within that society. As Sedwick (2010) has pointed out, confusion in public discourse comes up when the words radical and radicalization are used as "absolute concepts". The solution, he suggests, is to cease doing so and to continually emphasize the relativity of these concepts, just like some of the practitioners interviewed. One of the examples is the following:

"When I think of radicalization, I always think about kind of what constitutes a norm and then an extreme and how that is always maybe something that is not kind of static, but it's in motion. So I think it's relative. Radicalization is always relative to something. Which makes it tricky. I mean, in the case of kind of violent extremism, I would say radicalization often involves a certain kind of process of alienation and then maybe reclaiming a sense of belonging." (Int. 19)

Schmid (2013) does a similar statement when he points out that the standard reference points by which radicalization and extremism are assessed in Western societies include Western 'core values' like democracy, majority rule with safeguards for minorities, rule of law, pluralism, separation of state and religion, freedom of thought and expression. Many governments therefore use the term 'violent extremists' as a synonym for terrorists and insurgents.

One question that is raised by many authors (such as Bramadat & Dawson, 2014) who study radicalization is about its relation to violence. Some include violence in their general definition – for example, Doosje and colleagues (2016) define it as a process through which people become increasingly motivated to use violent means against members of an out-group or symbolic targets to achieve behavioral change and political goals. Della Porta (2018) gives a similar description, when she defines it as a process of escalation from nonviolent to increasingly violent repertoires of action that develops through a complex set of interactions unfolding over time.

Some authors adopted terms like "violent radicalization" or "radicalization leading to violence", others use it together with "violent extremism". Brouillette-Allarie and colleagues (2022) define violent radicalization as a

"non-linear process by which an individual or group (including a state) undergoes systemic transformations (e.g., behavioral, socio-economical, psychological, identity-based, political, and/or ideological) that lead them to support or facilitate the use of

violence towards an individual or a group in order to further their cause and bring about individual or societal changes." (Brouillette-Allarie et al, 2022, p. 127)

One definition taken as a reference by many authors is the following:

"an individual or collective (group) process whereby, usually in a situation of political polarization, normal practices of dialogue, compromise and tolerance between political actors and groups with diverging interests are abandoned by one or both sides in a conflict dyad in favor of a growing commitment to engage in confrontational tactics of conflict-waging. These can include either (i) the use of (nonviolent) pressure and coercion, (ii) various forms of political violence other than terrorism or (iii) acts of violent extremism in the form of terrorism and war crimes. The process is, on the side of rebel factions, generally accompanied by an ideological socialization away from mainstream or status quo-oriented positions towards more radical or extremist positions involving a dichotomous world view and the acceptance of an alternative focal point of political mobilization outside the dominant political order as the existing system is no longer recognized as appropriate or legitimate" (Schmid, 2013, p.27).

Many of the interviewees have cited this definition as the one they mostly base their practice on. Here are some examples:

"Schmidt' definition is what I use in my work. I like the distinction between radicalization, violent and non violent, and that it can be an individual or a group and that it is a process, that there is a sort of legitimization of violence that happens step by step, somehow, to reach a goal. That's that there's a goal at some point, it can be political or religious can be ideological in some cases, so it overlaps with extremism." (Int. 8)

"c'est important dire que la radicalisation n'est pas toujours violente. C'est une rigidification des idées, mais pas nécessairement violente ou que veut être un' influence pour les autres non plus.Il y a des gents qui sont été radicaux dans leur vies, mais ont fait des changements dans la société – Martin Luther King, Malcom-X… ils on fait des mouvements pour les libertés individuels. Donc c'est pas toujours négative, mais reste une rigidification des idéaux." [4] (Int. 11)

"Je le définis comme un processus qui, en fait, amène un individu à adopter une vision radicale d'un problème politique, économique, social, religieux. Et finalement, qu'il l'amène à un point où il y a une rigidité cognitive qui fait qu'il n'accepte plus d'arguments et ultimement… qui peut mener à la violence parce qu'il va estimer que on peut recourir

---

[4] it's important to say that radicalization isn't always violent. There are people who have been radical in their lives, but have made changes in society - Martin Luther King, Malcom-X... they made movements for individual freedoms. So it's not always negative, but it's still a rigidification of ideals.

à la violence pour mettre en application ou défendre ses idées là. Donc moi, je distingue la radicalisation, la radicalisation violente. " [5] (Int. 29)

There are multiple challenges associated with researching and modelling the processes of radicalization, including conceptual clarity, the nature of the research phenomenon, and the nature of the process. In policy documents, radicalization is frequently portrayed as a linear process through which individuals follow a defined pathway, transforming from "ordinary" citizens to cognitively radicalized individuals, increasingly interacting with other extremists and thereby becoming further radicalized into a state where the individual might undertake a violent act. Jämte & Ellefsen (2020) highlight however that research has shown that the relationship between extreme and radical attitudes and behavior is far from linear and that cognitive change does not necessarily lead to behavioral change.

Another critical aspect about the definition of the term is brought by Schmid (2013): it is not just a socio-psychological scientific concept but also a political construct, introduced into the public and academic debate mainly by national security establishments faced with political Islam in general and Salafist Jihadism in particular. The concept has been used therefore to highlight a relatively narrow, micro-level set of problems related to the causes of terrorism that Western governments faced in their efforts to counter predominantly 'home-grown' terrorism from second and third generation members of Muslim diasporas. Ahmed (2020) states that the 'war on terror' discourse may marginalize certain groups by creating a dichotomy of acceptable beliefs, perceptions and expressions of ideology and identity and even accentuate the dualism of 'western nations' versus 'Islam and Islamic nations'.

One of the interviewees indeed was quite critical about radicalization studies and their political goals:

"So, I can't really talk about radicalization in Québec. That's a whole other story for me, because this society actually creates radicalization, in my opinion. So, it is so intertwined with the politics of institutions in this province that I don't even want to touch it. I wouldn't have anything to do with the people that are doing this kind of work because I disagree with their politics. And I'm just saying that overtly. This is so to me, this is a highly politicized funded by government, funded by Quebec." (Int. 40)

---

[5] I define it as a process which, in fact, leads an individual to adopt a radical vision of a political, economic, social or religious problem. And ultimately, that it brings him to a point where there is a cognitive rigidity that means he no longer accepts arguments and ultimately... that can lead to violence because he will feel that violence can be used to implement or defend his ideas. So I make a distinction between radicalization and violent radicalization.

As Meringolo (2020) indicates, radicalization theorists have comprised a large range of approaches, from studies focused on religious ideology to more complex models of radicalization that see an interactive process between ideologies and socio-psychological aspects. Rather than religious beliefs by themselves driving individuals to violence, the picture is one in which ideology becomes more extreme in response to a 'cognitive opening', an 'identity crisis' or a 'group bonding' process.

Antonelli (2021) brings up two main definitions made during a panel of 21 European experts organized within the project "Horizon 2020 Trivalent". First of all, radicalization could be considered as a socialization process through which a person adopts a paranoic vision of the world and of politics. This process occurs after the interiorization of and extremist ideology that legitimizes the violent or terrorist action. In this sense, there are some similarities that could be drawn with becoming part of a sect, such as the gradual distancing of previous social bonds and the establishment of totalitarian connections with people who share the same vision. In addition to this, the experts pointed out that radicalization can also be seen as a recruiting process and as political participation. In this sense, radicalization is a process through which people build bounds and belonging to an organized universe. Radicalization in this sense would be a way of non-conventional political participation in which violence has an expressive and instrumental role.

Another important aspect on the definition of radicalization is the difference between cognition and action. McCauley and Moskalenko (2012) differentiate among 'opinion radicalization', which involves the cognitive commitment to radical ideas, and 'action radicalization', which denotes acting on these radical ideas. This differentiation has also been referred to as 'cognitive radicalization' and 'violent radicalization'. Similarly, Malthaner & Lindekilde (2017) define radicalization as a composite process, made of cognitive radicalization, changes in activist practices, and relational mechanisms that interact in complex ways.

An issue pointed out by some interviewees indeed is the relation among cognition, emotion and interpersonal exchanges:

"So, it's not just taking an extreme position, but it being very rigid and unresponsive to ordinary dialogue, ordinary back and forth counter-evidence, all these other things. So that kind of polarization and adopting an extreme position vis a vis something that matters and defending it against counter evidence or other influence and then in particular, when it then connects to very negative things." (Int. 39)

"Radicalization puts people in a borderline experience so they marginalize themselves from the group and a borderline experience can… it makes people maybe more emotionally invested in what they're marginal about. So, their political ideas so. I think for a lot of people it doesn't lead to violence. But for some people who may have some

vulnerabilities or have some particularities in their personal life, this borderline experience can lead to acting out. And this is where violence may appear." (Int. 41)

Gaspar and colleagues (2020) make an interesting distinction between radicalization into violence, without and within violence. They state that radicalization into violence refers to the most conventional understanding of the concept and in order to achieve political goals or ideas there would be a declaration of violence or at least the willingness to use it, rejecting legal channels. The authors highlight that the other two kinds of radicalization have been researched to a much lesser degree. Radicalization within violence refers to individuals or groups that already use violence and radicalize even further, while radicalization without violence refers to individuals and collectives that attempt to achieve their objectives explicitly through non-violent means but intentionally violate the given framework of the applicable legal system to express their increasing tendency to reject the existing order. The authors advocate for a broader understanding of radicalization. They define radicalization as the increasing challenge to the legitimacy of a normative order and/or the increasing willingness to fight the institutional structure of this order.

As demonstrated in the previous paragraphs, radicalization must be considered as a complex concept which requires a multidisciplinary approach. Different research domains have contributed to diverse aspects of the efforts to understand and define the phenomenon. Psychologists have tried, for example, to understand if there could be any connections with psychopathologies. Even if no single psychopathology nor psychological profile was found to be specific in cases of violent radicalization or terrorism, researchers consider that some psychological factors frequently contribute to radicalization. Hardy (2018) points out that the strongest among these are a lack of self-esteem and sense of identity, which result in the need to join a cause and feel valued by others and also points out to the role of social relationships. This is one example taken from the interviews:

"(…) how important identity or central identity is and so I guess I feel like sometimes if people, you know, people who are searching for an identity might be very vulnerable to extremist views of the world. You know, for instance, if you feel that you've been downtrodden… you know, the example of Incels…But that idea that oh, yeah, I found a group who's going to support me as you know, disenfranchise, let's say, in this case, white men who want to become white men, disenfranchised white men." (Int. 6)

Richards (2017) emphasizes that a term or concept which becomes so firmly embedded that it materially influences policy in a significant way across the world, as is the case with radicalization, needs to be constantly reviewed and tested rather than accepted as an institutionalized ghost in the machine. The present research is

an attempt to walk in this direction, even if the difficulties to find a synthesis among such a huge number of ideas, studies and researches, frequently quite heterogeneous, are substantial. A participant of the second focus group has written:

> "Radicalisation: Qu'est-ce que c'est ? Qui peut être radical ? C'est une bonne ou une mauvaise chose ? Comment on peut la prévenir ? Quels sont les signes ? Doit-on la craindre ? Toutes des questions auxquelles nous sommes confrontés au quotidien dans le cadre de notre travail. Ce qui est intéressant de ce concept est sa nature changeante et évolutive selon les époques, les endroits, les réalités. C'est aussi ce qui le rend « challengeant » en tant que professionnels. C'est stimulant." [6] (FG 2, P. 5)

2.2 Radicalization studies and critical issues

The enormous and still expanding literature on radicalization cannot be fully represented here. As it has been exposed in the previous section, there is little agreement on how extremism and radicalization should be defined, how these are linked to terrorism, and at what point in the process it is appropriate for governments to intervene. Some scholars agree that radicalization is a process, but this process has been modelled in different ways, while others consider it an entirely context-specific and personal set of factors that cannot be documented very clearly (Richards, 2017). What some call "Radicalization studies" is a quite recent but at the same time varied and multidisciplinary field, that presents several challenges.

As pointed out in the introduction, it has been estimated that more books were published on the subject of radicalization leading to terrorism in the five years following the September 11, 2001 attacks than in the 50 previous years combined (Silke, 2008), and that the use of the term 'radicalization' in English-language press more than doubled between 2005 and 2006 (Sedgwick, 2010). On the one hand, this growth on the number of studies is understandable, but on the other hand it has increased the risk of producing research based on cognitive and methodological biases. It has also stimulated in many cases meta-stereotypes (Koomen, Van der Pligt, 2016). The concept of radicalization has led to the construction of Muslim populations as 'suspect communities', and sometimes has led also to civil rights abuses (Kundnani, 2012). The greatest increase in frequency of use of ''radicalization'' in the press was between 2005 and 2007, timing that strongly suggests that the term's current popularity derives from the emergence of ''home-

---

[6] Radicalization: What is it? Who can be radical? Is it good or bad? How can it be prevented? What are the signs? Should we fear it? These are all questions we face in our day-to-day work. What's interesting about this concept is its changing, evolving nature according to time, place and reality. It's also what makes it "challenging" as professionals. It's stimulating.

grown'' terrorism in Western Europe, notably the London bombings in July 2005 (Sedwick, 2010).

Many literature reviews have pointed out these critical issues. For example, Desmarais and colleagues (2017) have analyzed a sample of 250 scientific articles published between 1990 and 2015, and have noticed that only 20% produced new data based on empirical research, while the other 80% was based on secondary sources. Neumann & Kleinmann (2013) indicate the type of funding as one of the causes of these biased studies. Radicalization research is funded to a much greater degree than other fields of study not by research councils, foundations, and other more traditional sources of finance for academic research, but by governments and government agencies. This means that frequently the academic peer-review mechanisms and processes of academic scrutiny were missing.

The initial trend of radicalization studies has anyway gradually shifted. For example, Schuurman (2020) found that the use of primary data has risen considerably during the last years, and there has also been a significant rise in the range of data-collection strategies and techniques used by the scholarly community. Recent meta-analyses and systematic reviews of the discipline have also revealed the current knowledge in this scholarly field and provided a good account of the knowledge applied to the risk factors and protection of radicalization. Moyano and colleagues (2022) affirm that even though there are positive data on the growth in the quality and quantity of studies in this field, research into the processes of radicalization, violent extremism and terrorism faces difficulties and challenges that have not yet been resolved. Among them, the authors cite the diversity of the existing theoretical models, the difficulties in conceptually delimiting certain constructs, cultural biases, the difficulty of obtaining empirical data and accessing information from police sources and the difficulty of replicating studies.

It is important to take a step back and try to understand how Radicalization Studies were developed. Antonelli (2021) considers the article "The causes of terrorism", written by Martha Creshaw (1981) as an important reference to the study field. She had proposed a first multidimensional model of the terrorist act, that was supposed to be the end point of a long process characterized by "structural preconditions" and "precipitant factors". For some years the article has remained on the margins of other theories, but it found space after September 11 attacks and has been quite used by security agencies and public institutions. In this context, the potential radicalized/terrorist was identified in the "Other", both political and religious. Crenshaw's view of the causes of terrorism distinguished individual motives and beliefs, group-level decision making and strategy, and the wider political and social context in which terrorism occurs. This three-way distinction of individual, group, and mass factors is echoed in much of later research (McCauley & Moskalenko, 2017).

Kundnani (2012) brings up some important aspects of this study field development. The author states that an article written by Walter Laqueur in 2004 builds a bridge between the older terrorism studies and the then-emerging radicalization literature. Laqueur (In: Kundnani, 2012) tried to provide a 'root cause' that no longer referenced the wider political context, but instead focused on what he called 'a cultural-psychological disposition'. Framing the 'root cause' question in this way and providing a model of this 'disposition' offered intelligence and law enforcement agencies the possibility of an analytical framework that could be used for surveillance purposes.

Despite the lack of consensus on the definitional aspects, the fact that Radicalization Studies are rooted in Security Studies is not questioned. The further and future development of the study field is not as clear as its origins anyway. At the beginning, studies were strongly oriented towards empirical and applied research, with a theoretical model strongly focused on the individual. In this context, radicalization was studied as a process that led to terrorism and therefore as a way to understand how to prevent it. The field was to some extent influenced by research on social movements and political violence but developed a very distinct analytical perspective on radicalization. Its focus rested predominantly on jihadist radicalization and on individual dispositions and trajectories, to some extent embedded in radical networks and group-dynamics, while paying little attention to processes of collective radicalization and their broader political context (Malthaner, 2017). Although the field of radicalization research was increasingly influenced by research on social movements and political violence, it gradually developed into its own branch of research and in a great extent the focus was on jihadist radicalization (Gaspar et al, 2020).

Kundnani (2012) assumes a quite critical behavior in relation to this initial development of radicalization studies:

"In this early account, the main components and confusions of the radicalisation discourse are already present: the focus on the religious beliefs and psychology of individuals and the downplaying of political factors; the view that terrorism is rooted in a wider youth culture of anger and aggression; and the listing of factors likely to drive individuals towards support for terrorism, such as anti-western attitudes, religious fundamentalism and self-segregation. Already, the term 'radicalisation' tends to merge a number of meanings – disaffection, youth alienation, radical dissent, religious fundamentalism, propensity to violence – which ought to be kept analytically distinct; already, unfounded and biased assumptions about the social and political history of Muslims in Europe are being introduced; and a causal process from a 'cultural-psychological disposition' to violence is being asserted without any substantial evidence. Finally, it is worth noting that there is no mention of US and UK government rhetoric on the need to fight a war against 'radical Islam', of the war on

Iraq, of the uniting of millions of European Muslims and non-Muslims to actively oppose it, and the failure of these mobilisations to prevent the war by democratic means. Later works in the radicalisation discourse can be seen as attempts to systematise the basic framework laid out by Laqueur in 2004 in a number of directions" (Kundnani, 2012, p. 9)

In order to give theoretical and academic basis to counter-terrorism strategies adopted by institutions, different commissions composed by researchers were created. One famous example is the Expert Group on Violent Radicalization, created by the European Commission – as Antonelli (2021) explains, between 2005 and 2008 the new studies on radicalization and terrorism began to spread around the world. The research program was strongly influenced by institutions and by political and security authorities, that needed to have access to scientifically grounded knowledge both to legitimize their actions and to program preventative activities. The author points out two biases of this new study field: the radicalization discourse is elaborated and supported mainly by occidental institutions and researchers, even if a great part of the events take place in Southern countries and in societies already hit by violent conflicts and civil wars. Moreover, the paradigm was built mainly in relation to Islamic radicalization, while a great part of the threat in Occident comes from other fields, such as nationalism, separatism and political ideologies. Antonelli (2021) emphasizes also that since research programs are quite operational, in general models are not constructed following a rigorous scientific path with empirical control, but result usually of generalization of empirical evidence through an inductive method.

2.3 Interpretative models

To elucidate the radicalization process, some researchers have introduced a phase model that is also ultimately linked to the use of violence in its final stages (Gaspar et al, 2020). Important examples are the staircase model by Moghaddam (2005), the four-step model from the New York Police Department (NYPD) (Silber and Bhatt 2007), the four radicalization factors outlined by Sageman (2008) and the twelve-mechanisms model by McCauley and Moskalenko (2008). Multistage models of radicalization, which consider radicalization processes as sequences comprising various steps, establish a direct correlation between radicalism and terrorism or jihadism. These linear models consider the use of violence as the logical outcome of radicalization that occurs if the process of radicalization has not been interrupted beforehand (Gaspar et al, 2020).

In his staircase model, Moghaddam (2005) identifies perceived deprivation and the perception of (un)fairness as the ground floor of the radicalization process. According to this model, people move to the first floor due to the lack of

participation in decision making and the perception of injustice. Those who reach the first floor seek ways in which to improve their situation and achieve greater justice, but if they do not see possibilities for individual mobility, they are more likely to keep climbing. Individuals who reach the second-floor experience anger and frustration, and in some circumstances are influenced by leaders to displace their aggression towards an "enemy." Individuals who are more prone to physically displace aggression onto enemies climb further up the staircase. According to the author, the most important transformation that takes place among those who reach the third floor is a gradual engagement with the morality of terrorist organizations, while those who become more fully engaged with the morality of terrorist organizations and keep climbing up the staircase are ready for recruitment as active terrorists. Recruitment to terrorist organizations takes place on the fourth floor, where potential terrorists learn to categorize the world more rigidly into "us-versus-them" and to see the terrorist organization as legitimate. On the last floor, some individuals are selected and trained to carry out terrorist acts.

In a more recent contribution, Moghaddam brings up the concept of mutual radicalization:

"when two groups take increasingly extreme positions opposing one another, reacting against real or imagined threats, moving further and further apart in points of view, mobilizing their resources to launch attacks and finally attempting to weaken and destroy each other. A key feature of mutual radicalization is that it is a process that can only emerge through interactions between groups and nations" (Moghaddam, 2018, p.4).

For the author, mutual radicalization is a combination of psychological and material factors, which are strictly interlaced.

The four-step model from the New York Police Department (Silber and Bhatt, 2007) considers radicalization as a process composed by four distinct phases. The first would be "Pre-radicalization", the life situation before individuals who usually conduct an "ordinary" life with little or no criminal history. In the following phase, "Self-identification", individuals begin to explore Salafi Islam influenced by both internal and external factors. The catalyst for this "religious seeking" is a cognitive opening, or crisis, which shakes one's certitude in previously held beliefs and opens an individual to be receptive to new worldviews. The third phase would be Indoctrination, in which an individual progressively intensifies his beliefs and wholly adopts jihadi-Salafi ideology. The last one would be Jihadization, in which members of the cluster accept their individual duty to participate in jihad and self-designate themselves as holy warriors or mujahedeen.

The model proposed by Sageman (2008) puts emphasis on friendship and affiliation as central to the radicalization process. For the author, the root cause of

radicalization it is the embedding of theological radicalism within a group dynamic. He refuses accounts that consider economic or political conditions as significant and justifies this choice based on the fact that these factors affect millions of people, while only a small number become terrorists. He identifies four prongs to this process: first of all, a sense of moral outrage about a perceived injustice in the world, then an enabling interpretation that places this outrage in the wider context of a moral conflict. Thirdly there would be personal experiences, such as of discrimination, and lastly mobilizing networks. In Sageman's model, the four prongs are not linear, in that they can be present and affect an individual in simultaneous ways and in different combinations.

Kundnani (2012) considers Wiktorowicz's approach similar to Sageman's, since he emphasizes the way that groups place 'grievances' within an interpretative 'frame', and the importance of socialization into the group's construction of reality to create a 'network of shared meaning'. The author introduces the concept of 'cognitive opening', which refers to a psychological crisis in which previously accepted beliefs are shaken and an individual becomes receptive to other views and perspectives. The view of these two researchers, that radicalization is essentially a theological-psychological process (in which radical religious beliefs, activated by group dynamics or cognitive openings, transform individuals into terrorists) has been influential among law enforcement agencies.

McCauley and Moskalenko (2008) consider radicalization as a dimension of increasing extremity of beliefs, feelings, and behaviors in support of intergroup conflict and violence. In their model, twelve mechanisms across individuals, groups and mass publics were distinguished: Personal victimization, Political grievance, Joining a radical group—the slippery slope, Joining a radical group—the power of love, Extremity shift in like-minded groups, Extreme cohesion under isolation and threat, Competition for the same base of support, Competition with state power—condensation, Within-group competition—fissioning, Jujitsu politics, Hate and Martyrdom. For ten of these mechanisms, radicalization occurs in a context of group identification and reaction to perceived threat to the ingroup.

Among many other studies, McCauley and Moskalenko (2017) highlight some other milestones of the field. Horgan's *Psychology of Terrorism* (2005 in: McCauley and Moskalenko, 2017) brings three psychological issues: the psychology of becoming a terrorist, the psychology of being (persevering as) a terrorist and the psychology of disengaging from terrorism. The author pointed out the importance of distinguishing between radical ideas and violent action. Moreover, he underlined that the progression to terrorism is usually gradual, that an individual is more open to influence the greater is his/her dissatisfaction or disillusionment with life and that community support for violent action that affords status to militants can help motivate violence.

McCauley and Moskalenko (2017) cite also two other quite important studies: della Porta's *Clandestine Political Violence* and Kruglanski and colleagues' *The Significance Quest*. In the first, the author looked for common mechanisms of radicalization to violence in four types of underground groups: Italian and German leftists, Italian rightists, Basque ethnonationalists and al-Qaeda jihadists. Beginning from social movement theory, she focused on the dynamics of competition and conflict between groups: between police and militants and between activist factions in the same movement. She identified common mechanisms, such as escalating policing, competitive escalation, activation of militant networks and implosion. Kruglansky and colleagues (2014) present a model based on the notion that the quest for personal significance is a major motivational force that may push individuals toward violent extremism. Their model is composed by three elements: motivational (the quest for personal significance) that defines a goal to which one may be committed; ideological, that identifies the means of violence as appropriate for this goal's pursuit; and the social process of networking and group dynamics.

Beginning around 2010, a number of researchers started raising doubts about the usefulness of the notion of radicalization. The challenge being raised against radicalization and extremism is that these concepts elide ideas and action, so it is necessary to recognize that radicalization to extremist opinions is psychologically a different phenomenon from radicalization to extremist action. As Borum (2011) has argued, it is necessary to distinguish radicalization, as the process of developing extremist ideologies and beliefs, from action pathways, as the process of engaging in terrorism or violent extremist actions. The two pyramids model of radicalizations represents radicalization of opinion separately from radicalization of action (McCauley and Moskalenko, 2017). This idea is related to Schmid's definition and, as already has been pointed out, was underlined by many researchers and practitioners interviewed. In the second focus group, when asked to write the word "Radicalization" and then write whatever came to their mind, one participant wrote:

"Radicalization makes me think of revolution and change. Social transformation. Radical ideas are the mother of change that can make our societies more just and inclusive. We need change. However, it can be associated with violence and separate and block dialogue between different groups. What we refer to as polarization, which can in turn create an environment where radical ideas can be easily matched with positive attitudes towards violence, thus increasing the risk of violence in our society. A violence that can be seen by some as the only way out to change the world and fight injustice. I'm talking here about radicalization and violent radicalization at a collective level or as a societal phenomenon that has repercussions on society, communities and individuals in an ecosystemic framework." (FG 2, P.3)

Another important aspect that has been investigated by radicalization researchers refers to root causes, trigger events and moderator factors – the three types can be further divided in micro, meso and macro-social factors (Antonelli, 2021). Root causes are profound and structural causes, and related to radicalization the micro-social factors can be psychological, cognitive or socio-economic. Among others, it seems quite relevant the concept of relative deprivation, which means being convinced of having less than others and less than what would be in our right. Meso-social factors are relational, such as group thinking, ideology, hate speech. Lastly, macro-social factors are related to geopolitical conflicts, modernization and globalization consequences. Trigger events are political, economic or personal events that can induct radicalization. At the micro-social level, it could be a mourning, imprisonment, job loss or being a victim of discriminatory acts. At meso-social level, there are group identity and social networks, and at macro-level there could be a war breakout or an attack. Moderator factors are personal and social characteristics that hinder radicalization process. It is important to note that the instruction level's role is controverse, since a low level of scholarity doesn't seem to be associated to a higher level of radicalization.

Antonelli (2021) brings up in his book the results of a literature review done between 2014 and 2017 for a European project (Horizon 2020 Trivalent), in which 258 scientific articles were analyzed. Regarding Root causes and Triggers, meso-factors are dominant, followed by micro-factors and to a much lower degree macro factors. Moreover, the results showed that 80% of the scientific studies were focused on Islamic radicalization. The author considers the under evaluation of macro-social levels as linked to the ethnocentric aspect of radicalization studies. Another observation that he does is that social, cultural and psychological factors do not seem to be enough to explain the genealogy of the radicalization process – they are necessary but not sufficient conditions.

Della Porta (2018) emphasizes that the reflection on how root causes are activated is still open. Focusing on the micro level for example, a great part of research has agreed that radicals and terrorists tend to have normal personalities. Similarly, Malthaner (2017) indicates that studies on radicalization and terrorism from a psychological perspective have pointed out the lack of empirical evidence for any notion that perpetrators of political violence are psychologically abnormal. Researchers have focused instead on risk- and background-factors that can under certain circumstances make individuals vulnerable to radicalization. These factors, however, are often either rather general social characteristics (such as age and gender), or contingent upon an individual's personal situation and prior patterns of political beliefs.

Another author that needs to be mentioned is Khosrokhavar (2017), who claims that we should talk about radicalization's paths, associated with different sociability

configurations, in order to make a deep analysis of reality. The author describes radicalization, and in particular jihadism, as a long-term process that has changed, a bit at a time, sociability and mentality of political-religious militants towards a growing mobilitation of "traditional" symbols and the development of "imaginary communities" to which a strong sense of belonging is settled.

In recent years, a number of authors have begun to chart and assess the emerging field of "radicalization studies," questioning the notion of radicalization as primarily a cognitive and ideological process, criticizing its excessive focus on the individual level of analysis and its tendency to de-contextualize the phenomenon, and calling for greater attention to be given to the meso-level of radical movements and milieus and the role of the wider societal and political environment (Malthaner, 2017).

Rousseau and colleagues (2017) make some critical observations about the models presented in scientific literature. First of all, risk and protection factors have mostly been studied in parallel, and only a few studies have simultaneously examined their joint effects. Secondly, models are usually based on retrospective studies of radicalized individuals (mostly Muslims), and they neglect the diversity of radicalization trajectories. Moreover, the authors point out that there is a lack of transnational and multi-level studies using a common methodology and analytical methods. Lastly, they state that disciplinary frameworks are poorly integrated beyond the more common socio-logical-psychological models. While the processes underlying diverse forms of radicalization have been shown to be very similar, radical individuals' profiles are heterogeneous, and it is hard to accurately predict violent behavior among radicalized individuals.

Despite the lack of consensus on the definitional aspects, until recently there have been two ubiquitous trends in the literature on radicalization and extremism. First, a majority of scholarly output associate radicalization and extremism with religious edicts of Islam without questioning the naturalness of the connection between Islam, radicalization, and extremism. Second, the majority of conversations around radicalization and extremism emanate from and are thus couched in a securitized orientation (Arshad-Ayaz & Naseem, 2016). These trends have been changing recently, as the data gathered during the empirical research demonstrates.

Antonelli (2021) has a highly critical position regarding radicalization studies. The author points out that, despite the main goal of the field has been to provide a scientific reading the processes that lead to radicalization and terrorism in order to prevent or control them, there is still a great distance from goals and reality. The policies that aim to contrast radicalization are the result of a complex process of social, cultural and institutional construction and mediation, of which scientific knowledge is only a part. He provides as an example recent data of the National

Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), from the University of Maryland. The center has analyzed 183 widely used propositions on political debate and academic world on how to contrast radicalization and terrorism. Out of these, 50 were missing any empirical support; other 57 presented multiple qualitative and/or quantitative data that were contradictory and therefore had no valid scientific basis, and only 6 presented strong empirical evidence. The author concludes that the effective level of scientific knowledge related to counter-radicalization policies and practices is still limited, despite the great amount invested on this research field and the attempts to create predictive and precise models.

In a recent article, Moyano, Kruglanski and Trujillo (2022), reflect about radicalization, violent extremism and terrorism. The authors notice that although terrorism, in the sense of politically motivated violence, is not a new phenomenon, in the past 50 years it has had a dramatic impact on international security. They cite figures published by the Institute for Economics & Peace in 2022 - for example, in 2021 alone there were a total of 5,226 terrorist attacks worldwide, which left 7,142 dead. The study shows that these figures are not distributed homogeneously around the world and 48% of the deaths due to terrorism took place in sub-Saharan Africa, primarily of jihadi origin. Along with the jihadi threat, however, it is essential to mention the rising political extremism in Western countries, where the entire spectrum of populism and the outbreak of new social movements, such as conspiracy theories and involuntary celibacy, threaten to become dire security problems in the near future. The authors mention the increase in political terrorism on the far right - in North America, Western Europe and Oceania, attacks from the far right have increased by 250% between 2014 and 2020, and the number of victims has risen by 709% during the same period. Furthermore, they consider reasonable to expect that concurrent crises like the COVID-19 pandemic and the invasion of Ukraine will continue to intensify existing trends that have already been occurring in the past decades (Moyano, Kruglanski & Trujillo, 2022). There are therefore several challenges for future research, that go from better definition of the concepts to a greater number of validated empirical data, but it is clear that the problem exists and must be better studied and comprehended.

Chapter III.
RADICALIZATION AND VIOLENT EXTREMISM PREVENTION

If the very concept of radicalization itself is problematic, the same must – by extension – also be true for radicalization prevention programs. Even if the evaluation literature has been growing rapidly in the last two years, of the large body of studies related to violent radicalization and extremism, very few are empirical outcome evaluations of prevention programs put in place by governments, institutions, or organizations. Knowledge regarding best practices for prevention remains disparate, and the effectiveness of current practices is not clearly established (Brouillette-Alarie et al, 2022). As an interviewee has stated:

"One of them was that we would sometimes read reviews that were written by the government, and so it was like it just seemed so biased. Of course, everything works because they just say, 'We do this, we do that'. And then the actual in terms of like identifying its success, it was really not very convincing to me. So, they basically asked the practitioners how successful they thought it was. I think that something to change would be to ask the individuals." (Int. 20)

Even though, as it was exposed in the previous chapter, radicalization differs from violent extremism and terrorism, many of the researches that deal with prevention leave this distinction aside. This adds complexity to the study field and to the effort of summarizing the main prevention initiatives. Some studies and literature reviews are going to be mentioned in this section, in order to introduce the topic, that will be further discussed in the following chapters.

It is important to highlight that addressing some of the underlying factors that can lead to radicalization and violent extremism and the role that education might take in helping to repel or mitigate the attractiveness of violent extremist ideology and actions is a central issue and a key concern for governments and agencies around the world (Upton & Grossman, 2019). Education is considered as one of the main paths to prevent radicalization from occurring or developing further, since it

is known that it can play a key role in the behavior and beliefs of individuals (Sas et al, 2020).

3.1 Primary, secondary and tertiary prevention

One possible way to classify radicalization prevention activities comes from the public health interventions. The original public health classification system of disease prevention was proposed in 1957 by the Commission on Chronic Illness. Rather than proposing a one-size-fits-all solution, the public health system of classification aims to identify combinations of solutions that work for different groups in different contexts. As authors like Bhui and colleagues (2012) point out, public health interventions are population based, emphasize collective responsibility for health, disease prevention, and recognize underlying socioeconomic and wider determinants of health and disease. The approach emphasizes partnerships with all those who contribute to the health of the population and it had already been applied to violence prevention, so reducing the mean levels of any particular risk factor in the population. The classification system consists of three levels: primary, secondary, and tertiary. Primary prevention seeks to decrease the number of new cases of a disorder or illness, secondary intervention seeks to lower the rate of established cases of the disorder or illness in the population, while tertiary intervention seeks to decrease the amount of disability associated with an existing disorder or illness (Harris-Hogan et al, 2016).

The World Health Organization has suggested that a public health approach is needed to understand the local determinants of all forms of violence – including violent extremism – and to design programs that are adapted to specific socio-ecological environments and sensitive to major ethical challenges (Rousseau, Aggarwal & Kirmayer, 2021).

Similarly, in this field it is important to distinguish primary, secondary and tertiary prevention. Primary prevention focuses on the population as a whole and its goal is to proactively target the causes or factors (individual, interpersonal, community, or societal) that may be at the root of the dynamics of radicalization leading to violence of any type. They can include initiatives ranging from openness towards others programs disseminated in schools and universities to counter-narratives displayed on radio or television. Programs are designed to educate individuals about violent extremism and to prevent the emergence of conditions, behaviors, and attitudes which may be conducive to the radicalization of individuals. Prevention activities may also include educating and upskilling existing community services and personnel such as psychologists, social workers, healthcare professionals, or teachers to understand and deal with the issue of radicalization in their communities independent of government or police (Harris-

Hogan et al, 2015). As highlighted by some interviewees, primary prevention projects are quite important, but means to measure their efficacy are still missing:

"we really need to invest into primary prevention and to evaluate what we do. There's many people doing many things. But if we're not documenting the impact and how we do it, and whether it's working, it's not gonna help much because we don't understand what's working for whom." (Int. 8)

Secondary prevention targets individuals who are at risk of becoming radicalized and are directed towards populations that are identified as somehow vulnerable to violent radicalization and extremism. This assumption can be rooted in valid and reliable assessment procedures or in information suggesting that such populations are at risk. These programs mostly aim to prevent violent behavior or attachment to extremist ideologies among individuals identified as vulnerable but not yet violent. Programs that fall under the secondary classification facilitate interventions for those displaying 'symptoms' of radicalization. Individuals targeted by such interventions may either be engaged within a social network which contains extremist influences, or expressing ideological support for a violent extremist ideology (or potentially both). By specifically targeting those on the periphery of extremist groups, or those who may have recently joined but not yet be fully committed, secondary level projects aim to conduct interventions on individuals deemed most 'at risk' of becoming significant members of extremist groups in the future. Such interventions may be voluntary, or designed without the advanced knowledge of the participant, and may also include programs providing the necessary specialist training and education required to identify and assist such individuals. (Harris-Hogan et al, 2015; Broulliette-Allarie et al, 2022).

Tertiary prevention is aimed at helping individuals disengage from violence and extremism and adopt a critical distance from extremist views or beliefs. Tertiary prevention programs, or intervention/disengagement/deradicalization programs, target individuals who already are on a path towards radicalization, have committed acts of political violence, or have joined a violent extremist group. They focus on reintegrating the individual into society and making them give up violence (Broulliette-Allarie et al, 2022).

As Bhui and colleagues (2012) point out, public health approach has the potential to foster social inclusion and social justice in communities that feel threatened by terrorism, to help destigmatize 'suspect communities', and to identify and address common issues of grievance or marginalization. Moreover, this approach can facilitate the identification of factors to protect individuals from induction into violent ideologies during critical developmental periods.

In the systematic review published by Brouillette-Aallarie and colleagues (2022), it is underlined quite clearly that programs that target a specific ethnic or

religious group - in this case, Muslim communities - generate more negative/iatrogenic effects than benefits. The negative consideration does not come only from the communities the programs, target but also by stakeholders and personnel working for them. They were described as mostly counterproductive, resulting in negative consequences such as stigmatization, discrimination, suspiciousness, and fear of being monitored. These negative consequences are especially problematic because they have been documented in the literature as risk factors for violent radicalization, mainly in connection to how extremist movements in Western countries mobilize grievances centered around discrimination and racism to create an "us vs. them" mentality to justify. In contrast, several secondary prevention programs that were tailored to address Islamist radicalization were viewed with suspicion, as they were adapted to individuals who were actively courted by Islamist extremist groups or were already on a trajectory towards violent radicalization. In line with this critique, when asked about critical aspects of radicalization approach:

"Okay, I'm really radical. Because when I was doing my field, I worked with an organization at …. And the organization was the problem as well, because every activity was like linked to radicalization of like, gunfire like weapon, or like Islam, and I was telling the coordinator like "You are the problem because you are making them radicalized". I was like, instead of talking about that, we can go and bring them do jujitsu, for example, like do like some sports, and doing sports educates, like having like a routine and to be like, I don't know how to explain that to have like, a better way of living. So the critical aspect that I have is that but as well as, sometimes we go to them, like we're going to help you, or like when we go through them, it's like, okay, I know that some of you are radicalized, so I'm going to help you. So it's the assumption that they are radicalized. And actually one of the guys I was working with, said, you know, your people make me on want to radicalize, because when you come here, you are just asking these kind of questions like, like street gangs, or like the weapons or like Islam, he said, I want to radicalize myself." (Int. 2)

"I wonder if it works with youth arriving and saying, 'We're going to prevent you today from doing bad things'. I wonder if that works, because I think in order to be able to reach youth, which is who you want to reach right before things faster. Because prevention in and of itself, it's saying we suspect that you might do something bad. That's not empowering. That's us posing a gaze and seeing that we it's not listening to how they perceive themselves. So prevention may be in and of itself as a concept is a little bit hard to navigate." (Int. 16)

These potential critical aspects of prevention activities indicated both by literature and by the data gathered in the research need to be taken into consideration if one wants to build long term and effective projects in this field.

3.2 PVE, CVE, P/CVE and De-radicalization

Another classification used widely in this field regards Preventing, Countering or Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism. Frequently, as mentioned before, these programs are used indistinctly in prevention also of radicalization and terrorism.

As Schmid (2013) explains, some government agencies in the West make a distinction between 'violent extremists' and 'non-violent extremists' and then focus much of their counter-terrorism (CT) efforts on countering violent extremism only. The origin of the concept 'Countering Violent Extremism' (CVE) goes back to the year 2005, when some US policymakers in the second Bush administration sought to replace the bellicose 'Global War on Terror' (GWOT) with a concept like 'Struggle Against Violent Extremism' (SAVE). Some CT officials see non-violent extremists as possible partners in countering the violent extremists.

In the last decades there has been an increase in the number of young people becoming involved with violent extremist networks throughout the world. Along with this increase has come a debate regarding the appropriate role of education and educational institutions in countering violent extremism (CVE). A recent development has been to bring together the notions of Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) and CVE under the single banner of Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism (P/CVE). Violent extremism is not confined to particular religions, nations, cultures, or ideologies - and is constantly evolving and changing. Therefore, efforts aimed at P/CVE need to evolve in order to address the most pressing threats of violent extremism as well as their root causes (Pistone et al, 2019).

A scoping review published by Pistone and colleagues (2019) has shown that, in general, there is a lack of evidence-based interventions within the field of P/CVE. More specifically, out of the 112 publications included in the review, only 15 publications were primary studies supported by empirical data and only two publications measured the comparative effectiveness of specific interventions. The results of the few empirical studies are though encouraging, as they imply that educational interventions increase knowledge about, and change attitudes towards, radicalization and violent extremism.

Brouillette-Alarie and colleagues (2022) underline that there is a recognized social need for addressing violent extremism rise among vulnerable populations, but at the same time there is a lack on the availability of empirical evidence translated into practice guidelines.

Similarly, Baruch and colleagues (2018) state that one of the few points of consensus about programs for the prevention of radicalization and violent extremism (PRVE programs) is that the processes by which such programs are

implemented and the effects that they have are not evaluated often enough. While initially developed to counteract international Islamist terrorism, contemporary PRVE measures have gradually come to impact a wide range of activists and social movements. This is particularly evident for activist groups that are depicted as extremists and those that employ illegal or violent forms of action. The targeted milieus differ among countries but usually include militant Islamist extremism (MIE) and right-wing extremism (RWE), and in many cases left-wing extremism (LWE), as well as milieus and single-issue movements related to separatism, animal rights or environmentalism (Jamte, Ellefsen, 2020).

Jamte and Ellefsen (2020) conclude their study stating that there is a discrepancy between the complexity identified in a vast amount of research and the tendency to simplify and generalize on the policy level creates challenges for public servants tasked with preventing radicalization and extremism in local communities.

An alternative distinction made in literature and in prevention programs is related to de-radicalization and counter-radicalization. As Schmid (2013) explains, de-radicalization refers to programs that are generally focusing on radicalized individuals or groups of suspected or convicted terrorists with the aim of rehabilitating them and re-integrating them into society or at least dissuading them from further use of political violence. Antonelli (2021) points out that strategies of de-radicalization include psychological support, dialogue and confronting, paths of reconciliation and reintegration. A great part of these activities is done for inmates who were condemned for crimes related to terrorism. De-radicalization strategies can be both individual, through psychological and religious counseling that aim a mentality shifting or collective, through political negotiation, for example a cease-fire.

Differently, counter-radicalization has an anticipatory thrust and seeks to prevent members from non-radicalized populations from becoming radicalized. The main focus of counter-radicalization efforts is therefore not the terrorists themselves but rather the strengthening and empowering of the community from which they might emerge and which might, if neglected, be deemed potentially supportive of them (Schmid, 2013). Regarding the categories explained in the previous paragraphs, counter-radicalization could be compared to primary prevention or P/CVE and de-radicalization to tertiary prevention.

3.3 Security vs. socio-pedagogical approaches

Most authors agree that purely security approaches are not helpful to prevent radicalization and may even be counter-productive. The British program "Prevent", first established in schools in 2006 is a negative example used widely in literature (Thomas, 2020). The program has been considered deeply problematic because it

has targeted Muslims and has been considered Islamophobic. It has placed undue attention, fear, and stress on a population that already faces marginalization. Some of the pitfalls of Prevent include encouraging a fear and surveillance-based culture that further stigmatizes Muslims over-emphasizing Muslim-based extremism over other forms of radicalization such as right-wing extremism, and ignoring community-based initiatives. Teachers have also been involved in surveillance roles through the program, and this role has had negative repercussions (Novelli, 2017). This is in line with what many interviewees have stated. For example:

> "I would say that one of the things that really came out is the important difference between a program that targets the community and whether it's tailored for community and that is kind of discussed mainly with the substantial problems of the Prevent strategy in UK which kind of stigmatize the whole Muslim community, when actually it's fine to have programs for people that are religiously radicalized and you don't intervene the same way with person that are religious radicalized with Islam versus Christianism or whatever else. That is obvious. So tailoring good, but then just targeting a community and assuming that practicing Islam equals risk factors that is not only untrue, but a stigmatization for these for these communities. In terms of stuff that works in terms of tertiary prevention, especially, one of the main things that came out is that we can nearly use criminal prevention intervention as it is and it's good." (Int. 28)

Other countries in the Western world have also used securitized views toward Muslim populations, even if they do not have government-mandated PVE programs in education institutions (Shirazi, 2017). Though it may seem effective to prevent extremism, surveillance might actually have a negative effect. If individuals view themselves and their affiliated groups as being under attack, they may feel frustrated and victimized. Some European countries, such as Belgium, France, Spain, or some cities in Switzerland, have set up structures for education professionals to signal cases. Several of these mechanisms are relatively new and, while many countries do not have dedicated mechanisms to spot signs of radicalization, some governments are moving in this direction. Some European policies on radicalization are defective in terms of prevention and fail to address the issues of identity - many adopt "hard" prevention strategies (Sjøen & Jore, 2019) which occasionally have adverse effects both on young people who are viewed with suspicion, and on some communities, which are stigmatized (Azqueta & Merino-Arribas, 2020).

Authors like Azqueta and Merino-Arribas (2020) point out that frequently anti-radicalization policies make contradictory demands on schools and educators. On one hand, education and school are seen as particularly relevant factors for prevention and for facilitating integration; on the other hand, however, they are turned into information platforms for security agencies through risk indicators. To prevent violent extremism, PVE must address grievances and educate against

polarized thinking that promotes vilification. It is thus counter-productive to contribute toward narratives that further marginalize or oppress individuals and groups (Schmid, 2013).

Accordingly, Wimelius and colleagues (2018) underline that there are concerns about the "securitization" of the caring professions, whereby social workers, medical professionals, and teachers may feel pressure to identify people they think may be at risk of radicalization—notwithstanding the acknowledged and enormous challenges inherent in correctly identifying such people—and report them to the authorities. Such actions would be counter to the firm ethical principles on which these professions are based. This conflict is underlined by some interviewees, for example:

"I think that primary prevention should be restricted to social rail and security agencies and forces should back off, and should not be involved nor funded… and this is a problem, because most funds come from security agencies… it's none of their business and they're making things worse so… In Canada, for example, we have the "Community resilience fund" created by the security Ministry… that undermines community trust. Why should a security Ministry, who's in charge of the police, be concerned with community resilience? Community resilience should be the business of Welfare agency, municipalities, educational system, and so on. So primary prevention should be implemented by social and political actors who are in charge of social life, not security.. and the aim is multi-layered, so the first was appropriately with United Nations." (Int. 36)

The major socio-pedagogical approaches focus on developing cognitive resources and on promoting or strengthening values in order to prevent individuals from being drawn toward violent extremist ideologies or groups (Stephens, Sieckelinck & Boutellier, 2021). Current evidence suggests that most efforts to develop education interventions for the prevention of violent extremism tend to focus on promoting tolerance and understanding through citizenship education and the teaching of civic values (Aly, Taylor & Karnovsky, 2014). One of the most prominent roles ascribed to discussion in the literature is creating the space and opportunity for the exploration and critique of ideologies. It is suggested that censoring or avoiding discussion around controversial issues means there is no opportunity to challenge or alter "extreme" views. Therefore, attention is given to the environment required for such dialogue, referring to the need for safety to explore and discuss issues without fear of condemnation (Stephens, Sieckelinck & Boutellier, 2021). It is emphasized also by many authors, such as Taylor and colleagues (2017), the need to promote dialogue, cultural hybridity, restorative justice, critical digital literacy, critical thinking, as well as human rights in order to prevent radicalization and violent extremism.

A big part of the interviewees agreed on similar ideas about prevention activities. When asked about capacities to promote in prevention activities, these are some of the answers:

"Écoute, écoute, observation. Analyse. Compréhension. Ouverture. Ce sont tous des thèmes qui doivent être prioritaires au départ."[1] (Int. 13)

"Listening skills in a debate. Right now, the education system helps to formulate ideas and to be argumentative and but there's not a lot of, um, teachings about how to receive ideas and what to do with them and how to exchange ideas. I think it's something that could be taught at the level of High schools." (Int. 41)

As it will be also highlighted later, listening is a crucial skill both for researchers and practitioners who study and plan prevention activities, who need to learn how to observe and listen to people's needs and start from there, and for the public in general. Linked to this concept, one can add the openness to pluralism:

"It has to go back to what I believe in is essential in primary prevention, which we don't do enough about. And that is pluralism. So, this concept that we don't have to this, the concept is that we have to accept that differences of perspectives are going to exist on thorny issues, like immigration, like economic equality, like racism, like sexism." (Int. 1)

"Acceptance of the other… I definitely think dialogue is part of it… because conversations to be had me speak about this often is that how do we address these conversations that come up? Or how do we encourage people to say what they have to say and then take it from there? But I think it's often very difficult to draw the line between freedom of speech and hate speech, and at times, so speech can be very hateful, but it's not necessarily very easy for communities who are exposed to frequent hate speech for them to accept it and to continue conversation with that." (Int. 9)

"I think one key component is to, for people to be able to always think in grey, I mean to push against this kind of black and white polarization thinking that is so common, and that gets faster by social media, by how political discourses are developed." (Int. 10)

It is therefore quite important to welcome pluralism and different positions in the discussions made at school or other social and professional environments, with the due attention to limits of hate speech. Linked to this idea of pluralism, one key

---

[1] Listen, listen, observe. Analyzing. Understanding. Openness. These are all themes that need to be prioritized at the outset.

point seems to be the flexibility to accept that one may be wrong or simply have a different opinion and there is nothing problematic about that:

"I think primary prevention is about the education system, is about the media – how the media can represent this plurality of social, while being conscious that it can be hurtful, how do social spaces, local spaces in municipality and neighborhoods can welcome diversity without making it rosy. Diversity is great… and hurtful. And it brings conflict. The issue is not a rosy social space with a constant idea of mediation. Mediation is hard. But we've been working a lot in mediation during the pandemics… Presently there's lot of conflict in school around gender identity and orientation issues and some migrant communities who are religious and feel very uneasy with the official position of the government and the school board… and in all of that, there's not a right or wrong position. There's a diverse society, which hurts… and in which you have conflicts, and in which every party has the right to descent… the thing is how to provide a space for people to express these differences and to see what is it kind of a good or a bad enough solution, and how can we survive with our disagreements." (Int.36)

"J'ajouterai un terme dans la résilience démocratique aussi. Ce sur quoi il faut travailler, c'est le droit au désaccord et le droit au dissensus. " (Int. 29) "et au débat. Savoir qu'on a le droit de ne pas être d'accord, on a le droit de s'engueuler même."[2] (Int. 30)

These suggestions may seem not too difficult to include in day-to-day practices, but unfortunately the reality is quite complex. One factor cited by many practitioners and researchers was the role of social media:

"digital wellbeing is one of them. I mean, it's specifically for online radicalization. (…) Yeah, pluralistic dialogue is super important. Absolutely. And to me that's something that's part of digital wellbeing, right? So one thing that I you know, that's part of sort of the conceptualizations I'm working on right now is, you know, like it's in your social and your feeds. It's really important to have multiple perspectives, right? And to me that's part of that, that dialogue." (Int. 14)

"Digital literacy is huge. It's huge because the Internet is so vast and confusing and binary. It's you're either on this team or on that team. So finding nuance within cyberspace also. I really think. Yeah. Ways so that youth can represent what they are about so as a capacity would be like... I guess, literacy on self-representation. Like, when I do a post on Instagram about something that I am mad about. What? What is… How will that represent me? What will it do to people who see it? I guess it's developing that." (Int. 16)

---

[2] I'd add a term in democratic resilience too. What we need to work on is the right to disagree and the right to dissensus. (Int. 29) and to debate. Knowing that we have the right to disagree, we even have the right to yell at each other.

"Well, trying to make sensibilization, raising awareness for the public, I think it's one of the key thing is how to treat information because nowadays we have that big challenge with… fake news and how the fact that you can easily have access to different platform can affect so I think the digital literacy or education is really important to help people not only to build resilience, but to understand how to look for information and how they can be so critical thinking differently. (…) we need to teach people how to live with differences, so much culturalism education about difference." (Int. 23)

In a world in which everything changes so quickly and the information gets spread in seconds around the globe, it seems that digital literacy is a key capacity to navigate the Internet with more awareness. One of the huge challenges of our days is how to learn differentiating real from fake news and to avoid entering echo chambers in which the second type prevails. Other interviewees have highlighted more general skills, such as

"Education for citizenship. Empathy. Inclusion, diversity. (Int.15)

"critical thinking could be a standpoint." (Int. 5)

"I think that primary prevention definitely needs to focus on more complexity, cognitive complexity, cultural sensitivity. I mean, a certain degree of empathy for others. Civic engagement, positive, constructive, civic engagement, vocational training, continue education" (Int. 18)

All these suggestions can be really useful for the development of prevention activities based on past experiences and new ideas. Obviously, it is not easy to organize activities that really promote all these capacities, such as critical digital literacy, intercultural dialogue, critical thinking and listening skills and most of all, it is not simple to measure efficacy over time. Some of the researchers interviewed reflected about that and about how to improve these practices.

Chapter IV.
WORKING IN PREVENTION

Some questions of the interview were focused on the studying and working experiences of the practitioners and researches, their engagement in prevention and the way through which the have constructed their expertise on the subject.

4.1 Studying background and engaging in prevention

As it was mentioned earlier, a quite particular aspect of this field is that professionals and researchers have a wide range of studying backgrounds. From 45 interviews in this study, there are around 20 different studying paths. The two most common were Psychology and Political Sciences, with seven interviewees each, and other two quite close to the second one: International politics. Regarding the world of Arts, five participants have studied Fine Arts, Film making, Music or Music therapy. Five of them were psychiatrists, but divided in three different branches: forensic, child and cultural psychiatry. Two had a degree in Education, from which one was specific about Educational philosophy. One had a more specific degree in Media Education and another in IT and multimedia. Two of them have studied Communication, then the other paths with only one person were: Statistics, Sociology, Law, History, Sexology, Public Health and Economy. Here are some examples of the extreme diversity of paths:

> "I did my doctorate my PhD in developmental psychology and focused I did intersection of developmental psychology and cross-cultural psychology. So I was working with the on the social psychological adjustment of immigrant early adolescence, from three ethno-cultural communities so the Morocco community, the Romanian community, and the Chinese communities. And I worked with schools, around their social emotional adjustment and risk and protective factors for their adjustment in our positive youth development perspective." (Int. 8)

> "Un bac maîtrise en sociologie. J'aurais d'abord fait des études un peu en économie, mais je me rendais compte... C'était pas pour moi, c'est tellement dogmatique, mais bref,

sur un autre sujet. Après ma maîtrise en sociologie, je suis allée travailler dans différents domaines, surtout en communication, puis éventuellement en politique." (Int. 12)

"I have a bachelor degree in sexology. So I did my specialization in creating programs of prevention of violence but for any type of violence and I specialized in sexual violence with perpetrator of violence because of my bachelor's degree in sexology, and then I did a master's degree in education." (Int. 31)

In some cases, the interviewees had also done more specific studies on radicalization, but they were exceptions:

"I've done my bachelor's degree in political science with a with a minor in law. And then I started my master's degree in Public and International Policy with a concentration on national security and interior security.. being mentored by David Morin. I've completed an essay on Qanon movement and the radicalization of their members and followers." (Int.11)

"I'm a psychiatrist, so I did my medical school. And right after I studied the year in philosophy. And after that, I went in Peru and did some trips in Peru and Cuba to do medical volunteering. And after that, I did my residency in psychiatry, and right now I'm doing a Master in transcultural psychiatry, specifically on radicalization." (Int. 41)

Some interviewees, when asked about their background, have also reflected about different approaches to knowledge and quantitative / qualitative methods:

"(…) So I think the difference is that I learned to, especially before entering university and then pursuing a mathematical degree first before becoming a teacher and then doing Masters and PhD. Because I was so comfortable in mathematics, I tended to ignore the more humanities and literature-oriented stuff that really appealed to me. (…) my study experiences have been positivist in orientation, very much around empirical ways of thinking and doing looking for measurable outputs. You know, treating science as the only true religion, when you think of, you know, waves of ways of thinking and knowing my epistemology is grounded in that kind of empiricism. (…) I have rediscovered and really kindled my more humanist orientation. So, thinking of ways in which we can employ multiple disciplines, so not being curtailed, just buy quantitative, or qualitative methodologies of thinking and knowing and measuring and empirical ways of thinking and knowing, but really looking towards theoretical, philosophical, speculative ways to inform the work that I do." (Int. 1)

"I've studied political science, but in Quebec usually this field take a purely quantitative approach. I have a more qualitative and sociological approach." (Int. 10)

One interesting aspect brought by some participants was the interdisciplinarity in studies and also a quite diverse working experience, such as:

"Formally, I have a BA in Social Work, a master's degree in Public Health, and individualized PhD here in Arts and Social Sciences - it's individualized. And most of the time, you have to combine the three disciplines." (Int. 34)

"Premièrement, ce n'est pas parce que j'ai quand même eu, on pourrait dire, deux vies professionnelles, plusieurs, mais deux vies, comme bien des gens. Avant d'entrer à l'université, je suis rentré à l'université, moi, très tard. J'ai commencé mon bac à 31 ans. Avant ça, je travaillais surtout dans le domaine de la restauration hôtellerie (…) Et je faisais aussi beaucoup d'humour du stand up comique. Et j'ai commencé l'université... Je suis rentré à l'université en 2004, j'ai commencé mon baccalauréat, j'ai fait un bac majeur en politique mineure, en communication. Après, j'ai fait une maîtrise en sciences politiques. Finalement. Après ça, j'ai commencé… J'ai travaillé ici pendant cinq ans. On pourrait dire à peu près entre la fin de mes études de maîtrise, de 2010 jusqu'en 2015. Et pendant cette période-là, j'ai été professionnel de recherche et on appelle ça professeur enseignant, c'est à dire voilà poste de professeur enseignant. Mais en 2015, j'ai décidé de quitter mon poste pour faire mon doctorat en sciences politiques et j'ai soutenu ma thèse il y a un peu plus d'un an maintenant."[1] (Int. 13)

"Yes, actually I have a background in medical studies. I did pre-med. I have a degree in Medical Sciences at Université de Montréal. And that's where I discovered forensic psychiatry (…) studying violence markers in individuals suffering from schizophrenia to try and predict which patients are more at risk of acting out and which ones are not. Then I did an Arts and Science minor at Université de Montréal as well in Languages - this is where I started to learn Portuguese… And then I went back on a Master's degree in forensic psychiatry, which is when I started studying violent extremism and radicalization and then I switched to the PhD in Psychology, which I am still completing." (Int. 35)

It may happen in other humanistic fields that professionals and researchers have varied studying backgrounds, but it seems that in this field they have pursued

---

[1] First of all, it's not because I still had, you could say, two professional lives, several, but two lives, like many people. Before I went to university, I went to university very late. I started my baccalaureate at the age of 31. Before that, I worked mainly in the restaurant and hotel business (...) And I also did a lot of stand-up comedy. Then I started university... I went to university in 2004, started my bachelor's degree and majored in politics, minored in communications. After that, I did a master's in political science. Finally. After that, I started... I worked here for five years. You could say roughly between the end of my master's studies, from 2010 until 2015. And during that time, I was a research professional, and we call it a teaching professor, so that's a teaching professorship. But in 2015, I decided to leave my position to do my PhD in political science and I defended my thesis a little over a year ago now.

particularly diverse paths to arrive where they are. Maybe this is due to two main reasons: the multifaceted nature of the phenomenon that requires different approaches and the fact that it is a quite recent studying area, developed quickly in the last two decades. Therefore, there are no standard definitions, nor standard prevention practices or specific widespread professional trainings. On-field experience, as it will be shown in the next paragraphs, seems to be particularly important.

One question of the first part of the interview was related to engagement in prevention. Coming from quite different backgrounds, as it has been underlined, researchers and practitioners have also started their working experiences with radicalization through diverse paths.

Some of the interviewees started this path in their working environments, for example in schools:

"So, I mean, specifically, with my high school students, the first whole unit of like, the school year I teach is just what is communication? How do you communicate? How does that translate online? So that's part of digital literacy, and having… helping youth develop skills to communicate, I guess, just understand, I think they don't even understand what can come into interference make somebody can't understand the message that's being sent. So we look a lot at that. So I guess it's a form of prevention by that not saying Oh, don't do this, but more just understanding the mechanisms of communication." (Int. 4)

"Je pense que de plus en plus, je me considère engagé dans la prévention. Je ne me rendais pas compte, par exemple, que j'étais déjà engagé dans la prévention. Est-ce que vous aussi plusieurs de plusieurs travaux ou dans mes enseignements, par exemple, quand je suis en classe depuis longtemps? Je m'aperçois que souvent, je vais aborder des sujets de tension. Je vais aborder des sujets, beaucoup dans les discours. Comment est-ce qu'on va? Les discours? Vont, vont, vont parfois radicaliser, polariser. Et ce sont des questions qui me préoccupent depuis longtemps, mais que je lis vraiment arrimées en lien avec les luttes contre les discours haineux. Ça, c'est plus récent. Je dirais de façon concrète que ce n'est post-doctorat vraiment révélé. C'est cette préoccupation de façon plus forte." (Int. 13)

Some interviewees have stated that they started working in this field after specific terrorist events:

"There were two attacks in Montréal between 2014 and 2015, and in that period, there were cases of young people leaving for Syria. Government consulted a group of experts to try to understand the problem - in particular, it was decided to analyze the role of the internet and families in the radicalization process. My thesis dealt with the impact of Islamic videos on young people, that's how I started working with prevention." (Int. 10)

"Bien comme je le pensais vraiment par le regard plus médiatique, notamment quand j'étais au Conseil de presse du Québec, on a été souvent interpellé sur la responsabilité des médias dans la prévention de comportements violents. Donc, notamment, il y a eu un certain moment, il y a eu une fusillade au Collège Dawson, à Montréal. Kimveer Gill, l'auteur, était seul comme un jeune qui s'était radicalisé, qui est arrivé armé et qui a tiré dans au collège et les médias a eu plusieurs dérapages à ce moment-là, on a parlé de six tireurs alors qu'il était seul. Ça crée une panique chez les parents. Imagine déjà qui est un tireur à l'école ou ton enfant, et c'est paniquant." (Int. 30)

"Pour un peu, peut être que je ne vais pas dire que c'était un choix personnel parce que c'est en fait un choix institutionnel. (…) Ce n'est donc pas une démarche de ma part, c'est une démarche de la part du gouvernement après les attentats de Paris et un petit peu avant les attentats de Bruxelles." (Int. 38)

Various researches and centers specialized on radicalization were started and created therefore following terrorist events. In many interviews, practitioners and researches have asked themselves about the sustainability of the field and about what will happen in the future. An interesting experience of approach is the following one, a psychologist specialized in conspiracy theories who was reached out by institutions that asked for his intervention in prisons:

"Alors, je ne m'y suis pas engagé directement. Je veux dire qu'on est venu me chercher, je travaillais déjà sur le complotisme et on était à une période où il y a eu pas mal d'attentats évidemment, et où il s'agissait de prévenir la radicalisation. C'était vers 2015/2016. On est vraiment venu me chercher en me disant… « Les gens qui se radicalisent sont complotistes. Est-ce que vous pouvez venir pour faire quelque chose contre le complotisme ? » On a des gens que nous avons arrêtés et qui sont en attente de jugement parfois. Est-ce que vous pouvez lutter contre leur théorie du complot? Et donc ma première réaction était de dire « non, non, je ne peux pas. Non, je ne viendrai pas ». Parce que moi, j'ai fait des études sur la compréhension des mécanismes d'adhésion aux théories du complot, mais pas de djihadistes, pas de personnes dans des idéologies extrêmes. Donc j'ai d'abord refusé. Puis le ministère de l'Intérieur, le ministère de la Justice sont revenus. Vraiment, ce serait bien. Et donc voilà, c'est ça. Et donc là, j'ai mis mes conditions en quelque sorte. D'abord, c'était des formations auprès des personnels de la justice ou des forces de l'ordre, donc formation auprès de gendarmes, formations auprès de surveillants, etc. Donc j'ai dit ça, d'accord, je vais faire ça, mais pas de détenu, pas voilà, je ne suis pas clinicien, je ne vais pas intervenir, donc ça je fais pas. Donc j'ai fait dans un premier temps plein d'interventions sur le terrain,

auprès de magistrats, auprès des formations des fois, c'est quoi les théories du complot? Comment ça marche ces mécanismes psychologiques?" [2] (Int. 42)

Other practitioners came from a more general approach on violence prevention:

"So, violence prevention is something I have always done… It's not new, because my specialization was when I studied in psychology, what interests me like what is family violence? And gender.. violence towards women and girls, so, so I have always been engaged in prevention of violence and then prevention of violence... When I started working in transcultural psychiatry and cultural psychology, I also focused on the issue of violence and mainly with refugee and immigrant populations that we have trauma that refugees had experienced and connected to that working with Cécile." (Int. 18)

"Actually, I was working directly with the prevention of violence. So, I've always worked in the third level of prevention, but in the work field that I was, being able to re-engage individuals that had committed any type of violence is really a way to make sure that they will not engage in violence. So doing so you need to have their first level of prevention." (Int. 31)

There is also someone who has worked previously in a broader environment related to International political violence:

"Um, for me, I I've always been interested in violence, political violence mostly... But in my undergrad, I did a research project on the peace transitions of Nicaragua and Guatemala. So I was interested in transitional justice basically. But I was still dealing with you know, violent like post violent conflicts contexts. After that, during my master's I worked on basically the contestation of liberal internationalist norms. So still touching a bit violence but mostly you know, discourses that were going against the liberal internationalist world order as we knew it for the last two decades or so. And I

---

[2] So, I didn't get directly involved. I mean, they came looking for me, I was already working on conspiracy and we were at a time when there were quite a few attacks obviously, and it was about preventing radicalization. That was around 2015/2016. They really came looking for me, saying... "People who become radicalized are complicated. People who become radicalized are conspirators. Can you come and do something against conspiracy theories?" We have people we've arrested who are sometimes awaiting trial. Can you fight their conspiracy theories? And so my first reaction was to say, "No, no, I can't. No, I won't come. No, I'm not coming". Because I've done studies on understanding the mechanisms of adherence to conspiracy theories, but no jihadists, no people with extreme ideologies. So at first I refused. Then the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Justice came back. Really, it would be nice. So that's it. And then I set my conditions, so to speak. First of all, it was training for justice or law enforcement personnel, so training for gendarmes, training for supervisors, etc. So I said that, from the outset, we'd work together to find a solution. I'm not a clinician, I'm not going to intervene, so I don't do that. So initially, I did a lot of field work, with magistrates, with training courses, like "What are conspiracy theories? How do these psychological mechanisms work?

guess that working at the CPRLV was a way for me to actually concretely do something about violence, like I studied violence before, but no at the CPRLV it's more in the practical way of dealing with those subjects, basically" (Int.32)

Some interviewees stated that they have shifted from a security approach to a preventative one, like in the following example:

"Moi, mon background à moi, c'est vraiment plus la sécurité, la sécurité nationale et internationale. Mais. Je pense que rapidement... J'ai pris conscience avec d'autres, avec plein de chercheurs, que la réponse sécuritaire, elle, était insuffisante. Qu'elle n'arriverait pas à endiguer le phénomène qu'il fallait... Elle est nécessaire, la réponse sécuritaire. Évidemment, si quelqu'un veut poser des bombes, il faut l'arrêter. Mais ou quelqu'un qui diffuse des discours haineux en ligne, il faut faire quelque chose. Mais en même temps, à côté de ça, on voyait quand même un élan d'un certain nombre de jeunes intéressés par ça. Nous, on se disait ouf, il n'y a pas juste les djihadistes. (…) Puis Vivek travaillait déjà sur la prévention avec le projet Someone, notamment sur les discours haineux en ligne. Ghayda elle est psychologue, donc elle bon, elle sait que le sécuritaire est nécessaire quand il y a quelqu'un... Mais, mais en même temps, elle, fondamentalement, elle pense que c'est la prévention. Donc je dirais que le feat était bon par rapport à la nécessité de travailler là-dessus. Et puis, pour nous, c'était important d'occuper aussi l'espace public. Des médias pour ramener rapidement ce message-là. Pour dire attention. Évidemment, on n'aime pas les djihadistes, on n'aime pas les extrémistes, et cetera Mais une fois qu'on a dit ça, on n'a rien expliqué. Donc il faut essayer de comprendre les causes de la colère, comprendre les causes de la violence et puis de travailler là-dessus. C'est vraiment ça qu'on s'est dit assez rapidement. "[3] (Int 29)

Funding was also pointed out as an important motivation to work on this field:

---

[3] My background is really more in security, national and international security. But... I think that quickly... I realized, along with many other researchers, that the security response was insufficient. That it couldn't stem the tide of the phenomenon that needed to be stemmed... The security response is necessary. Obviously, if someone wants to plant bombs, they have to be stopped. But if someone is spreading hate speech online, something has to be done. But at the same time, we could see a certain number of young people interested in this. We thought, wow, it's not just the jihadists. (...) Then Vivek was already working on prevention with the Someone project, particularly on online hate speech. Ghayda is a psychologist, so she knows that security is necessary when there's someone... But, at the same time, she, fundamentally, thinks it's prevention. So I'd say the feat was a good one in terms of the need to work on this. And then, for us, it was also important to occupy the public space. The media to get that message out quickly. To say be careful. Obviously, we don't like jihadists, we don't like extremists, etc. But once we've said that, we haven't explained anything. So we have to try and understand the causes of anger, understand the causes of violence and then work on that. That's really what we said to ourselves pretty quickly.

"My introduction to prevention, I have to say came up because of my fascination with government funded programs, Canadian government funded programs, to look specifically at radicalization and violent extremism and how to counter it. So counterterrorism now was my introduction to prevention. And when I thought about prevention, it was less along the lines of safety and security, so much less non political science or criminology angles, and more along the lines of what can we do in society to build spaces for dialogue, where, you know, I'm going to be very careful. I think the dialogue needs to be curated. I think, if you want to encourage pluralism, you have to curate it very carefully. But you can't censor, so… For me, that notion of prevention comes about in the curation of these pluralistic dialogues. So my introduction to it was through programs raised to follow the Canadian government. And I ended up applying for funding from them to form an educational multimedia initiative" (Int. 1)

It is interesting therefore to observe that the interviewees had quite different studying and working experiences and have approached the world of radicalization studies and eventually prevention practices through quite different paths – some inspired by a particular person, others called by institutions; some because they were offered the opportunity and others because they had worked on similar fields.

4.2 Working practices learning

Coming from rather different studying backgrounds and having approached the radicalization studies and prevention field for diverse reasons and paths, one aspect that many interviewees have in common is related to their working practices learning. When asked "How have you learned to do what you do and with whom?", most of them have indicated informal and experiential learning.

Much of the learning that we experience occurs outside the realms of formal education and is classified as informal learning. Most of what we learn from birth about speech, cultural norms, spacial awareness, and social cues comes from personal experience and a personal creation of knowledge. Some scholars believe that at least 80% of learning in the workplace is classified as informal (Watkins, Marsick, & de Álava, 2014). There is no space for deepening the subject of adult learning, but an interesting input is brought by Fenwick, when dealing with experiential learning:

"Situated cognition maintains that learning is rooted in the situation in which a person participates, not in the head of that person as intellectual concepts produced by reflection nor as inner energies produced by psychic conflicts. Knowing and learning are defined as engaging in changing processes of human activity in a particular community. Knowledge is not a substance to be ingested and then transferred to new situation" (Fenwick, 2000, p. 253)

Some of the answers I got from this question touched exactly these aspects. Here are some examples:

"Oh, Vivek endlessly. (…) And so it was working through Leslie that I learned a lot, but as well, what can I say? I learned through myself to was in my life when I do when I go on the field, I'm like an ethnographer. I just stay on the field, like will normally my field I spent like, the last one I did, it was four days a week. But it was like five hours, like per day. So, I really like to stay with the people or learn from them as well." (Int. 2)

"So I started with CPN-Prev when it very first started in 2017. And, yeah, so I think that Ghayda was really my mentor because she's the one that has a lot of experience in terms of prevention of radicalization. But then, there's a lot of, you know, learning as you go because it's such a new field of research and intervention that there's a lot of literature to read, a lot of research to make, and you have to use your own resources and creativity to reach the goals that you need to attend because there is no checklist that you can follow, like people working in, in other fields that are very well documented in terms of, you know, project management, or also in terms of literature, etc. So, yeah, I'd say it's, you have to be very resourceful, creative, independent, but also having Ghayda to rely on really helped me develop those skills, but also building my confidence. Because there is a lot of question marks everywhere." (Int. 35)

Many interviewees pointed out specifically one or two persons who gave them the chance to learn working practices on the spot. Others, like the following one, have mentioned the environment in general and the various experts that they have crossed in time:

"J'ai appris comme on dit en Belgique, j'ai appris sur le tas, donc je n'ai pas de formation spécifique en prévention de la radicalisation violente. C'est vraiment en étant en contact avec des spécialistes académiques et universitaires que je me suis formé. On a eu, si vous voulez, un encadrement, on va dire, par un comité d'experts qui a été mis sur pied par le gouvernement. Dans ce comité d'experts, il y avait des chercheurs issus des universités spécialisées dans les matières liées à la prévention de la radicalisation violente et notamment la radicalisation d'origine islamique."[4] (Int. 37)

---

[4] As we say in Belgium, I learned on the job, so I don't have any specific training in the prevention of violent radicalization. It's really by being in contact with academic and university specialists that I've been trained. If you like, we were supervised by a committee of experts set up by the government. This committee of experts included researchers from universities specializing in the prevention of violent radicalization and, in particular, radicalization of Islamic origin.

One interesting aspect that emerged from the answers was the role of freedom: in the case of some respondents, having freedom to develop their own paths was an important ingredient of professional growth:

"Well I think having a lot of specifically at the center, I have a lot of freedom. And I think the Vivek never… he has general ideas of what he wants. But I think this freedom allows me to explore and that's how I learned what works and what doesn't work." (Int. 4)

4.3 Prevention activities: ideas of improvement

This is a particularly interesting part of the data gathered in Québec. When asked about critical points and about what they would do differently if they could, everyone had much to say. Only one interviewee out of 45 has answered that he was satisfied with how the center where he works develops and realizes the projects and has answered that he would not change anything. All the others had a list of things they would like to do differently and, as it was mentioned before, during the focus groups the writing exercise "If I had a magic wand" was a great outburst and almost cathartic moment for everyone. Here are some interview pieces.

One point that was stressed out by many of the participants was the need to listen to the communities' needs before planning any activity. In other words, it was clear to many that top-down projects were far from being ideal. In the following interview, the researcher even wonders about the utility of doing research in communities in general:

"It's really difficult for me to be in this project as well, because it's I'm questioning a lot about like the research and like the way I do research, because research at the end is always extractive. So I tried to be less extractive, and especially working with my community, I'm like, I do want to do something that is wrong or be a part of the problem. So that's why when I begin the group de consultation, I wanted to ask the community "Do you think that the *groupe de consultation* will be helpful for you?" (Int. 2)

Connected to this statement, another interviewee brings up the problem of projects in schools lacking of contact with the real world:

"I say not just art education, but in general institution education lacks of contact with the real world. So, it would be important to work without walls, to really work in the real-world problems, to address real world issues, to bring up real examples of things that are going on in real time in the real world. To me, I think schools are still very isolated from real world problems. And I think that's a red flag and a huge red flag. (…) I don't I don't think a program could be sustainable by itself without the support of social health and family situation." (Int. 5)

69

Coherent with this idea, others have stated similar concepts:

"I mean, I guess prevention activities need to be educational, but they also need to be context specific for I don't think you can design a universal prevention activity. That's my opinion, because I think it depends on what you're preventing, what aspect of radicalization you're addressing because radicalization as a concept may be universal, but how it's practiced, I think is very context specific." (Int. 9)

"Because I think the big challenge in many PCV programs is the fact that they don't really know what they are trying to prevent. And sometimes they don't make a link between the activities that they are developing and the real impact that they have on prevention, because they, they are, they aren't reflecting exactly about what they are trying to prevent." (Int.10)

These statements are in line with the ideas proposed by the Commission on Chronic Illness and author like Bhui and colleagues (2012) and Harris-Hogan and colleagues (2016), brought up in a previous section, regarding the need to identify combinations of solutions that work for different groups in different contexts, rather than proposing a one-size-fits-all solution:

"Well, I think first of all, to do successful primary prevention, there has to be a form of model or strategy and to me, it's the public health or education model, that is the most important in understanding that violent radicalization is really another way of being and it's mostly caused by structural inequalities, and risk factors there. So in terms of prevention initiatives, we can implement a lot of prevention initiatives. The problem is that not many prevention initiatives have evidence that they work… they likely work just because they've been there for so long. (…) The activities need to be constructed in deep collaboration with the communities or whatever, where the prevention is happening shouldn't be top down, it should come from the bottom it should be deeply co-constructed by the community, who knows what it means. It has to be funded, has to be evaluated and what works… has to be continuously funded." (Int. 18)

"I would say if they are made by the community, through the community, and always updated, because society changes, communities change, doesn't remain the same. Over the years, so yes, being sensitive to how the community changes something needs changes, always assessing, you know, the changes that are happening. All the programs really have to be organic, to the community they are taking place in and giving a place to everyone like I said to the table, and not saying "oh, we are the government or we are researchers, or we are an intervention clinical team and this is what it's best for you to do it". You know, that's very paternalistic, and it doesn't necessarily respond to the actual needs of that community. So I guess co-creation like I mentioned earlier, and yeah giving a bigger place to the community than to the experts would helped a lot

because when they feel that it comes from them, they are more motivated to keep it going because there's some personal engagement." (Int. 35)

Moreover, another interviewee stated that teachers' trainings should be systematic, updated and integrated in the regular activities, otherwise the links between research and school is feeble:

"I think it actually needs to be incorporated into teacher's training, which it isn't… it just isn't, like we had a mandate to create this thing. And I don't even know if it's going to be integrated or not. And if it's integrated then it needs to be kept up to date with." (Int. 4)

The same dynamic is valid for the relation among universities, research and the real world:

"la première chose qui m'embête… C'est de traverser les lignes de l'université et les lignes de nos réseaux avec lesquels on communique, à qui on parle. Ça, c'est pour moi, c'est un défi énorme. On a de la difficulté... J'ai de la difficulté à communiquer, à pouvoir contacter d'autres personnes que mon groupe… Et ça, c'est pour moi, c'est un gros problème. (…) Oui, c'est top down et c'est trop tape dedans qui amènerait un troisième en jeu, c'est à dire une espèce de cloisonnement, qui… fait qu'en sorte, qu'on ignore des pans complets de gens ou de groupes de personnes qui, qui dit qui et qui n'entendent pas ce qu'on a à dire ou pis, qu'on n'entend pas ce qu'ils ont à dire. On n'en entend pas dans le fond... Il y a un élément qui est au cœur de ça. C'est à dire qu'est ce qui mène au radicalisme? Ça le faisait aussi. Quelle est notre responsabilité dans la radicalisation? Quelle est cette responsabilité? Au-delà du jugement, particulièrement de l'extrême droite… combien des gens ou même la droite ont de façon générale plus forte, c'est le genre ou certaines attitudes très d'intolérance. Mais d'où vient cette intolérance? Et moi j'ai eu l'impression que pendant trop longtemps on (et je m'inclus là-dedans) leur ignoré. On a juste le négligé et avec les résultats que qu'on a, que l'on observe. Et cette impression que moi, si je prends, moi par exemple, j'avais l'impression que je faisais partie du camp des gagnants et des bons. Et tout à coup, j'ai l'impression que je suis peut-être moins dans le camp des gagnants, des moins bons. Et ça, j'en ai. Et là, bien que faire la gueule, moi, je le sais, il y a beaucoup de défis. Là, il y a beaucoup, beaucoup de défis."[5] (Int. 13)

---

[5] the first thing that bothers me... It's crossing the university lines and the lines of our networks with whom we communicate, to whom we talk. For me, that's a huge challenge. We have difficulty... I have trouble communicating, being able to contact people other than my group... And that, for me, is a big problem. (...) Yes, it's top down and it's too much of a slap in the face, which would bring a third party into play, i.e. a kind of compartmentalization, which... means that, in a way, we ignore whole sections of people or groups of people who, who says who and who don't hear what we have to say, or worse, that we don't hear what they have to say. Basically, we don't hear any of them... There's an element at the heart of this. What leads to radicalism? That did it too. What is our

One topic brought out by many interviewees and underlined in numerous articles about prevention activities (Antonelli, 2021; Brouillette-Alarie et al, 2022) is the urgent need of investing more time and efforts on the evaluation of activities' efficacy:

"Yes, I'd like to do more. But, yeah, well, there's a lot of critical aspects. I mentioned some already, I think like the risk of making it worse. Rather than making it better like and we really need to invest into primary prevention and to evaluate what we do. There's many people doing many things. But if we're not documenting the impact and how we do it, and whether it's working, it's not gonna help much because we don't understand what's working for whom and so there's not much like how our project to evaluate this like… the few projects we have, they're not very strong methodologically, because it's very difficult to get data on this.. sometimes on the evaluation of especially secondary and tertiary prevention – it's sensitive data, so it's difficult to have data. When we do literature review, there's not much with data and solid evidence." (Int. 8)

"So I guess two things that sprung to mind to me personally. One of them was that we would sometimes read reviews that were written by the government, and so it was like it just seemed so biased. Of course, everything works because they just say, We do this, we do this, we do it. And then the actual in terms of like identifying its success, it was really not very convincing to me. So they basically asked the practitioners how successful they thought it was. So I think that that would something to change would be to ask the individuals." (Int. 20)

Correlated to the need of evaluate efficacy of prevention projects, a fact that was brought up is the importance of having long term fundings, in order to be able to really evaluate the outcomes in time:

"you need to build activities with a long-term perspective. Seems to me too many projects are just launched on three, four-year basis. And over here in Canada, at the federal level they fund a lot of things but… Yeah… In a very short time frame. And they expect evaluation during the three-year project and say, how will we know that our public awareness campaign has prevented radicalization within three years? That's impossible. And it's sometime and it's also pretty much impossible to really evaluate the

responsibility in radicalization? What is our responsibility? Beyond the judgment, particularly of the extreme right... how many people or even the right have generally stronger, is the kind or certain attitudes very intolerant. But where does this intolerance come from? And I've had the impression that for too long we've (and I include myself in this) ignored them. We've just neglected it, with the results we've seen. And this impression that I, if I take myself as an example, had that I was part of the winning and good camp. Now, all of a sudden, I'm under the impression that I'm perhaps less in the winning camp, less in the good camp. And that I have. And here, although I know I'm pouting, there are a lot of challenges. There are many, many challenges ahead.

effect. We can evaluate satisfaction of participant. People are always happy to participate in that and stuff. But. So that's... We have to live with the part of uncertainty and having consistent programs that aim at long term objectives based on general ideas like discussed, fostering respect and dialogue. These issues will have some sort of continuity and effectiveness. We need to reframe from getting on board in that.. in crisis mode. That's something that we have seen a lot in that prevention... Programs being set up in a hurry because there were terrorist attacks or something." (Int. 27)

One engaging answer was given by a practitioner who reflected about cognition based activities confronted to experiential ones:

"I think that when I began, I was reading into contents, giving contents to people in terms of prevention, so they would know… that they would have more like cognitive information. I think that's not the right now, I will realize that I think that maybe I'm wrong, that the cognitive aspect is like a lot of people know, racism, or violence is wrong, but they're doing it for other reasons that is less rational. So I'm already going more to the experimental and doing experience of people together, instead of dealing with concepts, going into dialogue and talk to each other. So that was maybe the shift like that we try a little bit with CPN after it's like, to be less content based and more experience based. Because yeah, that's what I think that works better." (Int. 7)

An interesting suggestion is the creation of a community of practice, in order to exchange experiences and prevent burnout:

"One of the things that the team is doing is monthly meetings with other professionals in four other cities of the province that are interested in doing the same thing. So, it creates a community of practice. I think this is something that helps to be sustainable, so that people don't feel alone and it prevents burning out, I think. Because we can share the difficulties… And the feeling of powerlessness. And this is something that helps to be maybe to connect people from different areas, so that there is also like a dynamic process of sharing new ideas and to, uh, to adapt to the, the current situation. It's really, I think, a dynamic process and it's evolving over time. Like I was saying, in a few years, the shift of ideology that are more threatening. So, we need to be adaptable. And I think by if we're not, I think we're kind of risking to not being effective. It' important having networks across the globe, I guess, to understand this." (Int. 41)

Furthermore, an important aspect brought up by an interviewee was the necessity to establish more fluid collaboration among levels and institutions:

"(…) Necessita di un legame molto più forte e fluido tra i diversi livelli. non si può pensare che il lavoro che si fa in carcere sia totalmente svincolato dal lavoro che si fa nelle scuole o che si fa nei nelle associazioni che si occupano di re-inserzione tramite il

lavoro sociale, perché si finisce per creare una sorta di competizione tra le istituzioni, su chi è competente in una materia o meno."[6] (Int. 45)

The following participant gave an interesting and original answer about what he would like to be different related to distinct timing necessities among media, institutions and researchers:

"Alors utopie et créativité ? (…) Et puis le deuxième élément, mais qui serait totalement ce n'est pas utopique, c'est impossible. C'est une capacité à mettre le temps sur pause, c'est à dire le temps politique et le temps médiatique. Être capable d'arrêter le temps politique et le temps médiatique pour que les chercheurs, les scientifiques et les acteurs de terrain, actrices et acteurs de terrain puissent travailler sereinement et ne pas être dans la course à la recherche du financement, dans la course à la publication. Mais voilà, prennent du temps pour se rencontrer dans des colloques, discuter et et ne pas agir. Ce matin, je ne sais pas si vous étiez à la conférence, la première conférence où le collègue que je ne connaissais pas. Il est théologien, il est très sollicité par les médias pour réagir et je le suis aussi. Et les médias ? Souvent, ils nous disent « Je dois publier demain, cet après 12 h, 14 h ». Non, non, pause. Voilà donc une capacité, un super pouvoir. Quand j'étais petit, c'était de pouvoir mettre pause."[7] (Int. 42)

As it is possible to observe, except for interview n. 42, who asked if he was expected to be utopic and creative and then thought about the super power of being able to pause the time when politicians and media need quick answers to complex problems, such as radicalization and violent extremism, the other interviewees thought about more concrete aspects. The main ideas were based on the importance of collaboration and networking, on teacher trainings, on developing experience-based activities and, cited by many, the necessity to base the activities on the community needs.

---

[6] There's the need of a much stronger and more fluid link between the different levels. It is not possible that the work that is done in prisons is totally detached from the work that is done in schools or that is done in associations that are involved in re-intervention through social work, because it would end up creating a kind of competition between the institutions, on who is more or less competent in a certain matter.

[7] So utopia and creativity? (…) And then the second element, which would be totally, it's not utopian, it's impossible. It's the ability to put time on pause, i.e. political time and media time. To be able to put political time and media time on hold, so that researchers, scientists and actors in the field can work serenely and not be in the race for funding, in the race for publication. But here we are, taking the time to meet in colloquia, to discuss and not to act. This morning, I don't know if you were at the conference, the first conference where the colleague I didn't know. He's a theologian, he's very much in demand by the media to react, and I am too. What about the media? They often say, "I've got to publish tomorrow, this afternoon, 12 noon, 2 p.m.". No, no, pause. So that's an ability, a superpower. When I was a kid, it was to be able to pause

When asked in focus groups to write the text about "If I had a magic wand…", the participants wrote some similar concepts, but allowed themselves also to dream quite high and also to imagine structural changes in society:

"Si j'avais une baguette magique… je l'agiterais pour faire disparaitre les inégalités, celles qui oppressent, celles qui étouffent, celles qui tuent, celles qui radicalisent les esprits les plus doux, les plus pacifiques. Si j'avais une baguette magique, je l'agiterais pour faire le silence, pour que ceux et celles qui ne se voient pas, qui ne m'écoutent pas, qui ne m'entent pas puissent enfin se regarder et s'écouter. Pour que la polarisation et les conflits qui d'enracinent dans cette incompréhension mutuelle puissent se régler dans le dialogue et le respect de l'autre. Si j'avais une baguette magique, je suppose que je voudrais qu'elle serve à prévenir, à guérir et à comprendre les formes de violence, je suppose que je financerais sans limite la recherche et le travail de prévention que mes collègues et moi faisons." (FG 2, P1)

"- I would ensure that the fight against oppression, discrimination and stigmatization is not only fought with words, but also with action.
- I would improve the life and social conditions of those less fortunate so that they don't find solace in violent, radical groups and ideas.
- I would ensure that all have a roof over their heads.
- I would make a friend that I lost to radicalization and mental health problems come back to our group before it is too late." (FG 2, P6)

"If I had a magic wand… j'essayerais de remplir le mieux les besoins de chacun et chacune. Etant donné que la radicalisation, au niveau personnel, répond à des besoins, des besoins qui sont largement partagés par l'ensemble de l'humanité, il est nécessaire d'adresser ces besoins si l'on veut aller au cœur de cet enjeux.
Je ne pense pas que si tous et toutes avaient leur besoin remplis, il n'y aurait plus de la radicalisation ou de radicalisation violente (…) Ensuite, je suis de l'avis qu'il y a un manque d'empathie, d'ouverture et d'esprit critique. Je trouverais une manière d'amener les gens à développer ces valeurs fondamentales. Par l'art, la littérature, la rencontre des autres cultures, la cuisine et le dialogue… je pense que l'on peut développer ces valeurs. Je crois que ces éléments vont au cœur de la radicalisation - c'est-à-dire : les besoins, l'écoute, l'empathie et l'esprit critiques. Sans être un problème à régler, on pourrait aller à sa source – c'est-à-dire l'oppression, les inégalités, la discrimination." [8] (FG 2, P 4)

---

[8] I'd try to meet everyone's needs as best I can. Given that radicalization, on a personal level, responds to needs, needs that are widely shared by the whole of humanity, it's necessary to address these needs if we want to get to the heart of this issue.
I don't think that if everyone had their needs met, there would be no more radicalization or violent radicalization (…) Secondly, I think there's a lack of empathy, openness and critical thinking. I'd find a way to get people to develop these fundamental values. Through art, literature, meeting other cultures, cooking and dialogue... I think we can develop these values. I believe that these elements

The three participants above have mentioned concepts like oppression and inequalities, that were extensively analyzed by Paulo Freire in his works, as it will be explained in the following chapter.

One subject that appeared in many answers, in line with what interviewees had stated in previous questions about capacities, is the importance of listening and of dialogue:

"If my wand was really magic, then let that magic make everyone engaging in dialogue. Have the space to truly listen to the other and the openness and agency to change their mind. When we break down walls, I believe we're all more similar than different. And finding shared humanity could absolutely create an opening or a pathway for healing and change. If only my magic wand could move mountains and create miracles, perhaps we could find some peace within each other." (FG 2, P2)

"je ferais de la tolérance l'élément central du développement des sociétés. J'habiterai dans un monde où les débats, les contradictions, les oppositions ne sont pas considérées comme des menaces. "[9] (FG 3, P2)

"si j'avais une baguette magique, tout le monde apprendrait à exprimer ses émotions négatives autrement que par la violence, parce que ça s'apprend. Les gens si écouteraient et essaieraient véritablement de se comprendre. "[10] (FG 3, P3)

Maybe this exercise was so appreciated by all because being utopic is an option that in the last decades has been always more suppressed in contemporary societies, we do not allow ourselves to dream too much. The participants were really delighted in allowing themselves to be utopic for a moment and the discussions that followed were really interesting. It is quite clear that radicalization and violent extremism cannot be approached with a reductive and strictly individual interpretation, but an interdisciplinary and multi-faceted perspective is always needed.

In the following chapters, three different studying fields will be briefly presented: Critical Pedagogy, Psychoanalysis and Transcultural Psychiatry. It is important to highlight that in previous researches no direct link between

---

go to the heart of radicalization - that is, needs, listening, empathy and critical thinking. Without being a problem to be solved, we could go to its source – for example. oppression, inequality, discrimination

[9] I would make tolerance the central element in the development of societies. I would live in a world where debates, contradictions and oppositions are not seen as threats

[10] If I had a magic wand, everyone would learn to express their negative emotions in ways different from violence, because it can be learned. People would listen to each other and really try to understand each other.

radicalization and specific mental health issues were found, so Psychoanalysis and Transcultural Psychiatry will be presented not as clinical frameworks, but as disciplines that can offer interesting inputs to reflect on radicalization and violent extremism. Even if it is not possible to present the disciplines in all their complexities and developments, some concepts used in the beginning will be brought up, followed by interviews to contemporary thinkers who were asked also about radicalization and violent extremism.

Chapter V.
CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

> Não é possível refazer este país, democratizá-lo, humanizá-lo, torná-lo sério, com adolescentes brincando de matar gente, ofendendo a vida, destruindo o sonho, inviabilizando o amor. Se a educação sozinha não transformar a sociedade, sem ela tampouco a sociedade muda. (Freire, 2000).[1]

As Ledwith (2001) points out, complex times, defined by rapid socio-political change, call for a coherently articulated critical pedagogy that approaches issues concerning social difference, social justice and social transformation. A pedagogy of transformative change, or liberation education, is rooted in praxis and located in educational sites of resistance, such as community work, community education and adult education. Critical Pedagogy is a radical approach to education which has three intellectual roots: the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School (especially the work of Jurgen Habermas), Antonio Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony, and the Educational Theory of Paulo Freire (Saleebey & Scanlon, 2005).

In this chapter, the focus will be on Paulo Freire's theories, and particularly on how he developed his work with communities and how he always reiterated the fact that the so called 'banking model of education' (Freire, 2013) must be replaced by a dialogical one in which there is a true and profound exchange. Paulo Freire was an important thinker and educator whose ideas continue to influence the field of education. Through his work, he challenged conventional notions of education and proposed a new way of teaching and learning that empowered the poor and oppressed.

---

[1] It is not possible to remake this country, to make it democratic, to humanize it, to make it serious, with teenagers playing at killing people, offending life, destroying dreams, making love unworkable. If education alone does not transform society, without it, society does not change.

5.1: Paulo Freire and Critical Pedagogy

Paulo Freire was a Brazilian educator who has left an indelible mark on the field of education, not only in Brazil but in the world. His ideas and theories have been influential in areas such as adult education, literacy, and education for social transformation. Born in 1921 in Recife, a town in the northeastern state of Pernambuco, Brazil, Paulo Freire was the son of a middle-class family. Although his parents encouraged him to become a lawyer, young he had other ideas. He was interested in education from an early age and wanted to become a teacher. At the age of 20, Freire obtained his teaching certificate from the University of Recife, and he began to work as a teacher in the region of Pernambuco.

Freire's first job was teaching Portuguese to illiterate adults in the countryside. This experience would have a profound influence on his ideas about education. He would later write that this experience inspired him to think about education as a tool for social transformation. At the same time, he became interested in Marxism and saw education as a means to empower the working class and to challenge oppressive social structures. During the 1950s, Freire worked as a director of the Department of Cultural Extension at the University of Recife. This role allowed him to develop his ideas about education and literacy. He began to develop a new approach to teaching literacy that he called the "Pedagogy of the Oppressed." In this approach, education was seen as a way to empower the poor and uneducated, rather than simply being a means of providing information. Instead of being passive recipients of information, students were encouraged to be active participants in the learning process (Freire, 2018).

In 1963 the famous literacy experience took place in Angicos, in the interior of his state Rio Grande do Norte, where three hundred workers were literate in 45 days (Dullo, 2014). Shortly thereafter Freire was invited by the President of Brazil, João Goulart, to organize adult literacy throughout the Country. It was planned to create 20 thousand "Culture Circles" to literate 2 million people. According to Gadotti (1996), considered by many to be his main biographer, in order to understand Freire's thought and his theory of knowledge, it is necessary to examine the context in which they arose, namely the Brazilian Northeast of the 1960s, when half of the thirty million inhabitants lived in the "culture of silence." It was therefore necessary to give them a voice and the opportunity to vote and participate in the construction of a Brazil that could overcome the dynamics of colonialism.

The project was interrupted by the military coup that took place in 1964. Considered a subversive, Freire was imprisoned for a few months and then was sent away for years of exile (Kohan, 2019). His first destination was Bolivia, from where he was forced to leave one more time after a military coup occurred also there only a month later. He then spent four and a half years in Chile, where he finished writing

his most famous book, "Pedagogy of the Oppressed", which was published in 1968. In this book, Freire articulated his vision of a new kind of education that could empower the oppressed and challenge the existing power structures. After a year in the United States, where he taught at Harvard University, Freire moved to Geneva, where he became a consultant to the Ecumenical Council of Churches and promoted literacy activities in several developing countries, such as Nicaragua, Guiné-Bissau, Cape Verde and Tanzania. During this time, he continued to develop his ideas about education and wrote several other influential books, including "Education for Critical Consciousness" (1973) and "Pedagogy in Process" (1978).

In his nearly two decades of exile during the military dictatorship, Freire expanded his knowledge and readings and came into contact with revolutionary thinkers, whose influences helped him fortify the foundations of his theories (Kohan, 2019). He continued developing his educational approach and writing books during all those years, and in 1979 he went back to Brazil, where he worked both as a university lecturer and as secretary of Education in São Paulo (Freire, 2018). In Brazil he continued to work as an educator and social activist. He played an important role in the country's transition to democracy and was instrumental in the creation of the Workers' Party, which would go on to become one of the most important political parties in Brazil.

Freire believed that education was a tool for social transformation and that it could be used to empower the poor and oppressed. He argued that conventional education was often used to reinforce existing power structures, and that a new kind of education was needed, one that put students at the center of the learning process and encouraged them to be active participants rather than passive recipients of information. His ideas on education and social justice have been widely influential, and his work has had a profound impact on many social movements, including those aimed at preventing violence. At its core, Freire's philosophy emphasizes the importance of education as a liberatory tool, since he believed that education should be used not only to impart knowledge and skills but also to help individuals challenge oppressive social structures and systems. Rather than simply transmitting information, critical pedagogy emphasizes the importance of reflection, dialogue, and action in the learning process (Freire, 2018).

Freire developed a model of liberatory education in which learners are encouraged to "read the world" around them, understanding their own oppression in an historical and present context (Gadotti, 1996). This process, which he termed 'conscientização', refers to helping learners to become aware of the nature of social inequalities and in turn, to act to change them. It is based on dialogues within communities of learners and teachers, rather than through the transmission of knowledge from teacher to learners, which Freire derided as a "banking model" of education (Gadotti, 1996; Saleebey & Scanlon, 2005). The banking metaphor

evokes the image of the teacher depositing the knowledge into the student, who lacks any critical analyses or agency. Freire contrasted this with dialogic education in which the knowledge, perspectives, and experiences of students and teachers are honored as central to the education process (Nagda et al, 2003). Instead of influencing students by using the authority of experts or experienced specialists, the instructors create a dialogue in which all parties are considered providers of both questions and answers. In this kind of setting, the relational dimension of knowledge is outlined (Dal Magro et al, 2020).

Freire comes very close to the "Teologia da Libertação" movement and its reading of the world from the principles of Christian faith and justice. As explained by da Silva Coelho and Malfatti (2021), the association between Christian ethics, the appropriation of Marxist social science, and the social experience of political ebullience in Brazil and Latin America, in which engaged Christians carried forward the praxis and way of thinking of the social struggles of the decades of the 1950s and 1960s, are fundamental experiences for Freire. A political dimension of theology and education is emphasized, which are not neutral and should be based on dialogue and aspire for the liberation of the people.

Freire has always argued for an educational practice that links theory and action, social thought and social change – what he called "praxis", the value of difference and the process of helping diversity to be articulated safely through dialogue (Saleebey & Scanlon, 2005). To the Brazilian pedagogist, community empowerment starts when people listen to each other, engage in participatory/liberatory dialogue, identify their commonalities, and construct new strategies for change (Wallerstein, Bernstein, 1988). He died in 1997, but his legacy continues to live on. His ideas about education and literacy have been influential not only in Brazil but around the world. He is considered one of the most important thinkers in the field of education, and his ideas continue to inspire educators and activists in different fields.

5.2 Critical pedagogy and radicalization studies

Freire hasn't written directly about radicalization leading to violence, but used the term 'radicalization' in its positive meaning. He defines 'radicalization' as positive because of the critical approach it brings with it. For him, a radical person does not deny others the right to choose and does not try to impose his/her ideas but discusses them. He opposes it to 'sectarism', which he defines as an emotional and a-critical position, characterized by an arrogant, anti-dialogical and anti-communicative behavior, that does not respect others' opinions and leads to action without reflection (Freire, 2015, p. 49).

Applying Freirean principles to a pedagogical program leads to talk of emancipation, respective transformation, and strengthening the development of critical and reflective thinking to promote social inclusion (Del Magro et al, 2020). It would be important to build a bridge among community, policy and research partners that build community resilience and pluralistic dialogue to combat discrimination (Nelson & Venkatesh, 2023).

Shaull (1972, p. 12) points to the relevance of the "Pedagogy of the oppressed" to the North American context, especially to the struggles of black people, Latino migrants and young people. Also, to the imminent danger of the technological society transforming people into objects, programming everyone to conform to the logic of the system. The culture of silence crossed geographical and ideological borders and there is no such thing as a neutral educational process. Education either functions as an instrument that is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, or it becomes "the practice of freedom," the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world.

A quite interesting article published by Shelley Piasecka (2019) explains how anti-extremist Theatre-in-Education (TIE) based on Freires' principles has been used in Great Britain to deliver counterterrorism projects in schools and colleges. The implementation of PREVENT Duty has not been without controversy, with commentators noting a disproportionate focus on Islamist forms of terrorism. The UK government imposed a legal obligation on educational institutions in 2015 to keep kids from getting involved in terrorism, and despite the potential of engaging young people in fruitful discussions about terrorism and violent extremism, the TIE guiding principle to effect social change is threatened in this environment.

In the context of TIE, subjectivity has enabled learners to make sense of far-right violence in relation to their home town and therefore, to the rest of the world. An image theater exercise reflected this idea, which encouraged learners to explore in action and in word their understanding of terms such as "Islamism" or "far-right". Subjectivity is not quite the same as a personal response to lived experience, since subjectivity positions the individual in relation to the world.

The use of humor to provoke laughter has been another deliberate strategy adopted by TIE and despite the seriousness of the subject matter, within Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed frame, one may think about the concept of "critical laughter". To laugh critically may be transforming and revolutionary, by introducing a new logic of action for which we do not yet have a name. Laughing *with people* (as opposed to laughing *at* them) changes how you feel about other people (Piasecka, 2019, p. 728). Other activities may enable learners to critique far-right beliefs and racist thinking from the vantage point of their own lives. From a

Freirean perspective, it shifts responsibility for learning from the actor/facilitator to the learner, thus destabilizing traditional pedagogic relationships. Freire affirms that education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers and students.

Related to this topic, one of the interviewees has stated:

"And having in terms of capacities to be capable of being vulnerable and accepting that part. I think… I don't know how I would do that, but one of the work the I think Raps is trying to do is more like drama therapy interventions in high schools." (Int. 41)

Created in 2014, Project SOMEONE (Social Media Education Every Day) is another recent example on how Freirian principles may be applied to radicalization and violent extremism prevention (Nelson & Venkatesh, 2023). An international consortium that aims at building community resilience to counter discrimination, the initiatives put social pedagogy into action and serve as models for ways to give access to the larger community, which includes artists, decision-makers in public safety, educators and artists. Through research, storytelling, public engagement, and assistance in helping marginalized communities reappropriate their cultural tropes, Project SOMEONE aims to amplify oppressed voices and to create the exclusive physical and virtual spaces that amplify the participatory action research required to create the possibility of dialogue. Freire's pedagogical program is designed to bring subjects through a problem-based educational practice that humanizes and empowers partners in the pedagogical praxis of reimagining themselves as free co-creators of the world around them as opposed to freedom-fearing thralls of the compensatory ideologies in which they are trapped.

As it was pointed out in the first part of this chapter, Freire's philosophy emphasizes the importance of education as a liberatory tool. He believed that education should be used not only to impart knowledge and skills but also to help individuals challenge oppressive social structures and systems. He argued that traditional educational models often perpetuate inequalities and reinforce social hierarchies, which contributes to the marginalization of certain groups of people. His approach focuses on creating a more equitable and just society by promoting critical thinking and social awareness. Rather than simply transmitting information, critical pedagogy emphasizes the importance of reflection, dialogue, and action in the learning process (Spaaij & Jeanes, 2013). Extremist ideologies often rely on simplistic and reductionist reasoning, which can be easily refuted through critical inquiry. By teaching individuals to question and analyze information critically, education can help prevent them from being influenced by extremist propaganda or rhetoric.

Since preventing radicalization and violent extremism requires a multi-faceted approach that addresses the social, political, and economic factors that contribute to extremist ideologies, Freire's ideas are particularly interesting to this field. One of the main ways that education can help prevent violent extremism is by promoting a sense of citizenship and collective responsibility. Education can teach individuals about their rights and responsibilities as citizens, as well as the importance of community engagement and active participation in democracy (Piasecka, 2019). By fostering a sense of shared identity and purpose, education can help prevent individuals from feeling alienated or excluded from society, which can be a key factor in radicalization.

Education can also help prevent violent extremism by building bridges between communities. Schools and universities can serve as spaces for intercultural dialogue, where different perspectives and cultures can be explored and celebrated. Critical pedagogy emphasizes the importance of challenging these structures and promoting social justice (Blackburn, 2000). By creating opportunities for positive interactions between people from different backgrounds, education can help break down racial, ethnic, and religious barriers and promote tolerance and understanding. Achieving this would require a concerted effort from educators, policymakers, and civil society organizations. Governments can invest in education systems that promote critical thinking and social awareness, and provide training and resources to teachers to help them adopt a critical pedagogy approach. Civil society organizations can also play a key role by providing alternative narratives and countering extremist propaganda.

According to Catarci (2022), Freire believed that authentic education is peculiarly characterized by its freeing potential, that is, its capacity to make the recipient of such a practice an autonomous, conscious subject, capable of acting in history and changing social reality, as part of a process of building a more just society. Therefore, Freire's pedagogical proposal is not only topical, but is even more useful in our time than the one in which it was formulated. Freire's legacy can currently be traced, for example, in the experiences of immigrants' integration, in paths of education for active citizenship, in initiatives of collective discussion and critical analysis of the problems of territories and the world, in approaches of community education or popular education that animate disadvantaged territorial contexts and in paths of intercultural education and for social justice.

The ideas that Freire developed were not born from mechanical abstractions, but from attentive experiences of historical reality and his work and his dialectical-conceptual originality can help to overcome current problems. Freire is an example to imitate, but not to copy by falsifying it. Therefore, it is up to us to decode the educational needs that respond to the historical era in which we live, to position ourselves, to understand the complexity of the processes and to know how to

manage and communicate them in the best way possible. When Freire states that we must educate in freedom and not to freedom, he teaches us what to do, but it is our responsibility to carry it out in the historical context in which we belong (Orefice, 2022). One interviewee has stated indeed:

> "It's basically to really tailor our pedagogical approach to their needs, because in that way, we can actually gather information of their own.. on their own practices and their own. What do they see basically, on the field, we're able to offer a pedagogical approach that responds to those needs, and it usually opens up other opportunities that we might be able to mobilize the support team for example, we might have to, to ask for a reason put on a specific subject to actually be able to provide some tools or information, so it's really being able to tailor our support offer, whether it be trainings, community support, engagement, mobilization." (Int. 32)

Studying and analyzing Freire's theories is quite useful for those who work on radicalization and violent extremism prevention. His dialogical and bottom-up approach may help in dealing with different opinions and learning to respect them in a non-violent way. Likewise, it is extremely important to approach communities open minded and willing to understand the needs of those who belong, in order to build tailor-made solutions, just like Freire used to do. One of the interviewees has stated the following:

> "Prevention starts by deconstructing the oppressor in yourself. If you go to engage in prevention, like.. (I will speak about myself)... I don't stop deconstructing or while engaging in prevention, deconstructing also my oppression, my oppression and oppressive aspects, because we really have a oppressive… (…) Also a lot of our exercises on non-violence come from Paulo Freire..and Theatre of the oppressed, as well… Because I think with all the money invested in preventing radicalization and we're still into where we are… (…) I come from a belief that most of the people would like live happily, and be okay, be nice and be engaged. But then something in the system that is creating that exclusion leading to radicalization, and while thinking about the interventions... The big question whether we are not creating the same oppressive circumstance when combatting radicalization.. and this is my biggest concern. And my biggest concern, and also the hope… change is possible. If we start changing ourselves, and we're ready to undergo the process, we cannot prevent radicalization while wearing gloves and masks…" (Int. 34)

As it is suggested in this interview, it would be important to have all these power dynamics in mind when thinking about radicalization, violent extremism and their prevention.

It is interesting to highlight some studies that relate transformative learning theory, that was inspired also by the work of Freire, and radicalization. Under an

educational lens, radicalization may be seen as the result of formal and informal socialization that produces a sense of belonging and recognition, along with meaning perspectives that become rigid and impermeable to debate, dialectics and evolution over time (Fabbri & Romano, 2021).

Wilner and Dubouloz (2015) propose that transformative learning theory, which emerged from the disciplines of education, rehabilitation and health, might be used to examine the radicalization process. Radicalization is primarily understood by the authors as a transformational process by which non-violent people come to tolerate and support violent behavior. Transformative Learning theory explains how triggering events, such as illness, financial hardship, and other socio-political factors, can lead to critical reflection of pre-existing personal belief systems and provides a deeper understanding of the complexity associated with processes of identity formation and personal change. These transformational processes serve as a roadmap for future action and have the potential to modify behavior over time, and the study examines the application of transformative learning theory to domestic terrorism and shows how formerly unflappable people support, justify, and engage in violent behavior. The authors try to apply transformational learning theory to Western jihadi radicalization and domestic terrorism. While current research on radicalization provides critical understanding of its causes of homegrown terrorism and on the behavior of terrorist organizations, they fall short in adequately examining and defining the internal cognitive processes fundamental to identity transformation in domestic terrorism and on the behavior of terrorist organizations.

Caramellino, Melacarne and Ducol (2021) focus on the difficulties in education associated with radicalization processes that might appear and progress in a variety of real-world settings. The fundamental premise of their contribution is that the Transformative learning theory framework can be used to analyze radicalization processes. The authors consider precritical cognition as a sort of radicalization process - one of the various learning processes that can result in both emancipation or in closures and restrictions. Under this point of view, the process becomes much more entwined with routine activities of daily life, with the separation and prejudice we watch and occasionally encounter in the real world of life and work. Adult learning theories are changing this field of study, by focusing on contextual studies rather than macro-readings of the processes of political, cultural, and religious radicalization.

Sabic-El-Rayess (2020, 2021, 2023) explores research on radicalization and transformative learning, drawing on findings from a study centered on radicalization in Bosnia and Herzegovina that can be taken as a starting point for further study of educational displacement and radicalization elsewhere. According to the author, radicalization begins with a sense of displacement from the

mainstream institutions and particularly from the formal education. The displacement and replacement model of radicalization warns that failures in the formal education system push students to look for validation elsewhere and therefore they might meet radicalizing alternatives. This may happen when students feel excluded, invisible and underrepresented in the mainstream curriculum and narrative in formal education. For example, when the feeling of exclusion grows, students may find a mentor, in person or online, who replaces institutional actors and other sources of knowledge to become a guide through transformative and experiential learning. This replacement can turn into radicalizing education, where extremist narratives subversively minimize the relevance of formal institutions, education, and teachers. Sabic-El-Rayess and Marsick (2021) state that it would be important to combat radicalized education, which draws marginalized and disenfranchised individuals into violent extremist practices. The authors consider it significant because of the sharp growth in racism, authoritarianism, corruption, and far-right groups around the world, which has led to a rise in interest in the public role of education, both informal and formal.

5.3 Freire in practice: the "Popular center for culture and development"

Through his work, Freire challenged conventional notions of education and proposed a new way of teaching and learning with the aim of empowering the poor and oppressed. His legacy continues to inspire educators and activists around the world who believe that education can be a tool for social transformation and who work to create a more just and equitable world.

The "Centro popular de cultura e desenvolvimento" (Popular Center for Culture and Development, CPCD) is located in the city of Curvelo (Minas Gerais, Brazil) and aims to promote popular education and community development. Sebastião Rocha, known as "Tião," founded the center in 1984 and is its director to this day. The information that follows was obtained in two different moments: the first occasion was an interview done in 2021 following a webinar organized for a project about educational poverty, "La seconda stella a destra", in which University of Siena collaborated with Oxfam Italia and other institutions. The interview was recently published in *Educational and Reflective Practices* (Slavutzky, 2023). The second was a follow-up interview done online at the end of May 2023, during which I had the occasion to ask more specific questions about my research topic.

This is how Tião Rocha defines the reality of CPCD:

"Qui partiamo da loro, da ciò che ognuno porta – questo è lo strumento, questo è il potenziale. Partiamo dal principio che l'apprendimento è qualcosa che genera lo

scambio: educazione è qualcosa che esiste solo al plurale, non esiste educazione al singolare. Sono necessarie due persone e quello che scambiano è quello che si ha con quello che non si ha. Noi ci completiamo, l'uno all'altro – a partire da quello che ognuno porta, si costruiscono tutte le sfide.

L'assunto base quindi è apprendere la cultura dell'altro. La sfida è tenere sempre in mente le nozioni di tempo e ritmo, imparate da Sant'Agostino – lui affermava che esiste solo un tempo nella nostra vita, ovvero il presente. Le persone vivono nel "presente del passato", nel "presente del presente" e nel "presente del futuro". I bambini vivono nel presente del presente, ma quando crescono questo non basta più. È contro l'essenza del giovane rimanere nel presente del presente a guardare solo il proprio ombelico. "Giovane" deriva dal latino e si collega a Giove nella mitologia romana (e Zeus nella mitologia greca): quello che può tutto, che è potente, osato, impavido. Per questo costruire "futuri possibili" è incanalare l'energia e il senso della vita dei giovani al di là di ogni limite. L'educatore deve imparare quindi il "tempo e il ritmo" dei propri allievi per costruire – insieme – futuri possibili e auspicabili. La sfida dell'educatore è riuscire a comprendere e a adeguarsi ai tempi e ai ritmi di ognuno. Da antropologo, mi vengono in mente anche le idee di Cliford Geertz sull'importanza di percepire la cultura altrui e di apprendere quello che è. Puoi imparare di tutto e su tutti, ma in un certo ritmo – in questo tempo della metabolizzazione, della formazione, della conoscenza, della saggezza." (Rocha, In: Slavutzky, 2023, p. 158)[2]

Freire's humanizing pedagogy offers fundamental insights both for critical reading of contemporary society and of educational systems directed, for the most part, toward technical and uncritical training. Reading Freire helps us rethink the

---

[2] Here we start with them, with what each one brings - this is the tool, this is the potential. We start from the principle that learning is something that generates exchange: education is something that exists only in the plural, there is no education in the singular. Two people are needed and what they exchange is what one has with what one does not have. We complement each other, each other -- from what each person brings, all challenges are built. The basic assumption then is to learn each other's culture. The challenge is to always keep in mind the notions of time and rhythm, learned from St. Augustine - he stated that there is only one time in our lives, which is the present. People live in the "present of the past," the "present of the present," and the "present of the future." Children live in the present of the present, but when they grow up this is no longer enough. It is against the essence of the young person to stay in the present of the present looking only at one's own navel. "Young" comes from Latin and connects to Jupiter in Roman mythology (and Zeus in Greek mythology): the one who can everything, who is powerful, daring, fearless. Therefore, to build "possible futures" is to channel the energy and meaning of young people's lives beyond all limits. The educator must therefore learn the "time and rhythm" of his or her students in order to build -- together -- possible and desirable futures. The educator's challenge is to be able to understand and adapt to each person's time and rhythm. As an anthropologist, I am also reminded of Cliford Geertz's ideas about the importance of perceiving other people's culture and learning what it is. You can learn about anything and everything, but in a certain rhythm -- in this time of metabolization, formation, knowledge, wisdom.

role of education in search of solutions for the profound crisis we experience in the present day, which also affects other spheres, such as ethics, politics, culture and economics. In Freire's words, "Se a educação sozinha não transforma a sociedade, sem ela, tampouco a sociedade muda." Tião Rocha's work with CPCD goes precisely in this direction and can serve as an example to many experiences that aim to put Freire's ideas into practice.

When asked about Freire and radicalization, Rocha has answered:

"Paulo Freire propôs uma radicalização, no sentido da origem da palavra... e as raízes né.. aprender o outro na sua intereza e fazer da cultura do outro da sua matéria-prima, de terra... dali partiu processo de transformação de educação, de alfabetização primeiro, depois de aprendizagem, depois de politização, depois de compromisso ético, humano... nisso eu acho que ele foi fundamental, para mim é uma questão de profundidade, de raiz... então é nesse aspecto eu acho que todo pensamento da filosofia freirana ela trabalha com uma lógica, que é a lógica da busca do ser humano cada vez melhor mais solidário, mais completo, mais amoroso... mais é... mais inteiro mas não é um indivíduo isolado, é o todo, como é que se pode ser para todo mundo então essa noção política não é que ele traz, incorpora do bem estar para todos né e a educação pode ser algo para todo mundo, para nós... ela tem que ser acolhedora, tem que ser generosa... e ele questiona todas essas formas de opressão, até do oprimido que vira opressor... oprimidos também podem reproduzir... o que sempre foi né autoritária, de cima para baixo, que foi seletivo, excludente etc. Então eu acho que quando ele fala na pedagogia do oprimido, de quem é esse oprimido em um lugar que tava que que ele tem como como é capacidade de luta de resistência né a esse modelo de opressão é exatamente a cultura né naquilo que se baseia, que é sua origem, a sua socialidade, o seu ambiente, onde ele constrói... criar um laço que é dele, dessa cultura."[3]

---

[3] Paulo Freire proposed a radicalization, in the sense of the origin of the word... and the roots ... to learn the other in his internet and to make the other's culture his own material, land... From there he started the process of transformation of education, of alphabetization first, then learning, then politization, then ethical, human commitment...
In this I think he was fundamental, for me it's a question of depth, of roots... so it is in this aspect that I think all the thought of Freirian philosophy works with a logic, which is the logic of the search for a better, more united, more complete, more loving human being... more is ... more whole, but it's not an isolated individual, it's the whole, how can it be for everyone, so this political notion is not that it brings, it incorporates the wellbeing for everyone and education can be something for everyone, for us... it has to be welcoming, it has to be generous... and he questions all these forms of oppression, even the oppressed who become the oppressor... the oppressed can also reproduce... which has always been ne authoritarian, from top to bottom, which has been selective, exclusionary, etc. so I think that when he talks about the pedagogy of the oppressed, of who is the oppressed in a place where they have the ability to fight and resist this model of oppression, it is exactly the culture on which they are based, their origin, their sociality, their environment, where they build... creating a bond that is his, that culture.

As mentioned earlier, Freire opposed the idea of radical to 'sectarism', which he defined as an emotional and a-critical position, characterized by an arrogant, anti-dialogical and anti-communicative behavior, that does not respect others' opinions and leads to action without reflection (Freire, 2015). In this sense, what he defined as sectarism is closer to the contemporary idea of radicalization. Rocha went on reflecting about culture, inclusion and exclusion:

"Ele trabalhava com a questão da educação popular, no sentido de pensar esses grupos oprimidos que eles pudessem dar um salto e fazer a revolução do conhecimento, a partir da sua cultura e também tivesse um impacto na revolução política e aí de um lado ficou muito essa questão (...) A ideia de Freire era de ir nas raízes dessa cultura popular tradicional, que tem a sua força que se mantém através dos tempos e como é que isso pode ser gerador de transformação, porque o mundo possa ser melhor é para todos então isso sem o processo de ser aceito pelo inclusão dessa cultura nos processos formativos na escola de maneira geral... que pudesse a partir daí você fazer você sair da pedagogia do oprimido e vai passar pela pedagogia da esperança, você vai chegar na pedagogia da autonomia, mas é um processo... não da exclusão, mas é da inclusão permanente."[4]

Rocha's statements contain important insights not only about oppression, violence and radicalization, but on educational goals in general and it makes quite clear how Freire's ideas can be useful even if decades have passed by and the society has changed profoundly. He concluded the interview saying: "Paulo Freire ainda se mostra também muito presente e como potencial muito grande... de mostrar caminhos, opções."[5] This is also true for radicalization and violent extremism prevention, since his ideas about critical thinking, emancipation, oppression, dialogue and inclusion are quite contemporary concepts.

---

[4] He worked with the issue of popular education, in the sense of thinking those oppressed groups that they could take a leap and make the revolution of knowledge, from their culture and also have an impact on the political revolution, and there was a lot of this issue on one side... so, at a certain moment we worked in education, we said, "well, we work with popular education, which was to confront this elite, authoritarian, academic education... it is another education, which was not on the schools' calendar nor the thinking line of action...
Freire's idea, I think, was to go to the roots of this traditional popular culture, which has its strength that stands through time and how this can be a generator of transformation, why the world can be better for everyone, without the process of being accepted by the inclusion of this culture in the educational processes in the school in a general manner... from there you can make you leave the pedagogy of the oppressed and go through the pedagogy of hope, you will reach the pedagogy of autonomy, but it is a process... not of exclusion, but of permanent inclusion.
[5] Paulo Freire is still very present and has great potential... to show paths, options.

Chapter VI.
PSYCHOANALYSIS

6.1 The beginning: Sigmund Freud

Sigmund Freud was born on May 6, 1856 in Pribor Thequia, lived in Vienna most of his life and died in London on September 23, 1939. He is the author of an extensive work on human enigmas, starting with his *Interpretation of Dreams* in 1900. The chapter VII of the book of dreams - Psychology of the oneiric processes - produced an epistemological break in knowledge by describing how the unconscious works. He defines dreams as the royal road to the unconscious and this concept defines Psychoanalysis, which is probably the most important Freudian discovery and a milestone in the knowledge of how the human being possesses a complex psychic reality. The psyche is not reducible to consciousness, and there are formations of the unconscious, such as dreams, failed acts, jokes, and symptoms. The formations express unconscious desires, and it is these desires that a person does not have access to except through the formations. Desires are essentially erotic or aggressive, linked to power and are insatiable, and it is thanks to them that one is always in search of something. The dream is an unconscious fulfillment of desire, as are all unconscious formations (Gay, 1989).

Freud was a thinker of culture and wrote about religion, the uneasiness in culture and war, and introduced many new concepts like the ones mentioned above and others such as transference and identifications. Psychoanalytic practice is changing with time, but much of what Sigmund Freud wrote is still important to understand the human being. Freud marked human knowledge as Plato marked philosophy, Leonardo Da Vinci did for arts and sciences, Beethoven for music, Shakespeare for literature (Laplanche & Pontalis, 2018).

The book that most shocked the culture of the early 20th century was the *Three Essays on sexuality*, especially child sexuality in the Victorian society of the time. He also wrote about the Oedipus complex, the castration complex, narcissism, drives, and psychoanalytic treatment. He formed colleagues and the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA), which today is established in the Western world and in parts of the East, such as Japan (Roudinesco, 2016).

Freud's uneasiness with cruelty grew from 1915, during the First World War, when he wrote *The disillusionment caused by war*. He imagined the quick war in which the Triple Alliance would win, but six months after the beginning he was disillusioned. When the First World War finished by the end of 1918, he was already thinking of writing his *Beyond the Principle of Pleasure*, in which he introduced the famous death drive. And it will be from this drive that the destruction drive will derive, which will be highlighted in his most read work *Civilization and its Discontents*. In this book, he highlights the importance of destructiveness, the drive to destroy, the cohesion and satisfaction of extremist violence projected onto a race, a group, strangers. If, on the one hand, nowadays we know more or less well the psychic mechanisms of the passions of hatred, it is still difficult to reduce its influence on humanity. Democracy, the sciences, and education have been dealing with times of hatred today, and if Freud has not explained it all, he has tried to contribute with his writings to clarify some questions (Roudinesco, 2016; Gay, 1989).

Exploring what Freud saw as the important clash between the desire for individuality and the expectations of society, the book is considered one of his most important and widely read works. Freud questions the sentence that commands man to love his neighbor as himself. Then, he affirms that "el ser humano no es un ser manso y amoroso, sino que está dotado de un poder instintivo agresivo. El prójimo es una tentación: explotar su fuerza de trabajo, utilizarlo sexualmente, robarle sus bienes, humillarlo, martirizarlo y asesinarlo" (Freud, 1988c, p. 108) [1]. Frightening statements, but they have occurred throughout human history, as the author recalled when describing the barbarian invasions, Genghis Khan, the Crusades, and the horrors of First World War.

It is disturbing how difficult it is for human beings to renounce aggressive inclinations, such as that of neighboring communities. North and South Germans, South and North Italy, English and Scots, and so on.   It is always possible to bind together a large number of people through love, as long as there are other people left to project aggressiveness. The "other" becomes a receptacle of the death drive, and that is when the narcissism of minor differences can reveal its cruelty. Examples are racism, the relationship with foreigners, xenophobia, and fratricide (Laplanche & Pontalis, 2018).

Another essential theme in the book *Civilization and its Discontents* is the helplessness that derives from sufferings that are threefold: 1) the body, vulnerable, destined to dissolve in the end; 2) the furies of the outside world that can befall us; and 3) the bonds with other human beings. Freud refers to drugs that alleviate

---

[1] ...the human being is not a meek, loving being, but is endowed with an aggressive instinct power. The neighbor is a temptation: to exploit his labor power, to use him sexually, to steal his property, to humiliate, to martyr, and to murder him.

suffering, generating intoxication. He highlights the creative ways to avoid pain, such as the sublimation of drives through art. Freud goes so far as to give self-help advice: just as the cautious merchant avoids investing all his capital in one place, it could be said that the wisdom of life advises not to expect full satisfaction from a single aspiration, for success is never certain. Then he defines what culture is: "Es la suma de operaciones y normas que diferencian nuestra vida de la de nuestros antepasados animales y que sirven a dos propósitos: la protección del ser humano frente a la naturaleza y la regulación de los vínculos recíprocos entre los hombres. La sustitución del poder del individuo por el de la comunidad es el paso cultural decisivo"[2] (Freud, 1988c, p. 108).

Many of his books were burned by the Nazis in Germany in May 1933 because Freud was Jewish and introduced a disturbing theme such as sexuality. The enigma of the origins of extremist violence challenged Sigmund Freud, who lived through the rise of Nazism in Europe before World War II. At the beginning of the year 1938 Sigmund Freud started writing the last part of his last book *Moses and the Monotheism*. He wrote: "Vivemos numa época particularmente curiosa. Descobrimos com espanto que o progresso selou uma aliança com a bárbarie" (Freud, 2014, p.89).[3] His examples are Soviet Russia, Italy and Germany in the year leading up to the outbreak of World War II. Important in Freud's comment is his amazement at almost eighty-two years of the human condition combining progress with barbarism. He was an Enlightenment man who believed in progress, hence the amazement at how barbarism persists in humanity despite progress. In fact, nothing perhaps astonishes more in culture than the growth of cruelty. The wonder of the fate of the human species in the face of the victory of utopia or dystopia. In 1931 Freud added a new ending to his book *Civilization and its discontents* in which he discusses the fate of humanity. Destiny between cultural development, instinct of life, and how much it will be able to dominate the instinct of aggression and self-destruction, expressions of the death drive (Roudinesco, 2016).

A different path, without excluding the latter, was pointed out by J.B. Pontalis (1991), French psychoanalyst and writer, who insisted on the theme of fratricide, the rivalry between brothers, the oedipal rivalry. He reflects on the theme of fratricidal fights, of civil wars, and gives a current example: he reads the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians under the viewpoint that they are two brothers fighting for the Holy Land or the Holy Mother - "It is mine, not yours, it is mine".

---

[2] It is the sum of operations and norms that set our life apart from our animal ancestors and that serve two purposes: the protection of human beings from nature and the regulation of reciprocal ties between men. The replacement of the power of the individual by that of the community is the decisive cultural step.

[3] We live in a particularly curious time. We discover with astonishment that progress has sealed an alliance with barbarism.

Impossible, so far, to share a mother as indivisible. For Pontalis (1991), fratricide has the same importance as parricide or matricide, but one question remained unmentioned: the role of power, the power of cold and arrogant elites throughout history. Power was once measured in brute force in the early days of civilization, it moved on to the power of land, of gold, of money, of values, and there the importance of weapons always grew. It is not by chance that the arms industry is one of the most powerful in the world; in fact, economic power has always supported wars. At the root of this blind hatred there is the narcissism of minor differences. A narcissism in which minor differences give rise to fanaticism, for fanaticism is omnipresent in human tragedy. Building a friend is a slower, more loving, more enriching construction than building an enemy.

One mechanism of Freud's theory that is still named by many thinkers is sublimation, even if the concept can have different interpretations. While neurosis is a private, intimate formation, sublimation takes place publicly, in society, through art, education, sports, religion, philosophy, love and humor. Sublimation is a metaphor imported from physics: it is the passage from the solid state of a substance to the gaseous state - from ice to steam, for example. Sublime has to do with aesthetics, beauty, which contains the idea of infinity (Laplanche & Pontalis, 2018).

Sublimation is a crucial concept, because it is linked to sexual and death drives, to the defense mechanisms of the "I" against the Superego. Psychoanalysis depends on the concept of sublimation in order to think about the works created by man, whether in the arts, education, sports or games. Sublimation means, first and foremost, plasticity, malleability of the drive. The process of sublimation is linked to the symbolic ideals and social values of the time in which it takes place. The two main ways in which the subject can confront helplessness are eroticism and sublimation, generating creative destinies. While it is true that helplessness is at the center of the psychoanalytic clinic, it is through sublimating creativity that the path to a creative life destiny opens up. The other path is that of a disastrous, destructive and cruel destiny for oneself and for others (Roudinesco, 2016).

6.2 Some developments and important concepts

It is not possible here to illustrate all the developments of Psychoanalysis, but it is important to highlight that many different schools of thought have been settled since then. Some of Freud's contemporaries created cleavages due to different understandings of the psyche and interpretive approaches, such as the inferiority complex for Alfred Adler or the collective unconscious for Carl Gustav Jung. Others, such as Karl Abraham and Sandor Ferenczi, carried on and developed Freudian ideas. Later, Jacques Lacan accepted much of Freudian theories and developed some further concepts related to the idea of the unconscious and

language. Several psychoanalytic schools of thought have been created in the last decades, such as the Object Relations theory by Melanie Klein; Ego psychology with Hartmann, Spitz, Mahler and Jacobson; many authors also considered as "independent" such as Winnicott and Bowlby.

Despite the smaller output of psychoanalytic papers on radicalization, violent extremism and terrorism relating to other fields, there nonetheless exists a tangible body of valuable psychoanalytic literature on the subject, especially after 9/11. In a quite interesting article, Shuki Cohen (2019) presents the most frequently mentioned psychoanalytic frameworks traced following three major psychoanalytic traditions: The Neo-Classical Psychoanalytic framework, the Object Relations framework, and the Ego Psychological Psychoanalytic framework.

The Neo-Classical framework for understanding sociopolitical violence can be traced to the immediate successors of Sigmund Freud, who shared his overall vision of developing psychoanalytic tools for understanding the unconscious conflicts and defense mechanisms of large groups and their manifestation in political violence. Freud's followers also shared his conviction that communal and global awareness of these unconscious drives and mechanisms is the best route for mitigating or even preventing sociopolitical conflicts and wars. Among these authors, Cohen (2019) indicates Wilhelm Reich, Anna Freud and Carlo Strenger.

Wilhelm Reich, contemporary of Freud, has individuated the identification of authoritarianism as the common mechanism of oppression on both the intrapsychic and the national (and international) levels, conceptualizing it as an interplay between social, psychological and personality determinants (Etchezahar, & Brussino, 2013; Cohen, 2019). One of the most pertinent contributions of Anna Freud to this field is her study of how war trauma might trigger an 'identification with the aggressor' defense mechanism, which compels the traumatized individual to externalize or "act out" their anxiety, loss, and distress in aggressive and violent means. Cohen (2019) also highlights the contribution of a contemporary psychoanalyst, Carlo Strenger, who identifies Western 'political correctness' as a self-handicapping unconscious defense mechanism that prevents liberal democracies from confidently and rationally critiquing, opposing, and eventually rejecting authoritarian and/or fascist political entities that exploit the 'respect' that the democratic process affords them. This defense mechanism, which operates on both the societal as on the individual levels, is in turn supported by a pathological denial of the historical struggle to achieve the Enlightenment principles, which leads to the dangerous illusion that they constitute fundamental innate rights and therefore may be taken for granted. This attitude, once entrenched, may mediate the dangerously false sense of invincibility that undergirds the West's mishandling of populist anti-democratic movements across the ideological scale.

Another theoretical model brought up by Cohen (2019) and Schmidt and colleagues (2005) is the Object Relations psychoanalytic models, pioneered by the work of Melanie Klein. She proposed earlier and greater roles for violent impulses in the child than Freud, such as the Death Drive and oedipal conflicts. This framework concerned more primitive defenses such as regression, splitting, and projection (or projective identification) and their concomitantly more pathological presentations, such as paranoid–schizoid and borderline states. According to Klein (Schmidt et al, 2005), the quality of the early mother–child relationship and how this is experienced and internalized by the infant is of utmost importance. From the beginning of life, the social interaction taking place in the mother–infant couple influences the child's development, psychic structure and sense of identity. She postulates two stages of such development: an early stage, which she describes as the paranoid-schizoid position, which with further development and integration of the ego, leads to a more mature stage, the 'depressive position'.

Cohen (2019) explains that in the Object Relations models of political conflicts,

"mass violence indicates the regression of the group following an actual, perceived, or anticipated attack to a paranoid–schizoid state of mind ("position"). In this paranoid–schizoid position, the group can no longer contain or modulate the overstimulation from their distress and is impelled to invoke splitting-based defenses to sequester their experience into an all-good or all-bad spheres and then use the projective identification defense to attach the all-bad aspects onto an external object (e.g., a scapegoat and a minority group) that must be subsequently annihilated to restore the sense of trust in fellow group members, in the world and in the future. Such dynamics of paranoid regression are often reinforced by malignant, narcissistic, or omnipotent idealization of the leader and/or the group member" (Cohen, 2019, p. 221).

An important contribution to this model was made by Otto Kernberg:

"As Freud originally stated, the mutual identification of all the followers in terms of their idealization of the leader, and the projection on to him of their ego ideal and superego functions frees them from moral responsibility for actions demanded by the leader, and fosters the relentless, brutal attack on the infidels" (Kernberg, 2003, p.957).

Following Klein's model, Kernberg states that in groups there is a rapid ascendance of primitive splitting mechanisms under conditions that promote the division of the world into 'good' and 'bad' segments. Groups of people along with their ideologies and political and social leadership will then be seen as either idealized or persecutory. The profound need for affiliation, for 'belonging', for being positively responded to by those around us, who, generally, share our language, accent, skin color, clothing, behavior patterns and preferences, becomes

contrasted with potential fear and suspicion of those who are different, alien, 'not like us':

> "It is important, I believe, to understand analytically both the psychological needs of the dominant, traditionally present culture, and the psychological attitudes of a threatened or discriminated against minority, while respecting the boundaries within which a social subgroup or minority should be able to develop its values as well as integrate into that dominant culture. It is important to raise consciousness and explore the projection on to the minority of a 'persecutory' set of social and political biases in the form of threatening myths about the 'alien' culture. It is equally important to pay attention to the defensive provocativeness of a cultural minority, struggling against its own sense of inferiority by 'identifying with the aggressor', and potentially also defending against its unconscious guilt over betraying its own tradition in adapting to the new or dominant culture". (Kernberg, 2003, p. 962)

Kernberg (2003) asks himself, from a psychoanalytic perspective, what are the possibilities of a terrorist or a violent radicalized to escape the violent system and return to a condition of normality that resolves the personal regression, the split-off aggression and the submersion in a fundamentalist ideology. The answer to this question is complex, but he points out a couple of aspects: it depends on the existence of a psychopathology more or less severe, about the level of narcissism and the presence or not of antisocial features. Moreover, it depends on the relative maintenance of an ordinary capacity for human empathy and identification with ethical values may permit some radicals to leave their system once its basic sadism, cruelty, irrationality and inhumanity become obvious to them.

Psychoanalytic Ego Psychology can be traced back to the neo-Freudian recognition of the ego as a largely independent locus of emotional adaptation and impulse control and as an arbiter of self-awareness and self-evaluation. Some of the most important advances regarding the etiology of violence were made by Heinz Kohut and more specifically to his theory of narcissistic injuries and rage. In conceptualizing violence as the enactment of an unconscious rage following insults to narcissistic vulnerabilities, Kohut helped bridge the gap between the widespread dehumanization of terrorists and other violent offenders and the psychoanalytic emphasis on empathic understanding of panhuman reactions to pervasive sociopolitical injustice and grievance. "Post-Kohutian theories of political violence have attempted to identify specific narcissistic vulnerabilities that might undergird it, such as shame and humiliation that specifically target presumed vulnerabilities over masculinity" (Cohen, 2019, p. 223)

Another school of thought that can be interesting for this discussion is the Attachment theory by John Bowlby, who broke up both with Freudian and Klein's traditions. He built an interdisciplinary approach that includes cybernetics, system's

theory, Piagetian cognitive psychology, ethology and evolutionary theory (Lis et al, 2012). He defined attachment as a primitive motivational system towards development, that pushes the child to establish a specific attachment relation with the caregiver.

According to Cohen (2019), Attachment theory conceptualizes the provision of security by a primary caregiver to an infant as imperative for enhancing the infant's chances of survival. As infants advance in life and become adults, future attachments may be formed with other substitute caregivers that satisfy their basic attachment needs and contribute to the development of identity. As a behavioral system, attachment enables one to develop the trust, industry, autonomy, and implicit knowledge to deal with the threats to self that often accompany an identity formation process. Research on individual differences in adult attachment processes have provided the basis for examining the relationship between lifespan attachment development and religious fundamentalism, showing how followers of a religion can ascribe to an ideology because of the psychological benefits it can afford them in dealing with issues of insecurity in real life.

A part of the sample interviewed had a background of Psychology studies, and a couple of them had also psychoanalytic training. One stated that working with concepts of the attachment theory, idealized by Bowlby, has been useful in her work with inmates:

"ho lavorato molto sul concetto… sulla questione dell'attaccamento, perché nelle esperienze che ho potuto fare io, con le persone che ho incontrato io spesso quando si parla non solo di aver attaccamento genitoriale, ma attaccamento in senso lato alla propria cultura alle proprie radici anche su più generazioni eccetera era proprio una défaillance a questo livello che poi lasciava quel terreno fertile su cui si venivano a innestare altre forme di legame di attaccamento, come poteva essere quella ideologica, senza che ci fosse necessariamente una reale comprensione a volte di questo aspetto ideologico, ma costruiva e diventava una base sicura che per diversi motivi a queste persone era venuta meno da qui per difficoltà più di personalità chi per difficoltà nel percorso di vita ma comunque mancava questo concetto di base sicura, di attaccamento sicuro che quindi diventava una un modo per poterla lavorare con loro… sull'identità in queste situazioni. Secondo me, a livello di psicologia, non necessariamente solo psicanalisi classica tra virgolette, questo concetto sarebbe da rimettere un po' in gioco nel lavoro sugli estremismi." (Int. 43)[4]

_____

[4] I worked a lot on the concept... on the issue of attachment, because in the experiences that I have been able to have, with the people that I have encountered often when you talk about not only having parental attachment, but attachment in a broad sense to one's culture to one's roots even over multiple generations and so on it was precisely a défaillance at this level that then left that fertile ground on which other forms of attachment bonding came to be grafted, such as it could be the ideological one, without there necessarily being a real understanding sometimes of this ideological aspect, but it built and became a secure base that for various reasons these people had lacked from here because of

Even if radicalization and violent extremism prevention is most frequently not related to a clinical approach, having in mind concepts brought by psychoanalysis can be useful. For example, the importance of listening, unconscious mechanisms, sublimation, narcissism of minor differences and, as the interviewee above mentioned, attachment styles. In the next section, ideas of a contemporary psychoanalyst are presented and are connected to discrimination, racism, prejudices and power dynamics.

6.3 A contemporary glance at psychoanalysis

Isildinha Baptista Nogueira has a degree in Psychology, a master's degree in Social Psychology from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP) and a doctorate in School Psychology and Human Development from the University of São Paulo (USP). She studied at the Ateliers de Psychanalyse, in Paris, with Radmila Zygourys, one of the founders of the institution.

She was one of the first psychoanalysts to approach with psychoanalytic instruments both the socio-cultural and the subjective dimension of the condition of blackness in Brazil and the first to include the discussion of the body. Even if she has not written specifically about radicalization and violent extremism, she brings an enriching point of view that gives inputs to think about several dynamics related to these concepts, like racism, prejudices, violence and power imbalance. As she has told me during the interview:

"Decidi fazer pesquisa sobre o racismo quando estava tratando um paciente que havia perdido parte da massa encefálica num acidente. (...) Um belo dia que estava com muita raiva, porque lembrava algumas coisas e outras não. Ele queria me agredir né... e ele começa a ser tão agressivo, dizendo para mim "Você sabia que os negros não podiam sentar nos ônibus dos Estados Unidos se tivesse alguém branco em pé..." (...) no final da sessão, ele me pediu desculpas e ele disse 'mas eu queria agredir você, eu me lembro que nós vivemos num País que é racista... e eu já fui racista... hoje com o seu trabalho eu quero pensar sobre isso, eu quero conversar com você a respeito disso... e assim foi. Nós conversamos muito, então eu resolvi fazer o doutorado que tivesse uma questão para pensar: a questão meta psicológica do racismo. (...) comecei a trabalhar essa questão não só porque é uma questão que me toca pessoalmente, enquanto mulher negra,

---

difficulties more of personality who because of difficulties in the life path but anyway they lacked this concept of secure base, of secure attachment which then became a way to be able to work with them on identity in these situations. In my opinion, at the level of psychology, not necessarily just classical psychoanalysis, this concept would have to be brought back into play a little bit in the work on extremisms.

mas eu queria entender o que se passava a nivel meta-psicológico. ou seja, o que acontece nesse processo de formação do sujeito."[5]

In a work that brings much of a deep dive in herself, in the condition of woman, black and Brazilian, she outlines the many ties that interdict the development of the person, self-deprecation and self-destructive processes culturally introjected in a racist society. If the unconscious carries the marks of the memories of everyone's formation, as Freud said, the disparate experiences, of opposite valuation, of blacks and whites, show that, yes, in the subjectivation of Brazilian bodies, one can say that it has color. It is by digging deep into daily neuroses that *The Color of the Unconscious: Meanings of the Black Body* exposes the roots of entrenched racism which, by belittling the individuals who suffer it, undermines those who exercise it - and poisons the society.[6]

Psychological suffering is one of the most painful marks of racism. To think oneself in a context in which the color of one's skin is the target of discrimination, to search for one's deepest values, to make one's body emerge, to breathe, to make a personal memory flow that will restore equilibrium, self-love, to demonstrate the power of one's culture, of one's roots, this is one of the most complex and arduous tasks that can be demanded of a person.

The Color of the Unconscious - Meanings of the Black Body is a book about racism and psychoanalysis, which perhaps had yet another beginning: the little girl Isildinha came home crying, her grandmother asked her why she was crying, and she said that a boy was laughing and repeating that her hair was messy, and her grandmother immediately hugged her, saying that her hair was just like hers, that she loved combing it. The granddaughter calmed down, smiled, but the prejudice, the racism, was already making marks in her life, in her psychic reality, in her unconscious. Helped by her grandmother and her mother, she soon understood that she had to study in order to face life's challenges and chose Psychology, then a

---

[5] I decided to do research on racism when I was treating a patient who had lost part of his brain mass in an accident. He had lost his immediate memory, but he kept a big part of his long memory. One day he was very angry, because he remembered some things and not others. He wanted to hit me and he started being so aggressive, telling me "Did you know that black people couldn't sit on buses in the United States if there was someone white standing there?" (…) at the end of the session, he said he was sorry and he said 'But I wanted to harm you, I remembered that we live in a country that is racist... and I was once a racist... today with your work I want to think about it, I want to talk to you about it..." and so it was. we talked a lot, so I decided to do a doctorate research that had a question to think about: the meta-psychological question of racism (…) I started to work on this issue not only because it is an issue that touches me personally, as a black woman, but I wanted to understand what was working on a meta-psychological level - that is, what happens in this process of the subject formation.

[6] The reflections are based both on the interview and the book "The colour of inconscient", but also on the preface to the book written by Abrão Slavutzky.

Master's degree. At the suggestion of her advisor, and thanks to support, she traveled to Paris to deepen her studies.

Recently, Brazilian Psychoanalysis started to open its doors to racism - in a country where more than half of the population is black, the symptoms of racism are in the physical and psychic violence against black people and how little we still know about our country. "The color of the unconscious" impacts, the unconscious in principle has no color, but this image reveals a truth intuited perhaps by Françoise Dolto in saying how much psychoanalysis owed the Brazilian colleague. In the unconscious there are mnemic marks, the marks in the memory and in the childhood of blacks and whites that live racism, some suffering and others enjoying the strange of color from white logic. Chapter VII of Sigmund Freud's book "The Interpretation of Dreams", "Psychology of Dream Processes", shows how the mnemic marks constitute the unconscious. This book points to some of the psychic roots of structural racism, a racism ingrained even today in white society, marks of a history of slavery, and then abandonment, mistreatment, murder.

The racist is convinced that all evil is outside himself: the hated and ridiculed enemy. Racism is a group phenomenon, and, being a passion, it is a desire put into tension, the racist desire is to exterminate his object of hatred. The psychic effects of racism on those who suffer and those who enjoy it are essential to understand Brazil. In the case of racism against blacks, the author's goal is thinking about how the marks of humiliation and contempt will mark the unconscious through mnemic marks.

The image of the body is crucial, because it structures the identity of the subject, and it is in the "mirror stage" that this primordial identity is built. The acquisition of identity is based on the imaginary dimension, starting from the child's recognition of its virtual image, which is not it, but is where it recognizes itself. It is an imaginary knowledge, but one that is grounded in experience. The "mirror stage" is a phase in the life of the child when it is still in a maturation phase, when it acquires consciousness of its own body, between six months of life and eighteen months.

The subtitle of this book, "The meanings of the black body", leads the author to make a dive into the complex issue of the body in Psychoanalysis, in which, based on Lacan, she defines that the body has three points of view that complement each other. From the real point of view, the body is synonymous with jouissance; from the symbolic point of view, the body is the set of elements differentiated among themselves and that determine an act in the other, and as an imaginary body, identified as an external and pregnant image, which arouses meaning in a subject. It is important to emphasize that the image of the body is unique and linked to its history, as well as it is unconscious and sustained in narcissism. And therefore the book reaches its core in the "In-humanization of the black man". Hence the conclusion: To be black is to be violated in a constant, and cruel way, without pause

or rest by a double injunction: that of embodying the body and the ideals of I of the white subject and that of refusing, denying and nullifying the presence of the black body (Nogueira, 2021).

"What are we, the black people?", she asks, and it is from this question that she patiently sews the marks of color at the unconscious level. Being white means a generic condition: being white constitutes the unmarked element, the neutral of humanity. If the process of building the imaginary body is considered from the referential of Psychoanalysis, it is possible to assume that if nothing extraordinary occurs in the evolution of the human being, who will become a subject from the other, from otherness. Then he will eventually experience the feeling of "uneasy strangeness" in the face of an unexpected experience, such as being, unexpectedly, reflected in a mirror or on a reflecting surface. In this way he will experience feelings of fear and embarrassment, and then recompose himself, recognizing and not repudiating himself, being confirmed as a subject by the gaze of the other.

For black people, however, the unsettling stranger is more than the recognition of an eventual other - stranger - in oneself: it is the recognition of their condition of *not being*. Being black is not a generic condition, it is a specific condition, it is a marked, non-neutral element. "Being black" corresponds to a category included in a social code that is expressed within an ethno-semantic field where the signifier "black color" encloses several meanings. The sign "black" refers not only to inferior social positions, but also to biological characteristics supposedly falling short of the value of the properties attributed to whites. These are not explicitly assumed meanings, they are remnants of a historical process that persist in a zone of associations and that can emerge in an explicit way. If what constitutes the subject is the look of the other, how is the black person when confronted with the look of the other, that shows that it recognizes in him / her the meaning that black skin brings as a signifier? It remains for the black person, beyond his ghosts, inherent to the human being, the desire to refuse this signifier, which represents the meaning that he tries to deny, thus denying himself, through the denial of his own body.

It is impossible for a black person not to be disturbed by the terrifying threats that come via racism. Racism is the expression of violence, it is an act, not an interdiction that is placed a priori, as a way to protect whatever it is. Within this universe of terror, even if the black person consciously believes that such racist threats will not be fulfilled, dread does not disappear. He/she carries in his/her body the meaning that incites and justifies, for the other, racist violence:

> "A nivel imaginario, a pessoa negra vê a si mesma e deseja ser uma pessoa branca, que nunca será, marcada por tudo o que ela representa (...) Como psicanalista, desejo explorar como a realidade socio-historico-cultural do racismo e da discriminação estão marcadas na psique da pessoa negra. Ou seja, aprofundo a questão de como, para uma

pessoa negra, o processo de constituição do sujeito se desenvolve, visto que está sob influência de todos esses significados."[7]

Both on the book and during the interview, like in this case, Isildinha Baptista Nogueira analyzed how historical injustices against Blacks have been significantly important to their identity and lives: "Since then, freed from captivity, but never free of the condition of slaves, of a stigma, Blacks have suffered all sorts of discriminations, based on the idea that Blacks are inferior beings, therefore, not deserving of equal social possibilities". More specifically, she explained during the interview:

"a colonização com certeza foi traumática, para que a colonização se desse da forma em que ela se deu, ela desconsiderou a humanidade daqueles que foram escravizados. A escravização dos negros não foi a unica escravização na historia da humanidade... desconhecer a humanidade dos ecravizados permitia toda a violencia possivel e imaginavel. foi um processo violentissimo para os escravizados – no Brasil principalmente os negros... (...) os negros são trazidos da Africa, eles são arrancados da sua terra original, são brutalizados já no transporte, porque era uma forma de ir desconstruindo a humanidade e a cultura deles... eles não vinham de uma só região - um navio negreiro como se chamavam (a maior companhia de tráfico de escravos era inglesa). Eles tinham um propósito de colocar.... uma uma tática, digamos uma técnica de colocar juntos negros de diferentes tribos, que portanto não falavam a mesma língua, não tinhas a mesma cultura, os mesmos costumes, etc... isso ja croava uma rivalidade entre eles, isso não permitia que eles fizessem uma unidade... para poder para fazer um motim, por exemplo, né.. eles não se reconheciam um aos outros... isso é o narcisismo das pequenas diferenças. O tráfico já vergava o negro na sua condição humana: desumanizava, animalizava.."[8]

[7] Imaginatively, the black person sees him/ herself and desires to be the white person who he/she will never be, marked by all that he / she represents (…) As a psychoanalyst, I set out to explore how the socio-historical-cultural reality of racism and discrimination is inscribed in the psyche of the black. That is, I delved into the question of how, for the black person, this process of constituting him/ herself as a subject takes place, insofar as he / she is affected, from all time, by such meanings.
[8] Colonization was certainly traumatic, for colonization to happen the way it did, it disregarded the humanity of those who were enslaved. the enslavement of black people was not the only enslavement in the history of humanity... ignoring the humanity of the enslaved allowed for all possible and imaginable violence. It was a very violent process for the enslaved - in Brazil especially the blacks... (…) The blacks are transported from Africa, they are removed from their original land, they are brutalized during transportation, why it was a way to deconstruct humanity and their culture... they did not come from one region - a black ship as they called themselves (the largest slaver trafficking company was English). they had a purpose of placing.... a tactic, let's say a technique to put together blacks from different tribes, who therefore did not speak the same language, did not have the same culture, customs, etc. ... this already created a rivalry between them, which did not allow them to make a unity... for power to make a rebellion, for example, they did not recognize one another... this

These dynamics of colonization and slavery did not happen only in Brazil, and it is interesting to reflect about them under a psychoanalytic lens. She continued her interpretation:

"Em qualquer país onde o negro foi escravizado, ele foi também desnaturalizado, ele deixou de ser o ser humano para ser um semi-humano que podia ser explorado. E isso serviu para manter a perversa fantasia de superioridade dos brancos. Obviamente isso vai produzir uma configuração psíquica completamente diferente, para os negros e para os brancos. (...) Todo o processo de escravização foi um processo também de enlouquecimento da população negra - para não se pensar... A população negra no Brasil ela psicotisa e e ela sofre mais com problema mentais do que os brancos, por causa de todas essas dinamicas, o negro não tem um lugar, o negro não pode manter o seu processo identificatorio saudavel, porque se identifica com o medo, com a angustia e com o desejo dos pais de brancura... então a identidade negra é um processo sempre de construção e deconstrução, simultaneamente. Por isso que há algo que beira o enlouquecimento. Porque você tem permanentemente essa tensão..."[9]

When asked about how psychoanalysis could be useful as a perspective to interpret radicalization and which insights it could offer prevention activities, Nogueira answered:

"Na verdade, eu acho que a psicanálise nos ajuda a entender o modo como as relações vão se dando. Nesse sentido, acho que ajuda a refletir sobre como a sociedade constroi e construiu seres tão violentos. A violência serve ao processo civilizatorio, no sentido do dominio do outro. Isso é o que eu penso... a violência, ela tem como base o domínio, ela tem como propósito o medo, e portanto a submissão do outro, quer dizer quanto mais violento uma pessoa um grupo ou uma uma tradição religiosa... mais ela consegue uma certa forma oprimir. A violência tem como função oprimir o outro. A violência é um processo... ela não serve digamos à tranquilidade da sociedade ou à possibilidade de acesso de todos, porque quem pode se defender da violência, se defende, criando muros

---

is the narcissism of small differences. Trafficking already broke the black man in his human condition: it dehumanized, animalized him.

[9] In any country where the black man was enslaved, he was also denaturalized, he ceased to be a human being to be a semi-human who could be exploited. and this served to maintain the white people's perverse fantasy of superiority.
Obviously, this will produce a completely different psychical configuration, for blacks and for whites. (…) The whole process of enslavement was also a process of maddening of the black population. Not to think... the black population in Brazil is psychotic and suffers more from mental problems than the whites, because of all these dynamics, the black person doesn't have a place, the black person cannot maintain a healthy identification process, because he identifies with the fear, with the anguish and with the parents' desire of whiteness... so black identity is always a process of construction and deconstruction, simultaneously. that's why there is something bordering on madness. Because you permanently have that tension...

altos, nos condominios... e os outros, a grande maioria é submetida à violencia. a violencia tem o propósito da dominação. Eu acho que a psicanálise nesse sentido poderia nos ensinar ou nos ajudar a entender como é que se forma o radicalizado ou o terrorista." [10]

It is interesting therefore to think about violence as a way of domination and related to power and also to the personal or social path of a person or a group:

"eu acho que o terrorismo não é algo aleatório que surgiu do nada, mas tem um histórico. Atrás dos grandes desatres e das grandes violencias, voce tem um historico, um rastro de violência. A violência ela, ela produz mais violência. A guerra por exemplo é algo que nos assusta muito, porque é a violência pela violência. O que interrompe ou pode interromper essa violência? (...) Acho que a psicanálise pode nos mostrar muitas coisas: por exemplo, até que ponto quando se vive num contexto de violência, a pessoa tem maiores chances de ser também… de produzior violência."[11]

Power dynamics, discrimination and the difficulties found in the path towards integrations are quite similar among those who are considered as minorities:

"é tempo dos psicanalistas pensarem nessas diferenças - não só em relação aos negros, mas em relação aos povos originários, os estrangeiros todos... porque os estrangeiros também sofrem muito com a discriminação. A diferença é que o estrangeiro ele ainda tem um lugar um pouco melhorado em relação ao negro, que chegou escravizado. O estrangeiro, a figura que migra, ela nunca é muito bem-vinda em qualquer sociedade em todos os tempos, porque ela trata uma cultura diferente ela traz habitos e costumes diferentes... e é difícil... o ser humano não aceita o outro tão facilmente. É uma ilusão, eu acho que o Freud coloca bem isso com o narcisismo das pequenas diferenças: da nossa dificuldade em conviver com a diferença. Esse conflito das diferenças é uma forma de encontrar um depositário para tudo aquilo que não é bom dentro do grupo

---

[10] Actually, I think that psychoanalysis helps us to understand how relationships come about. In that sense, I think it helps us to reflect on how society constructs and builds such violent beings. Violence serves the civilizing process, in the sense of dominating the other. This is what I think. violence, its basis is dominion, its purpose is fear, and therefore submission of the other, that is, the more violent a person, a group or a religious tradition... the more it succeeds in some way in oppressing. violence has the function of oppressing others. violence is a process... it does not serve the tranquility of society or the possibility of access for all, because those who can defend themselves from violence defend themselves by creating high walls in condominiums... and the others, the great majority, are subjected to violence. Violence has the purpose of domination. I think that psychoanalysis in this sense could teach us or help us to understand how the radicalized or the terrorist is formed.

[11] I think that terrorism is not something random that came out of nowhere, but it has a history. Behind the great disasters and the great violence, you have a history, a trail of violence. Violence, it produces more violence. War, for example, is something that scares us a lot, because it is violence for violence's sake. What interrupts or can interrupt this violence?
(…) Psychoanalysis I think shows us a lot: to the extent that you live in a context of violence, a violent context, you have a great chance of also being... of producing violence

dominante. Então, o negro vai ser o ladrão, vais ser o golpista, é o que não merece, é o desnaturalizado em relação ao branco, que é sempre a melhor pessoa possível e imaginável. É uma forma dos grupos dominantes de se manter, de dominar, porque tudo o que nesse grupo, que se mantém coeso narcisiticamente, tudo aquilo que não serve desse grupo é depositado no outro grupo. Essas diferenças são importantes para a manutenção da hegemonia, da elite que mantém o poder"[12].

It is interesting to observe that the reading she gives of violence, racism and radicalization is a crossway of intrapsychic, interpersonal and social-historical aspects. These insights can be really useful to approach radicalization and violent extremism prevention and in some how can be connected with the other theoretical frameworks, Critical Pedagogy and Transcultural Psychiatry – maybe one important difference is that Freire did not consider intra-psychic aspects. Even if many of the problematic aspects linked to violence and oppression just mentioned are not easily solvable, it is important to put them on the interpretative framework.

---

[12] It is time for psychoanalysts to think about these differences - not only in relation to blacks, but in relation to native peoples, foreigners, all of them... because foreigners also suffer a lot from discrimination. the difference is that the foreigner still has a slightly better place in relation to the black, who arrived enslaved. but the foreigner, the figure that migrates, is never welcome in any society at any time, there is a different culture, a different costume, a different custom... and it is hard... the human being does not accept the other so easily. It is an illusion; I think Freud puts it well with the narcissism of small differences: of our difference. This conflict of differences is a way of finding a depository for everything that is not good within the dominant group. So, the black is going to be the thief, is going to be the scammer, is the one who doesn't deserve it, is the denaturalized one in relation to the white one, who is always the best person possible and imaginable. It is a way for the dominant groups to maintain themselves, to dominate, because everything that in this group, that is kept narcissistically cohesive, everything that does not serve this group is deposited in the other group. These differences are important for the maintenance of hegemony, of the elite that holds power.

Chapter VII.
TRANSCULTURAL PSYCHIATRY

7.1 Introduction

The field of transcultural psychiatry began to emerge at the end of the nineteenth century, when colonial conditions afforded doctors the possibility of observing mental illnesses in colonized peoples according to western psychiatric concepts (Delille & Crozier, 2018). It was not created as a distinct discipline until after World War II. In 1956 the Department of Psychiatry and the Department of Anthropology at McGill University, Canada, under the guidance of Eric Wittkower, jointly published the newsletter Transcultural Research in Mental Health Problems, marking the formal beginning of a new field within psychiatry (Bains, 2005). The challenges to the beliefs, values and practices resulting from cross-cultural engagements changed psychiatric practices. "Transcultural psychiatry became a postcolonial knowledge dealing with the inherited problems of racist psychologies, which were still dominant at the end of the colonial empires". (Delille & Crozier, 2018, p. 259).

These approaches are based on the premise that no culture is superior to another, and that each culture has its own unique set of psychological issues. Therefore, therapists who use it must be knowledgeable about a wide range of cultures and able to find commonalities across all of them. This requires a deep understanding of both psychiatry and cultural anthropology. The therapeutic process involves the exploration of both the conscious and unconscious mind, as well as the cultural background of the patient. The therapist uses active listening and observation to gather information about the patient's behavior and their cultural influences. This information is then used to develop an understanding of how cultural beliefs and practices affect the patient's psyche and behavior (Delille, 2017).

With a tacit assumption of the human condition's universality, much debate in medical ethics and moral philosophy proceeds without paying explicit regard to its particular cultural context. However, the assertion that we can reconcile moral

disagreements by drawing on our shared understanding of the human situation raises the issue of how we define what it means to be a human (Levy, 2000).

Transcultural Psychiatry has been used to treat a wide range of psychological problems, from depression and anxiety to addiction and trauma. The approach has been particularly effective in treating patients from marginalized and minority communities who may have been misunderstood or misdiagnosed by traditional Western psychotherapy. Overall, it provides a unique and effective approach to therapy that takes into account both the individual and cultural aspects of human psychology:

> "The response to cultural, racial or ethnic inequities in health status and access to care must begin with the recognition of difference as a legitimate political concern. Redress must go beyond the politics of recognition to understanding the specificity of the design of health care systems, policies, and practices that are truly inclusive because they actively seek to understand and respond to the cultural particularities of each individual's experience in suffering and healing." (Kirmayer, 2000, p. 421)

While this approach requires a great deal of expertise and cultural sensitivity on the part of the therapist, it can be a powerful tool for helping patients overcome their psychological issues and reclaim their mental health. This field of study explores the cross-cultural aspects of mental health and illness. As the global problem of violent extremism continues to plague communities, this perspective has become increasingly relevant in understanding the root causes and potential solutions to this issue. Its goal is to analyze the mentally ill in relation to their cultural environment within the confines of a given cultural unit (Wittkower, 1970).

Radicalization and violent extremism are complex phenomena that encompass a range of ideologies and behaviors, and have been attributed to geopolitical, socioeconomic, and psychological factors. Transcultural psychiatry can provide valuable insights into the factors that contribute to the radicalization of individuals. One important aspect is the study of cultural and religious beliefs, and how they shape an individual's worldview and understanding of mental illness. This is particularly relevant when it comes to extremist ideologies that use religion or culture as a justification for violence. By understanding the cultural and religious context of violent extremist groups, one can better understand their motivation and develop more effective strategies for intervention and prevention.

Another key aspect is the study of trauma and its impact on mental health. Many individuals who are vulnerable to violent extremism may have experienced trauma or adverse childhood experiences, which can lead to emotional distress, anxiety, and depression. Addressing the underlying trauma and providing appropriate mental health support is crucial in preventing individuals from becoming radicalized towards violent extremism. Overall, transcultural psychiatry offers a

valuable lens through which understand the complex interplay of social, cultural, and psychological factors that contribute to violent extremism. By leveraging these insights, one can work towards developing more effective prevention and intervention strategies to combat the dangerous and destructive impact of violent extremism on communities.

The studies published in this field also highlight the role of ethnocentric views and call the attention to their influences on research and public policies. The history of transcultural psychiatry inquire about has been characterized by endeavors to set up the cross-cultural pertinence and legitimacy of psychiatric demonstrative categories. These efforts started by utilizing standard "western" clear categories and diagnoses, then continuously recognizing the got to take account of the extraordinary variety in social conceptions of incident, illness, symptom expression, acknowledgment of the sick part, and both utilitarian and social disability. There's still exuberant talk about within the field around "western demonstrative bias" and its widespread, cross-cultural application on one hand, and social relativism, the long-term psychopathological impacts of colonial abuse, and the mental impacts of rapid culture alter on the other (Wintrob, 2013).

In line with this idea, one of the interviewees has stated:

"Something I keep saying over and over again to people is… decolonizing this sector of prevention of radicalization, because it is a sector that despite all of the cultures and different ideologies that are involved is still very white and Western and most of the main actors are also very white and Western, so this, this can cause issues regarding the approach to prevention… (…) The second point is adopting a more culturally sensitive approach to prevention of radicalization because often there is still this stigma that when you say, radicalization, we're talking about Muslims wearing bombs you know… so yeah, I think yeah, changing the approach, changing the connotation of the word, radicalization. Changing the idea that writing radicalization is always dangerous also, but especially, you know, co-constructing programs that are more adapted to the community it is supposed to be in, you can't just take the social polarization team, right, model an intervention and put it in the Northwest Territory. Because it's the same population. There are not the same needs. It's supposed to be built with the people that are there and they say they're supposed to have a voice in how prevention is approached and developed within their community. And how culturally sensitive it is. And it should, it should always be updated, you know, and be open to criticism and not being focused on you know, performance, but more on human… adopting a holistic and humanistic approach is extremely important." (Int. 35)

7.2 Mc Gill's Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry

During my first stay in Québec, I had interviewed Prof. Cécile Rousseau, who teaches at McGill University, and a couple of researchers who have collaborated

with her. I had already noticed a different perspective, a diverse approach when talking to them, but in a first moment I was concentrated on other issues. When I started thinking about the theoretical approaches I would have chosen for the theoretical part of my research, it became clear to me that it would have been an important piece of the puzzle. Even if a bit farther from my study background than Psychoanalysis and Critical Pedagogy, I had attended some courses on anthropology, ethnography and ethno-psychiatry during my university path, and I had always thought that these fields brought different and insightful ideas to think about several issues.

I have had the occasion to interview in May 2023 two professors who have significantly contributed to the growth of this field: Prof. Laurence J. Kirmayer and Prof. Jaswant Guzder. This subchapter will be based therefore on parts of the interviews done with them and with Cécile Rousseau and some articles they have written.

Laurence J. Kirmayer is a Professor at McGill University and Director of the Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry. He is Editor-in-Chief of the journal Transcultural Psychiatry and directs the Culture & Mental Health Research Unit at the Jewish General Hospital in Montreal, where he conducts research on culturally responsive mental health services, the mental health of Indigenous peoples, and the anthropology of psychiatry. He co-edited the volumes: Understanding Trauma: Integrating Biological, Clinical, and Cultural Perspectives (Cambridge University Press); Healing Traditions: The Mental Health of Aboriginal Peoples in Canada (University of British Columbia Press); Cultural Consultation: Encountering the Other in Mental Health Services (Springer); and Re-Visioning Psychiatry: Cultural Phenomenology, Critical Neuroscience, and Global Mental Health (Cambridge). He is a Fellow of the Canadian Academy of Health Sciences.

Jaswant Guzder is a Professor, McGill Department of Psychiatry, a psychoanalyst, child and cultural psychiatrist and artist. She has been Director of Childhood Disorders Day Hospital, Head of Child Psychiatry from 2004- 2018, and co- founder of the McGill Cultural Consultation Service (since 1995) where she is a senior clinical consultant. She is active in global mental health work in primarily in the Caribbean and Asia. Her recent research and writing includes topics of refugee and migrant mental health, children at risk, family therapy and cultural psychiatry.

Cécile Rousseau is professor at McGill University Division of Social and Cultural Psychiatry and holds a Canada Research Chair in the prevention of violent radicalization. She has worked extensively with immigrant and refugee communities, developing specific school-based interventions and leading policy oriented research. Presently her research focuses on intervention and prevention programs to address social polarization and violent radicalization.

The Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry is a network of scholars and clinicians within the Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, McGill University, devoted to promoting research, training and consultation in social and cultural psychiatry. The broad themes of research and training conducted by members of the Division include issues like mental health of indigenous peoples, immigrant and refugee mental health, ethnopsychology and ethnopsychiatry, responding to diversity in mental health care.[1]

In 1955, Drs. Eric Wittkower and Jack Fried set up the section of Transcultural Psychiatric Studies as a joint venture between the Departments of Psychiatry and Anthropology at McGill University. Its first achievement was to develop a newsletter to form a network of psychiatrists for the exchange of information about the then little known effects of culture on psychiatric disorders. The newsletter subsequently became *Transcultural Psychiatric Research Review*. In 1981, a Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry was inaugurated to integrate research and teaching in these fields.

I had the occasion to ask both Prof. Kirmayer and Prof. Jaswant Guzder about the story of Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry, here are part of their answers:

"McGill is the oldest formal program in the world. (…) And it was driven partly by the fact that McGill had many people coming for training in psychiatry from different parts of the world, probably as part of the legacy of the British Commonwealth. McGill was on their mental map of the world, so people came from East Africa, from East Asia and South Asia and so on. And when they came to train here, they raised the issue right away that, you know, people don't talk about their problems in the same way where we come from. So it's not always immediately obvious how to apply the categories and the tools that we're learning. And so, the suggestion then was this is something rather than just a technical problem of translation, how to apply northern, western, whatever perspectives universally, it was seen as an opportunity to try to understand human variation. So they started a network of people who trained here and went back to work in other places, started a newsletter, which eventually became a journal of reviews and, when I took over in '91, became a peer-reviewed journal, Transcultural Psychiatry. (…) An important shift occurred in the 70s and 80s with a kind of renewal in medical anthropology through the work of Arthur Kleinman and others who began to adopt the position I just mentioned, which is that psychiatry itself is a cultural institution. And while it may produce generalizable knowledge, that's intertwined with its own perspective, its own, taken for granted categories, and that needs to be questioned in some ways. So it's a kind of post-colonial, post-Thomas Kuhn kind of turn in in medical anthropology. (…) I would say our program is not a School in the sense of here's the pyramid, here's the approach to things and everybody has to follow that. It's much more

---

[1] Source: https://www.mcgill.ca/tcpsych

pluralistic and much more dialogical in terms of engaging with many different perspectives."

These were the words of Prof. Kirmayer. I asked also Prof. Guzder about the McGill's Transcultural Division history and importance, here is what she answered:

"We're very small, but very productive. We worked really hard to develop the summer program internationally and the scientific journal. (…) You're lucky if you survive as 1 or 2 and then you have students. But it's a political problem, because psychiatry and I mean, if you think about the DSM and how powerful it is, how long did it take for the DSM five to include culture in even in its diagnostics? So that's not that many years ago. And that should tell you a lot about what psychiatry's viewpoint has been on culture and how ethnocentric it is."

As Kirmayer, Rousseau and Guzder (2014) affirm, the influence of culture on disease behavior and experience is now well supported by a huge body of research. The mechanisms of disease, the signs of distress, and the ensuing coping mechanisms or help-seeking behaviors are all shaped by social and cultural processes. Differences in social status and health status are related to the social categories and identities that are shaped by culture, such as ethnicity and religion. While certain groups enjoy advantages, others are marginalized. Moreover, the authors underline that the pervasive ethnocentrism among healthcare professionals and planners is one obstacle to tackling ethnic diversity in mental health care. Many clinicians consider that they treat each patient fairly and according to their own preferences, so they do not need to overtly take culture into account. Unfortunately, clinic routines and processes that failed to account for significant variances in patients' needs and expectations frequently exhibited this liberal "colour blindness". Another important issue is related to language. Many hospitals and clinics underutilize their available interpreter resources because practitioners are content with a minimal level of communication with their patients or find it to be ineffective, despite the clear indications in the literature and potential medico-legal implications of inadequate communication. In their words:

"No amount of empathy or recognition can take the place of respect for the others' agency, so pluralism also demands a political process of creating social institutions that anchor, support, and valorize the other, recognizing the others' voice and vision as an independent fact and imperative. This recognition has multiple effects on the patient, on the clinician, on their respective communities, and on society as a whole. Taking the other seriously, listening to and working with them, allows us to explore new ways of being, both individually and collectively, exchanging knowledge, putting into play new ideas, values and concepts, that then circulate in the larger society" (Kirmayer, Rousseau, Guzder, 2014, pp.16-17).

Cultures provide modes of self-understanding and the frameworks with which we fashion our identities, life goals and aspirations. Cultural systems generate the social categories that position individuals and communities in ways that may cause advantage or adversity. "Thus, culture contributes to the causes of mental health problems, as well as shaping symptoms and illness experience, modes of expression of distress, coping, help seeking, treatment response, social stigma and recovery" (Kirmayer, Jarvis, 2019, p.10). Culturally sensitive psychiatry can be very helpful in dealing with radicalization in different ways. Its research areas include cultural influences on mental health and sickness, the challenges in providing services to diverse populations and the analysis of psychiatric theory and practice as products of a particular cultural history and context (Rousseau, Aggarwal, & Kirmayer, 2021).

Studies indicate that most members do not have psychiatric disorders in terms of motivations; however, mental illness does affect 'lone actors' who are not connected to a network or community. Radicalized people may share common vulnerabilities that are intensified by events and mobilized by social forces:

"The human tendency to define and distinguish in-group and out-group is intensified by multiple factors, which can include anxiety about unrelated issues that increases the need for boundaries and belonging, exposure to expanding groups of strangers, a sense of competition for resources, status and control, and the erosion of communal solidarity. The narratives that fuel radicalization to violent extremism foster a dichotomous view of the world in terms of us and them. These narratives strengthen the sense of belonging to a group that is on the side of all that is right, good and true, as defined through values and orientations that are socially transmitted within a group. Much of the rhetoric of radicalization thus serves to convey meanings and practices that are related to righteousness, ideals, sacred values, paths for meaningful action, a vital mission, and the possibility for transcendence. This valorization of the in-group goes along with dehumanization and demonization of the out-group, ideology, or Other that is the immediate target of violence." (Rousseau, Aggarwal, & Kirmayer, 2021, p. 605)

Rousseau, Aggarwal and Kirmayer (2021) also observe that moral emotions and reasoning that are mobilized in violent radicalization include ressentiment and the desire for retribution and revenge. Other dynamics also play significant roles, such as the need for virtue and ideals, the desire for moral purity, the corollary process of splitting (the tendency to attach strong emotions to these distinctions and corresponding difficulties in appreciating and working with "grey zones"), and the interpersonal processes of othering and dehumanization. These emotional dynamics play a part in the capacity of feeling empathy and solidarity. The authors underline

that it is important to understand violent radicalization as a global phenomenon driven by socioeconomic injustices, cultural uncertainties, identity fragmentation, accelerated communication, radical ideologies and social polarization:

> "These newly energized forces of violent radicalization are bringing forward old ghosts: not only White supremacist, Islamophobic and anti-Semitic and masculinist ideologies, but also the search for "villains" as scapegoats in times of crisis, as seen in the rise of anti-Asian hate crimes and incidents during the COVID-19 pandemic. The gathering crisis of climate change is an over-riding issue that will exacerbate existing economic inequalities and create new forms of existential threat. Efforts to prevent or mitigate both old and new forms of violence face particular challenges because the dynamics of the popular media and the Internet allow the rapid spread of violence-promoting images and ideas. Social media and the internet are both channels to defend democracy and human rights and incredibly effective tools for propaganda and group manipulation available to anyone with an agenda." (Rousseau, Aggarwal and Kirmayer, 2021, p. 611)

Going back to the interviews, when asked about the definition of radicalization, Prof. Kirmayer has answered:

> "Well, I would first of all, distinguish, as my colleagues do, between radicalization and radicalization toward violence. Right. Because, yes, one can take a radical or extreme position and that's sometimes a very good thing. That's where a lot of creativity and art comes from, from people going to an extreme and seeing what comes of that. What makes it radicalization in a way that we want to call it something that is either unusual or a problem is about the rigidity of the position. So it's not just taking an extreme position, but it being very rigid and unresponsive to ordinary dialogue, ordinary back and forth counter-evidence, all these other things. So that kind of polarization and adopting an extreme position vis a vis something that matters and defending it against counter evidence or other influence and then in particular, when it then connects to very negative things. (…) So it has this other element, often of a negative valence in the sense that there is anger, there is fear, there is antagonism… So it becomes a social problem for many people. I would say all those elements have to go together for us to call it a specific type of problem. Otherwise, we would be taking it apart and saying, okay, so what leads people, for example, to have very strong biases in their thinking or to identify very strongly with a subgroup in some ways. And these are ingredients of the phenomenon we call radicalization, but they're probably not the phenomenon we mean by themselves. By themselves, they're not sufficient. I mention that, though, because if we think about what's going on right now, where this seems to have become more prevalent and more problematic, then it's partly about what forces or processes are amplifying certain factors or pushing people to extremes, letting them live inside social bubbles or spheres in which they don't have to compromise or engage with others creating frustrations and hurts and grievances that are satisfied partly by adopting a

certain position, all those kinds of social and psychological dynamics that get to very quickly when we start characterizing a certain set of problems as radicalization. Having said that historically, this has occurred in the context of particular the current version of particular sort of geopolitical events. And it can't be totally separated from that because the way that it's been framed is heavily influenced by that."

Prof. Jaswant Guzder has raised problematic aspects of radicalization studies in her answer:

"Well, Gandhi was a radical, Martin Luther King was a radical. (…) Gandhi didn't take a gun. But he could shut down a nation by saying you're not going to buy salt anymore. And you're not going to cooperate, etc. The word radicalization is really taking a radical new approach to a grievous problem. Okay. So then if you want to tag the word violence onto it, when it becomes a problem for my society, that your radical solution or radicalization or opposition to whatever… it also involves harm. Would you call it radicalization in the streets of Jamaica because the guns are turned on each other, or would you call it violent radicalization when a mother beats up her child because she's so frustrated from all the trauma that she's had? And it's just gone down and down, and just so you have to say, well, no, most people, when they hear that word, they mean 9/11. They mean someone turning against the state and creating upheaval and unrest and destabilizing the civil order. Basically. That is how I understand the anxiety of radicalization. And until 9/11, nothing of that scale ever happened on this continent. So that was a terrible, terrible shock, I think, in North America. (…) So, how you use those words can never be understood without understanding the context."

Prof. Cécile Rousseau, during the interview held in July 2022, had given me this definition:

"Radicalization is what happens when dialogue doesn't work. It's a systematic issue in which two or more parties will crystalize their position, in a more or less rigid way, because they're not able to establish a dialogue. Usually there's a motivation to change the social status quo (injustice, an exploitation situation…). Radicalization is a process, that can lead to positive social change or may also lead to violence (when you don't have an alternative social project)."

When asked about the concepts linked to radicalization, Prof. Kirmayer gave the following answer:

"Well, I would say that… there's a basic mechanism, related to in-group and out-group identification. So probably very early on in human evolutionary development, we have this tendency to bond with people who are familiar and feel comfortable. It's pretty basic to learn. (…) we feel great comfort with what's familiar and we feel more apprehension – though also sometimes fascination and attraction with what's unfamiliar. So, a complex set of emotions toward what's different and what's strange. So, this is an

important emotional engine, if you will. Then I think we have another set of issues around the desire to organize our life in a way that's coherent, to have a tolerable level of complexity. And one of the challenges we have in the contemporary world is we're all receiving huge amounts of complexity through the Internet, through mass media, and so on. We get lots and lots of diversity. For some people, because they like a higher level, this is enjoyable. In terms of personality traits, they're high on openness and they're interested in other cultures and they're fascinated. But for some people, this is way too much. And it leads again to wanting to homogenize, wanting to keep things very similar. So that's another dimension that has more to do with tolerance of diversity, of complexity, of uncertainty, which is, I think, separate but then interacts with this sort of in/outgroup dynamic. So, I think those are two important things we can probably think about more personality traits, other facets of human nature. Aggression is certainly one. (…) So when a leader starts talking in a way that is very base or aggressive, they lower the whole level of the threshold for what's acceptable, what's okay, or they raise the threshold, they anyway, they increase the possibility of people saying very harsh and negative things, which then interacts with these other processes that I've mentioned. So I think that I would emphasize that sociopolitical level that is about the nature of social space, the nature of public discourse, the shared values and ideals that people aspire to and that are reinforced by the society that's equally important to any of the specific psychological dynamics we talk about, because ideally we live in a society that helps us to land on the side of the good side of our nature the better angels of our nature rather than the more anxious and aggressive and violent aspects which are also part of our nature, of course. I'm especially interested in that social side because I see that as something we can address. First of all, we can try to do something about it by making sure that the right kind of discourse is circulating. (…) If someone gets up and says "kill all these people because they're not human", they should not be given a big platform. They can say that in the privacy of their home, but they should not have a megaphone on the Internet, like Tucker Carlson or others."

Prof. Jaswant Guzder gave a different answer to this question, even if there are many ideas in common, about the collective and social approach:

"For example, Nazism can be linked. I mean, look, shooting, killing Indians and saying "okay, we're going to take away your children and turn them into white people, so that they forget about being indigenous. We're going to eradicate your culture. And if a lot of them die up there, we're not even going to tell you what happened to them. We're just going to keep burying them, hundreds of them". Now, is that violent radicalization on the part of the state or is that only when an Indian person resists and gets a bit, you know, bent out of shape, do I send him to a violent radicalization clinic? There's a lot of anxiety in Quebec about violent radicalization.
(…). So how do you decolonize, how do you even begin a conversation about that? If you then go to the libraries of such schools and start throwing books out and stop people from reading and stop people from understanding their history and start controlling their

history… I mean, you realize that what you're doing is creating conditions for radicalization eventually, and also conditions which take the person away from what Freud would say is essential to our health, which is being in touch with our inner world, being reflective and attuned to it.

(…) If you have a situation where you think there's fragility in the collective, then you have to look at the deepest part of how that happened and you have to think preventatively who is it and what is it that helped that formation to happen, that kind of desperation, that kind of murderous rage. And all of this stuff that goes on in the dynamic, it's a deep question, a very deep question. And I don't have an answer for it. But I'm telling you that we are failing our children. We are absolutely failing them. And I'm very upset about it, actually."

Prof. Cécile Rousseau had given me the following answer:

"In the 70's and 80's, radicalization was more linked to a social justice view… in a moral and progressive view of the world. Before you had the ideas of terrorism and violent extremism not linked to radicalization per sé… In literature radicalization started to be more used in the other sense after jihadism gained space, so religious radicalization was considered as synonym for terrorism or violent extremism. There was a kind of appropriation of the term by the governments. I think there are many models that are not scientifically founded. It's not because you have a radical view, that you progressively come to legitimizing violence. It's not a linear relation. There is a relation between the level of legitimation of violence and a number of violent acts, but the relation is not linear. Having a polarized or radical thought doesn't mean that you will become a terrorist, absolutely not- The problem of linear approaches like the pyramid one…. Is that it makes suspect of the social discourse… that is problematic, that is used as a tool of social control. The problem in the field… if in name of terrorism and extremism, you politicize those concepts to implement social control of any protest, then that becomes very damaging."

I had interviewed Prof. Cécile Rousseau in 2022 because, besides teaching at McGill University, she coordinates RAPS (Recherche et Action sur les Polarisations Sociales). Here is how she had defined the research team:

"Raps is a heterogeneous research team, with twenty-five researchers from different disciplines and a lot of partners, so school boards, Ministries, Security forces, community organizations… One of the characteristics of Raps is that the continuum of researchers and partners are not in agreement. And this disagreement is important. I don't think… I think it's a very bad sign when we work on radicalization, on social polarization and on violent extremism… If we all agree, this is a very bad sign… because it means we're only at one side of the problematic and we're not able to represent what's going on in society."

When asked about prevention activities, Prof. Cécile Rousseau had answered:

"I would say first thing…. Primary prevention, secondary prevention and tertiary prevention are often presented as a continuum. And again, I think that is a problem, because they're not. They have totally different goals and should not be implemented by the same actors.
I think that primary prevention should be restricted to social rail and security agencies and forces should back off, and should not be involved nor funded… and this is a problem, because most funds come from security agencies… it's none of their business and they're making things worse so… In Canada, for example, we have the "Community resilience fund" created by the security Ministry… that undermines community trust. Why should a security Ministry, who's in charge of the police, be concerned with community resilience? Community resilience should be the business of Welfare agency, municipalities, educational system, and so on. So primary prevention should be implemented by social and political actors who are in charge of social life, not security.. and the aim is multi-layered, so the first was appropriately with United Nations. The first thing is, if you don't have basic human rights and social justice (and that is the main problem)…. whatever we do as a secondary and tertiary level will not work. That is, we have a global problem. At least, it needs to be said… given the fact that you do not have this social equality or good conditions…. There are a number of mechanisms which can give grievances a voice and facilitate that people can take a certain power… and that can mitigate the fact that violence is the only solution."

Prof. Kirmayer, on the other hand, has commented the following on prevention activities:

"Well, I think what works for people is friendship, right? So, I think the most basic issue is if you spend enough time with someone else in a common activity or goal or something that is rewarding, you begin to see them as a person, not as an object. And you can break down a lot of prejudice, a lot of walls that people have through that kind of activity. (…) If we ask society-wide what's going to make a difference, to me, it's through representations, through the arts, through participatory activities that bring people into contact with each other, where they have a shared feeling of communitas, of solidarity, of exchange, and begin to break down the "us and them" thinking that is always potentially there and needs to be worked with in some ways. So, I think I've actually suggested that even in our intercultural work where we see somebody in a clinic when they're in trouble, that that's a moment at an important moment where we can have some impact on someone. (…) I think it involves active education. So I think we need to do things with children when they're very young to break down prejudice, to strengthen the feeling of connection and to help build that feeling of that we're all in one boat as humanity, we're all in one boat."

It is interesting to observe that the three theoretical approaches presented is this thesis are complementary and frequently the opinions of the practitioners interviewed are quite similar, even if they have a different professional background. The ideas on how to read radicalization and violent extremism and how to improve the work of prevention are varied and insightful.

CONCLUSIONS

As it was mentioned in the introduction, the three fields chosen for the theoretical approach (Critical Pedagogy, Psychoanalysis and Transcultural Psychiatry) are not usually applied to Radicalization studies. According to Dewey's (1929) definition, the fields were not chosen as primary sources (educational practices-ground of hypotheses of intervention, beginning and end of the process), but as special sources, since they can be useful not necessarily to give pedagogical prescriptions, but to give us insights to interpret the phenomenon and to formulate hypotheses. It is interesting therefore to use inputs from these theories and from the empirical data on Unesco-Prev to draw bridges and conclusions.

Adopting an interdisciplinary approach is essential for comprehensively understanding the multifaceted nature of radicalization and designing effective, holistic interventions. By integrating insights from various disciplines, researchers and practitioners can develop more effective prevention strategies that address the root causes of radicalization.

The goal of the present study was to bring together inputs to better understand radicalization and violent extremism and to promote a reflection about prevention activities. The empirical data gathered with the interviews and focus groups can be quite useful ideas of what is already done in Québec and what could be done differently, as shown in the first chapters. The need to promote more interdisciplinary discussions was mentioned by many professionals. The choice of the theoretical approaches was based also on what came up from the field experience – in the beginning there was Freire, since he is one of the authors that inspired Project Someone, then during the interviews many talked about psychological and cultural features that could integrate the community and educational approach.

Critical Pedagogy and in particular Freire's ideas, as exposed earlier, present an educational approach quite valuable in this field. While Psychoanalysis and Transcultural Psychiatry are more useful as interpretative frameworks, Freire's ideas can guide prevention practices. In the last years some activities have already been inspired by his ideas, such as those gathered in Project Someone in Canada or anti-extremist Theatre-in-Education in Great Britain, but much more could be done

in the future. This is therefore one of the ideas for future practices and researches. How is it possible to integrate existent projects and create new ones based on ideas and competencies such as critical thinking, dialogue, emancipation, awareness, oppression liberation, respect for diversity and tolerance?

Different authors from the psychoanalytic field have written and dealt with concepts such as death drive, sublimation, narcissism of minor differences, defense mechanisms, group dynamics. One ambition of psychoanalysis from its inception has been to understand aggression and violence, which were considered primordial, pervasive, and essential for psychic functioning. Even if psychoanalytic attempts to comprehend and mitigate political extremism and terrorism have been curiously on the decline throughout the 20th and the 21st centuries, there is a tangible body of valuable psychoanalytic literature on the subject, especially after 9/11 (Cohen, 2019). Preventative activities will not work directly with these concepts, but it would be useful to include these topics in trainings, so that teachers, social workers and practitioners in general could be informed about these ideas and adopt an interdisciplinary approach.

The contribution of transcultural psychiatry is interesting because it allows us to redefine and question our positioning, to reflect about ethnocentric aspects of our thoughts and practices, to redefine culture. The critical point of view of researchers and practitioners from this field is quite stimulating to be taken in consideration, as demonstrated in the last chapter. The three approaches presented have some convergences and obviously also divergences (Tab. 1).

Tab. 1

	Why	**Educational approach**	**Impact**
Freire / Critical Pedagogy	He uses dialectic as a 'device' to make people more aware of their assumptions	They consider stories, speech, narratives as expressions and data for knowing the world (social, psychic, practices). They adopt a historical approach to the analysis of phenomena (something in the past has generated a phenomenon in the present that	It helps us to see social dialogue as a resource for making thought that 'excludes' not radicalized, while still keeping it within the dialectic. Even the radicalized person is to some extent a victim of a social process that has 'made' him or her unable to have different views or to restrict some of them.
Freud / Psychoanalysis	To consider intrapsychic dynamics as foundations and needs anchored in one's living and learning background		Invites to consider the permeability of thought to error as a potential that is always structural in the individual. It is important to be aware of the importance of unconscious mechanisms.

Transcultural Psychiatry	It places practices of analysis and care within the sphere of socially conditioned phenomena.	may affect or condition the future). Historical device - context in which people have lived	We cannot address radicalization as a universal process, without understanding it in its situated and culturally conditioned dimension.

As part of these conclusions, it is useful to draw a line of some of these aspects. First of all, the three study fields give a huge importance to the value of words and their exchanges through authentic dialogues. Starting from there, a couple of considerations can be made on the relevance of the content that the other is bringing up, whether if a single human being or a community.

Psychoanalysis is founded on the value of the words; it has been called the "talking cure". It is based on a conversation between the patient, who must say what he or she thinks freely and the analyst, who listens. From listening, he/she can say something that opens up new paths of association and clarifies the patient's past and present. It is important to emphasize that the patient's knowledge is in him/herself and not in the analyst. Ideas come up through the exchange of expertise – lived experiences on one side, listening and interpretation on the other. Even if many aspects of Freud's theories and clinical inputs are considered overcome nowadays, there are concepts that are always interesting to reflect about human beings. In a time in which words are frequently used in a light manner and without much thinking in social media or other written and oral exchanges, it would be important to keep in mind their extreme power, both in positive and negative directions:

> "Las palabras fueron originalmente ensalmos, y la palabra conserva todavia hoy mucho de su antiguo poder ensalmador. Mediante palabras puede un hombre hacer dichoso a otro o empujarlo a la desesperación, mediante palabras el maestro trasmite su saber a los discipulos...Palabras despiertan sentimientos y son el medio universal con que los hombres se influyen unos a otros."[1] (Freud, 1988b, p. 15)

One of the main messages that Paulo Freire has transmitted with his practice and his writings is the importance of starting from what learners and communities already know and the content they are familiar with. In this sense, both Freud and

---

[1] Words were originally psalms, and the word still retains much of its ancient soul-stirring power. By words one man can make another man happy or drive him to despair, by words the teacher transmits his knowledge to his disciples...Words awaken feelings and are the universal means by which men influence one another.

Freire were engaged on listening, the emphasis is on listening to what the other knows and not relying mostly on the wisdom of the analyst or teacher. The twentieth century has highlighted how much people need to learn to listen to each other and how difficult it is to learn from listening.

Freire, as explained earlier, dedicated a great part of his time to the promotion of adult literacy and to communities' development (Gadotti, 1996). Specifically for literacy, he proposed to start from identifying with each group some words, called "generating words", that were important in their everyday lives and develop the literacy process from there, not from empty syllables. Moreover, literacy was always connected with awareness and a critical view of power relations and oppression. This is how Freire defines dialogue:

"O dialogo é o encontro entre os homens, intermediado pelo mundo, para nomear esse mundo. Se é por meio da palavra, ao nomear o mundo, que os homens o transformam, o dialogo se impoe como o caminho pelo qual os homens encontram o significado de serem homens. Logo, o dialogo se constitui como uma necessidade existencial."[2] (Freire, 2016, p. 135).

Furthermore, Freire (2011) highlights the creating power of words, since they generate the world and are also action – "palavração", that reveals the relations among human beings and their world.

In Transcultural psychiatry, importance is given to the work of interpreters, but reflections are made also regarding the space for cultural consultation. Non only the words and the cultural aspects of patients who could represent minorities are taken in consideration, but also the acknowledgement of cultural assumptions in Medicine and in an ethnocentric view of the world (Kirmayer et al, 2014). The capacity of merging different levels of analysis is a valuable input to reflect on radicalization and violent extremism. From the importance given to words, derives the significance of listening to the other's needs and requests.

Many interviewees touched this topic, such as:

"Understanding and listening. Yeah, I think that we don't listen, you know, I think that we're just driven by what we want, as researcher or even like, as institution, we go with one aim or one goal, but then we just leave them with nothing. So for me, it's the way I try to do my research and yearning to give them as tools and to give back to them. So yeah, like, I've seen a lot of researchers who were going to communities and not listening to them." (Int. 2)

---

[2] Dialogue is the encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name that world. If it is through the word, by naming the world, that men transform it, then dialog is the path by which men find the meaning of being men. Dialogue is therefore an existential necessity.

"But really, really the biggest prevention happens when you're with face to face with someone. It's embodied. It's you spending time to listen to them with true interest and listening to them in a way that you recognize that what they know is important and it is expertise." (Int. 16)

"The primary experience is an important tool because within it, you have all the keys for the solutions… are we listening enough?" (Int. 33)

"Have the space to truly listen to the other" (FG2, P2)

The capacity to listen to others' needs and experiences is therefore a fundamental aspect brought up by literature and by the empirical data. Since people in radicalization process tend to close themselves to dialogue with those who have different opinions, this is one of the main aspects to deal with in prevention activities.

From the importance of words and dialogue, one can reflect also about power and oppression, two crucial subjects in Freire's work:

"Desenvolve-se no que rouba a palavra dos outros uma profunda descrença neles, considerados como incapazes. Quanto mais diz a palavra sem a palavra daqueles que estão proibidos de dizê-la, tanto mais exercita o poder e o gosto de mandar, de dirigir, de comandar. Já não pode viver se não tem alguém a quem dirija sua palavra de ordem. Desta forma, é impossível o diálogo. Isto é próprio das elites opressoras que, entre seus mitos, têm de vitalizar mais este, com o qual dominam mais"[3] (Freire, 2013, p. 140).

Freire (2013) affirms that the oppressor attempts to dominate the oppressed through conquest, division, manipulation and cultural invasion. The revolutionary responds to these anti-dialogical forms of action with dialogical ones: cooperation, unification, organization, and cultural synthesis.

These political and social topics are less present in Freud's writings, while contemporary psychoanalysts deal more with them, as it is shown in the last chapter and in the interview to Baptista Nogueira, who affirms that violence has the function of oppressing others.

---

[3] The person who steals the words of others develops a deep disbelief in them as incapable. The more he says his word without the word of those who are forbidden to say it, the more he exercises his power and his taste for ordering, directing and commanding. He can no longer live if he doesn't have someone to whom he can address his command. Dialogue is thus impossible. This is typical of the oppressive elites who, among their myths, have to vitalize this one the most, with which they dominate the most

Under the lens of Transcultural psychiatry, Kirmayer (2022) calls the attention to the fact that we are all embedded in systems that seek to hide the origins of structural violence and therefore our knowledge of history and the structures of ongoing oppression is always incomplete.

In some interviews, power and oppression were brought up. For example:

"I think it works well to discuss things in a playful way and still discuss about power relationships, understand power dynamics, uh, critical thinking." (Int. 41)

"Prevention starts by deconstructing the oppressor in yourself" (Int. 34)

One important aspect in the process of radicalization is how one perceives and deals with differences. The three theoretical fields bring interesting perspectives on this issue. Freire for example states:

"A intolerância ou a incapacidade de compreender o diferente, de conviver com ele, de com ele nos solidarizar, de lutar ao lado dele por uma causa comum é o que nos proíbe de superar nossas diferenças apenas adjetivas forjando assim a unidade necessária sem a qual nossa luta é inviável. A intolerância pressupõe no intolerante uma supervaloração de si mesmo em face dos demais considerados sempre aquém dele. De si mesmo, de sua classe, de sua raça, de seu grupo, de seu sexo, de sua nação. Não há por isso mesmo tolerância na falta de humildade. Como posso ser eu tolerante se, em lugar de considerar o outro como diferente de mim o considero inferior a mim?"[4] (Freire, 2015, p.82)

Perceived differences can promote therefore intolerance and rivalry. One of the interviewees stated:

"in-group and outgroup identification. So probably very early on in human evolution development, we, you know, we have this tendency to bond with people who are familiar and feel comfortable. It's pretty basic to learn. We have this capacity to fear the stranger, to protect against that boundary." (Int. 39)

---

[4] Intolerance, or the inability to understand what is different, to live with it, to show solidarity with it, to fight alongside it for a common cause, is what prevents us from overcoming our differences, which are only adjectival, thus forging the necessary unity without which our struggle is unfeasible. Intolerance presupposes in the intolerant an overvaluation of themselves in relation to others who are always considered to be below them. Of himself, his class, his race, his group, his sex, his nation. There is therefore no tolerance in a lack of humility. How can I be tolerant if, instead of seeing others as different from me, I see them as inferior to me?

The Freudian concept of narcissism of minor differences can also be insightful, since frequently they can arise among those who are much more similar than what they perceive. As mentioned in the previous chapter, differences may give rise to fanaticism, for fanaticism is omnipresent in human history. Building a friend is a much slower construction than building an enemy.

Another concept that can be useful sublimation, a mechanism of Freud's theory that is still named by many thinkers is, even if it can have different interpretations. Sublimation is the best way to face emptiness, helplessness and death. What is achieved by creating, whether in art, crafts or family creations, is to circumvent the anguish of this emptiness that constitutes us. An emptiness that reveals how incomplete, fragile and mortal we are. Sublimation is a transformation of narcissism, in which object love, through sublimation, reveals itself to be creative. In one of the interviews, this topic was brought up:

"There is this process in psychodynamic called as sublimation you know, where, instead of becoming aggressive, you sublimate these aggressive pulsions into something productive for the society. So… (…) artists that create beautiful paintings or all arts, or music instead of becoming violent and can be I don't know songs and rap so you know, working in different ways of expressing all the anger and frustration they have towards society is extremely important." (Int. 33)

Even if his contribution to Art Education is less well-known, Freire dedicated time also to this field (Barbosa In: Gadotti, 1996). Researchers and practitioners who came both from a psychological, educational and transcultural psychiatry background highlighted indeed the importance of arts:

"Je crois que le plus important est de continuer dans ce qui concerne la prévention primaire, de continuer tout ce que font déjà les acteurs de terrain, c'est à dire le lien social, c'est à dire la discussion, c'est à dire être sur place, c'est à dire des activités, que ce soit des activités culturelles, des activités artistiques. " (Int. 42)[5]

"I think arts are extremely important in healing in such a society." (FG 1, P2)

"a video installation. And so that's it. It taps into what it means to listen across difference. The art, the help that art can bring in creating those dialogic spaces, open spaces where difference is not put aside but acknowledged and celebrated. How can we be together differently or not be together? But how can I listen with you to you within your difference?" (Int. 16)

---

[5] I believe that the most important thing is to continue with primary prevention, to continue with everything that the local players are already doing, i.e. social links, discussions, being on the spot, activities, whether cultural or artistic.

Moreover, radicalization has been considered lately more associable to polarization and extremist positions than to terrorism. Some of the practitioners do not even use the term "radicalization" anymore and have substituted it with violent extremism and social polarization. Some of the interviewees were convinced that radicalization studies will disappear, many others were sure, on the contrary, that it will keep on being an important issue to study and further understand, in order to create more preventative activities with a more substantial efficacy proved basis. The question about how specific these activities need to be is still open. In other words, is there a need to program specific radicalization prevention activities, or can they be linked with other kinds of preventative activities, such as the ones targeting online and offline hate speech, racism, hate incidents? And, as brought up by some, wouldn't it be better to focus on promotion instead of focusing on prevention? In other words, wouldn't it be more productive to shift the attention from the bad things we want to prevent to the positive capacities we would like to promote?

Related to these questions, there is another issue that comes up from the research: security and targeted approaches have been gradually replaced by educational and universal ones, that seem to be much more. More research still needs to be done on efficacy, but studies show that some pedagogical approaches contain results attesting to the effectiveness of improving protective factors against violent radicalization (Brouillette-Alarie et al, 2022). It is important to underline anyway that we should not be too radical on this aspect and think that security forces must have absolutely nothing to do with radicalization and violent extremism prevention. There are situations in which the collaboration is needed, and networking and information exchanging seem to be the best way to deal with such a complex phenomenon. Some interviewees who work with educational approaches in communities declared that they did not want to exchange ideas with police forces, and this could be problematic.

There is a strong conviction that a community approach, that takes into consideration real needs of participants, seem to have much more lasting and positive effects than top-down ones, in which the researchers think to have all the answers a priori. This is an aspect brought up by almost all interviewees, it is not possible to think that there is a homogeneous way to deal with these realities and each community has its own characteristics and needs.

One aspect to highlight in these conclusions is the need to give space to difficult discussions. Frequently in schools and working settings, when someone says something too sharp and uncomfortable, the tendency is to shut that person down and maybe even try to depict him or her as ridiculous. For example, when someone states a racist idea, teachers and leaders tend to close the discussion, instead of

dealing with it. The huge problem is that person who pronounced those racist words will not stop thinking those things – instead, it is probable that he/she will find elsewhere other people who think similarly and from there a way to hate incidents and violence could be open. It is not easy to deal with this kind of situation, but definitely it is worth trying. More research and training are needed, in order to give teachers and other professionals the tools to better deal with difficult issues in class and in other social contexts.

On a methodological note, I would like to dedicate some thoughts on what went well and what could have been improved. An important aspect that I had underestimated at the beginning is related to the language. I knew French was the first language in Québec and I knew long before my arrival there that I needed to practice my French to get confident in speaking it again. I had studied it for many years and I had had the occasion to go many times to Paris, where an aunt used to live. After many years without having used it though, I felt much more comfortable with English. I should have translated the interview track to French right away and I should have given the choice between English and French to interviewees since the beginning. Unfortunately, I haven't, so I could notice while I listened to registrations that some people were not completely at ease with English and maybe would have told me much more if they had spoken in French. One lesson learned is without doubt: the researcher must do everything that it is possible to create the best setting for the interviewee. This may mean getting out of his/her comfort zone and making efforts to deal with a language that is not his/her most fluent one or making efforts to find the best place and time for the interviewee, without the need to rush – another mistake that I have done sometimes was setting interviews too close one to another, so I couldn't give the interviewee all the necessary time to express everything he/she would have liked to say.

On a brighter side, I must say that I found myself really at ease conducting interviews and focus groups. I hadn't had long previous experience on that, but even if I was speaking languages that were not mine and even if I was in a completely different reality from the one where I live in, it was not difficult for me to create a enriching dialogical setting. I established a good connection with all my interviewees and focus group participants, and I am quite proud of that. It is not always easy to deal with different kinds of people and keep the conversation going, but I consider my experience a great success. Something that helped me a lot is the fact that in many cases I had had the occasion to meet the person before the interview, and that surely helped to create a friendly environment. I would like to have started the focus groups earlier, in order to have more data from this kind of setting. During my first stay in Québec though it was not easy, since there were still rules and concerns about Covid-19 pandemics. Maybe this could be further developed in future researchers.

One exercise that everyone enjoyed a lot and that I think could be further developed is the one about the magic wand. It got me thinking on our tendency to give none (or almost none) space to dreaming about a better future. Maybe giving space to a bit of utopia in our lives would make it easier to deal with complex issues. This does not mean losing contact with reality, but simply being able to change perspectives, like Italo Calvino suggested:

> "Nei momenti in cui il regno dell'umano mi sembra condannato alla pesantezza, penso che dovrei volare come Perseo in un altro spazio. Non sto parlando di fughe nel sogno o nell'irrazionale. Voglio dire che devo cambiare il mio approccio, devo guardare il mondo con un'altra ottica, un'altra logica, altri metodi di conoscenza e di verifica. Le immagini di leggerezza che io cerco non devono lasciarsi dissolvere come sogni della realtà del presente e del futuro…"[6] (Calvino, 2022, p.12)

It would be enriching to give space to researchers and practitioners to dream about what they would change in the world – it could be protective for them and it would be also helpful to gather more data about utopic ideas. On a practical note, I have recently had the opportunity to take part of a meeting of the Radicalization Awareness Network (RAN) in Budapest. I have spent two days discussing with practitioners from all over Europe how to improve P/CVE practices and during a group work we dedicated time to discussing how we would lead prevention strategies in an imaginary "RAN town". The confrontation made me think about the focus group "If I had a magic wand…" writing exercise, it was quite interesting and stimulating gathering all our imagination and creative skills to dream about a place in which prevention activities were really multi-agency, interdisciplinary and holistic.

More than the content of our presentation, I would like to conclude with an input received from a lady who works for the British Government. At a certain point, I said something about the problematic aspects of a security-based approach like Prevent. I had always read negative notes in scientific literature about it, as it was briefly cited in Chapter 3, and many of my interviewees had used it as the most negative and biased example of all. It was interesting to get in touch with a completely different perspective, since she told me about the successes of the approach and how many teachers gave extremely positive feedbacks about it. The conclusion of our confrontation, that I borrow for my thesis conclusions, is that frequently two key aspects are missing in preventive practices: 1) the link between academic world, practitioners' work and communities should be stronger and offer

---

[6] In times when the realm of the human seems doomed to heaviness, I think I should fly like Perseus into another space. I am not talking about escaping into the dream or the irrational. I mean that I have to change my approach, I have to look at the world with another perspective, another logic, other methods of knowledge and verification. The images of lightness that I seek must not be allowed to dissolve as dreams of the reality of the present and future…

inputs in both directions; and 2) frequently practitioners, researchers and policy makers worry a lot about the content of what they do and do not invest enough on communication. Sharing information and best practices is fundamental, as well as communicating to a wide public the results of what we have done.

The initial idea of this research was to offer different perspectives on radicalization and violent extremism. As it was written in the introduction, I am not sure if the elephant, as suggested by Belsky, will ever be fully depicted, but I am sure that we need to keep on trying and keep on doing research and planning efficient prevention activities. Moreover, future research should focus on comparative analysis of prevention activities and on their efficacy in long term period. As it is suggested also by literature, mixed methods could add value to this kind of research, since qualitative and quantitative data can inform the researchers about different aspects of the process and of the results.

APPENDIX I – INTERVIEWS[1]

Interview n. 1

Q: So, first question, could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: Okay, this is interesting though, because I grew up all over the world. So I had quite a very have very, I guess, exposure to educational systems. Born in India, and the most of my scholastic experience that I remember was in an American education system in South America and Venezuela for four years, and then the US for a few years back to India, to a British education system, which was very much rote learning, you learn by heart, and You vomited out in the exam not really applied. And then I think the fundamental change came when I moved to Singapore on a scholarship to do my post secondary. So whatever equivalent to grade 1112, and then University, where everything was very much applied. Mathematics was more applied sciences more applied, the only thing I really felt comfortable doing was languages. And, you know, just thematic analysis, expository work reflections, those kinds of things came much easier to me. The mathematical stuff was easy to do for me, because I enjoyed logic and rationale. So I think the difference is that I learned to, especially before entering university and then pursuing a mathematical degree first before becoming a teacher and then doing Masters and PhD. Because I was so comfortable in mathematics, I tended to ignore the more humanities and literature oriented stuff that really appealed to me. So, my work experience has really been very positivist. So sorry, my study experiences have been positivist in orientation, very much around empirical ways of thinking and doing looking for measurable outputs. You know, treating science as the only true religion, when you think of, you know, waves of ways of thinking and knowing my epistemology is grounded in that kind of empiricism. But since taking on a role, as, as you know, the founder, co-founder of Project Someone, and then also the UNESCO chair and prevention of radicalization and violent extremism, I have rediscovered and really kindled my more humanist orientation. So, thinking of ways in which we can

---

employ multiple disciplines, so not being curtailed, just buy quantitative, or qualitative methodologies of thinking and knowing and measuring and empirical ways of thinking and knowing, but really looking towards theoretical, philosophical, speculative ways to inform the work that I do.

Q: And how did you arrive here in Concordia?

A: I arrived at Concordia to do my masters. So I got admission to do my masters. So Master's in educational technology. That was the program that I joined. And that's it was a very, it was a very wide ranging program. Because we did research methodologies, we learned about cognitive science, learning theories, we learned about pedagogy and instruction and sequencing. It's a very, very, it's one of the oldest educational technology programs in North America. Very happy to have taken it because it gave me a very broad basis for pursuing my PhD, which was very mathematical again.

Q: Okay, so master in education, and then you got a Phd in…?

A: PhD in educational technology. But my PhD was statistical modeling. Same thing in my master's, my master's thesis was the stats model as well.

Q: How did you engage in prevention?

A: My introduction to prevention, I have to say came up because of my fascination with government funded programs, Canadian government funded programs, to look specifically at radicalization and violent extremism and how to counter it. So counterterrorism now was my introduction to prevention. And when I thought about prevention, it was less along the lines of safety and security, so much less non political science or criminology angles, and more along the lines of what can we do in society to build spaces for dialogue, where, you know, I'm going to be very careful. I think the dialogue needs to be curated. I think, if you want to encourage pluralism, you have to curate it very carefully. But you can't censor, so… For me, that notion of prevention comes about in the curation of these pluralistic dialogues. So my introduction to it was through programs raised to follow the Canadian government. And I ended up applying for funding from them to form an educational multimedia initiative, which is now called Project someone.

Q: You partially answer the following question. Could you tell me more about your first experiences here, as in how here? And how have you learned to do what to do? And with whom?

A: So we're talking about prevention. Right? That's the important part. Yeah, you know, I have to say that I got my start in prevention while thinking about government programs. But what really drew me to prevention was trying to understand how we could leverage the arts, cultural frames to discuss some very hot political and social and economic topics. So how do the arts open up those avenues? Right, so and especially the dark arts, you know, arts that focus on death and destruction and dystopia and speculative work that peeks into the future and

says "What a horrible future we're heading towards, because we are losing our humanism". And so prevention was more around. Look, we talk about horrors that we weren't expecting, but you can actually speculate and the arts can open a window to it. So my first foray into thinking about prevention was through collaborations specifically with philosophers. One philosopher comes to mind Jason Walling, he's at University of Alberta, and he's a professor of Secondary Education and an artist and he's also a member of the bands that I play and also musician. And the other person is Jeff Partition. Jeff is a marketing professor at in Pennsylvania, Franklin and Marshall College. So Jeff, Jason, and I actually worked a lot on describing what we call a theory of dark dystopic consumption. And it was important for us there to actually do some very, very grounded and in depth case studies of how communities, cultural, subcultural communities, consume these dark arts in different ways, whether it's music and cinema, whether it's actually visiting sites where atrocities are committed. And the reasoning behind it is not to make not to say "Oh, this is interesting". It's great not to fetishize it, it was about trying to understand, okay, how do you engage with some of the more the more dark recesses of the human mind, that was really where I was ready to delve into it. So that kind of work, informed a lot of the work I did in prevention, because it also helped me frame what it means to understand hate, which is really a lot of the focal point of a lot of my work is untangling this concept of hate. It's a big part a big problem and prevention, because a lot of people want to eradicate hate the same stopping, "zero COVID, zero hate" kind of thing. You know, like, I think that's a dangerous thing to do. I think that hate is a really wonderful and very beautiful emotion. So my work around prevention has always been about how do you come to terms with an emotion as disruptive as hate before it leads to violence? Or, but how do you also encourage it in order to motivate you to change to change things around you? So, again, so you'll see that it's, you know, philosophical, there's, the research itself that we did was very, very practical in the sense that we observed we reported empirically theorized, but then we also I also began to then look at ways in which I could create public events, to frame these topics, you know, hateful topics, to frame discussions of, of discrimination of inequalities, whether it was misogyny, whether it's homophobia… the immediate impact of that was alright, as an academic, I have a lot of privilege and a lot of liberty to exercise. And I want to use that privilege and liberty to make these public events possible. So I began to work closely with artists with visual artists with sound artists. Often during panel discussions about what it means to negotiate hate in our society out of the arts accepted, don't accept it.

Q: So mainly with like, let's say, people from outside the academic?

A: Oh yeah, always outside. But it was only when I was invited to perform this. But yes, outside the academic that was my own work the project someone in the

meantime, which I feel co-founded was doing a lot of academic work as well, working in peace education, working in working with communities, that was my area, building syllabus, how do you build critical thinking, teaching critical thinking in classrooms, and media, and information literacy, all of those pieces, you know, we were still doing a lot of that, but I wasn't necessarily in charge of it, I was really good at getting out into the public. It was only when I began to be recorded to form that UNESCO chair, after having made Project Someone a success, and, and, and launching it and then lobbying for money so we could take that work outside of Canada to Lebanon, for example. When I formed the chair, then I realized okay, there is an academic component here, which can fit into policy. So with David Morin, who's in political science and with Ghayda, who's a psychiatrist, we formulated a chair that could actually bring together our three Centers of Expertise, and build that network together. And that's where I think more of the academic and policymaking has happened. I think one of the other pieces I have to have to be, I have to be careful to acknowledge is that one of my first ever postdoc, his name is Ryan Scrivens. He's a criminologist. He came to our lab or projects on one lab and as a postdoctoral fellow, to specifically study former right wing extremists. And his work was instrumental because he went out and collected data during his postdoc from 10 former right wing extremists wrote up those analyses. And now we've been harvesting those papers data for different papers. So now the ones coming up today, I got another one that's been accepted. I'm working on one which actually is going to share with you on education. So in terms of who I worked with, that somebody I will always remember and acknowledge as a very important collaborator, so he's now a professor of criminology in Michigan, but that's an important, it was an important opening for me. Because I learned about, you know, prevention from the standpoint of tertiary prevention. You know, what brings people into right wing movements? What draws them out of it? Those things were very cool.

Q: Thank you. Can you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you? And with whom? And how have you felt?

A: I think the one that I remember that I remarked upon the most. And it was there was nothing untoward that happened, but the fact that we were invited by the representatives of the Minister of Public Safety of Quebec, to talk about our work directly to their representative, I thought that was really good. It made me think very carefully about... My work has an impact in public policy. I'm going to Quebec City to meet with the representative of the Minister of Public Safety, so it wasn't the minister it was minister address. And several people in that room and that in that room, they talked to us about how the UNESCO chair as being one that brings together all the research and policy initiatives in Quebec looking at prevention and they said to us you know, you are respected your professors in universities you exercise and academic freedom, your program, your research program, is very

powerful. And you know, we want you to take the lead in bringing together all these actors that are put together and you know, a lot of them right you know, you have CPN prev with Ghayda, you have CPRLV, you know, and then you have also a lot of other pieces in place, you have the different educational institutions that are running their own projects.

Q: So let's go to the second part. If I asked you to use, to think about three words or expressions to define radicalization, what words would you use?

A: So for me, the first thing would be an inability to resolve differences. That's the first thing that comes to mind. So I think first of all, okay, let's start again, radicalization is a process. It's not like…that happens and in a moment you're radicalized. That's not it, you know, there's a process. I think it begins with an inability to resolve a difference. I think it entertains violence as a solution to a difference - in a difference in opinion difference, or I guess, difference in opinions, not necessarily to, I guess, okay, violence as a solution to resolve a difference is the difference. Whatever that difference is, it could be you know, it could be this person wants to kill you or beat you up, because, you know, they feel you've taken their job from them. That's fucked up. But that is radicalized. So there's inability to risk inability to resolve a difference, a process resorting to violence. Now, the part where I think it's important to talk about radicalization, if we talk about radicalization, to violent extremism, that it needs to be tied to an ideology. Right, there needs to be an ideology that needs to be behind it. Now the ideology may be religious, it could be ethnic, it could be political. You know, there's a lot that goes into, into it. But an ideology needs to be driving the radicalization, otherwise, it's just an act of violence.

Q: In which concepts do you consider linked to radicalization?

A: terrorism, extremism, politics, religion, ethnicity, populism, Safety, security.

Q: What about do you think that hate speech, hate incidents? Do you think that would be linked?

A: I have trouble with that. I think that it's too easy to define hate speech is anything that you disagree with. Right? I think that if there is a legal definition of hate speech and the jurisdiction in which you belong, we need to look at that carefully and employ that with care. But broadly, hate speech has been defined… I've defined it in my articles as well as you know, any, any texts, audio, visual, any, any form of communication, which discriminates based on a whole series of factors - race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, you just go on and on with the trend, it doesn't have to be limited to it. But the key part here is the discrimination, right, based on a specific characteristic. Now, you can't be prosecuted for hate speech in Canada, unless it advocates genocide, if I'm not mistaken, there's a specific section of the Criminal Code… 13, I think… the code that specifies it, so when there's advocating of genocide, that's when you could be prosecuted for what's known as hate speech that promotes genocide. But you know, hate speech that… saying that you don't like

women saying that, you know, like Muslims don't like Jews, that's protected by free speech. It's fucking ridiculous, but it's protected by free speech. So I think, hate speech… Does it lead to radicalization?... but I think we need to be careful about that. And then hate crimes are different, right. Hate crimes have a specific, specific tolerance level, above which you have committed a crime. And that crime has to be registered, observable crime. The sad part here is that so there's such we've talked about this before the impact the mental health impact and the abuse, emotional abuse that is meted out by people not just on one person but on a group of people. Because of discriminatory rhetoric is very, very dangerous, but it doesn't necessarily mean that the person is radicalized. Because they may want to do it precisely because they're narcissistic or sociopathic or psychopathy. So yeah, I think hate speech hate crime, depending on jurisdiction, you got to be very careful. I got I have to be very careful about defining it, looking at carefully what is allowed, you know, offensive speech is permitted. It's offensive, but it's permitted. That needs to be carefully set aside from one that promotes and incites violence . inciting violence…. For me, it's like the gray areas crossed. There's a clear line between inciting violence. Let's go kill all Muslims, for gays and lesbians, whatever it is, that is inciting violence, that is punishable. And that is, you know, that is that is I think a step towards radicalization, for sure.

Q: Thank you. Have you ever met radicalized people during their activities? And if he asked, Could you tell me more about it? Or tell me one example,

A: I met former radical. And we invited them actually to run workshops for us, we invited them to share their experiences with us for our massive open online course from hit up. So their voices and their likenesses, their images are part of the course. So in a sense, they are they're out as formers and reformed, and working in different capacities in society integrating in different capacities, reintegrating, actually, because I think all three of them went to were incarcerated at some point. So the experience was very… on the one hand, you it's it's extractive and transactional. These are people who you're inviting, who you pay, I paid them an honorarium interviewed them here, actually, in this in this room and online course, and yeah, it was, you know, was work. Sort it was I don't know them personally, I don't

Q: Did anything change in your point of view after this experience?

A: No, you know, meeting them from a professional standpoint, and I appreciated their collaboration. And I think that their work and their respective work and experiences and their testimonies provides a much needed diversity in perspectives. Of course, which I think is really important.

Q: The last part about prevention practices. So what are the activities that characterize the center? Or this, let's talk about Project someone?

A: I would prefer to talk about the chair because the project someone has within the chair, and I'll tell you why. But it's very easy. You don't need to give me I know, a lot of it. But if you have to tell briefly - the main characteristic's networking, I mean, one of their four characteristics networking, second, would be researched, actually conducting research and innovative action research, research creation stuff in the community, learning about how radicalization happened happens wide may happen, how to prevent it. And also doing what's important. I feel like systematic reviews, you know, there's so much we know, but so much we don't know, how do we you know, dig, dig and say, here's that empty area that we need to know more about. So that kind of research, innovative action research, creation and systematic reviews, professional development, many people need to learn about how to employ prevention methods in their respective work contexts. And the fourth thing is really making sure our work gets known in the media, the media and showing our expertise to the media.

Q: And how political words and or scientific collaboration in the project works and what are the strength and critical points?

A: I think obviously, the scientific sort of the scientific nature or scientific work is by definition interdisciplinary, right? So when we come together as a research team for a chair project, we're constantly trying to say, okay, who's going to take care of this aspect? What lens are you going to use on it. But there's also very clear delimitations on what we can do - Oh, if it's a course, the next team has to be involved, because they know the pedagogy. They may not know the content, but they will know how to create the pedagogy. If it's about making sure that, you know, the health, social services and mental health and physical health of people are involved, it's called involve Ghayda's team, if it's around policy, and the second fits into your question or on politics, because foreign policy, everyone's involved in it, everyone prepares it. But let's make sure that David has, he has the right connections in the in the government structures. And that's where I think the politics part comes across really well, because we receive funding from the government of Quebec, but we also do receive the support of UNESCO. And so one of the major roles I've learned to play is making sure that I have that stakeholder facing aspect to my work, where we are in constant discussions with what our policy stakeholder funders need, how we can meet those needs. But how we can also influence the decision making within those structures, both at the UNESCO Paris as well as here in Quebec. And then, of course, the Canadian government who, you know, I think we've demonstrated to them how well we work - both David and I were invited to the House of Commons. So where the members elected members of Parliament's sit to talk about our research. I couldn't go but he went, I mean, this is good. It's important that we that we remain part of their book, the federal government and provincial government.

Q: What about critical points?

A: Yeah, I think we could, we could force ourselves to be part of the discussion more. I myself, especially I, I'm very careful about when I speak and with whom I speak, and how I speak about issues. But I think we need to be more out there. Does it mean that I need to be more of there or that we that David's already out there a lot.. Maybe it's enough that one person does it, because David never said something that I disagree with. It's not that we don't disagree, but when he's talking about the chair, and represents us in a single voice, so we know that we can trust him. So I think in terms of critical points, I think, yeah, I think we can share that load a little bit. I think that's important. But on the other hand, Ghayda and I do different things that others that the others don't do, you know, so I think workload is a critical point is too much too much work.

Q: Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: I wouldn't say I want to try and do differently. It's when opportunities present themselves to do something new that I realized, oh, man, we should be doing that. Like the summer school opportunity, the International Visitor opportunity that's presented itself in your case and taking your example. It's so enriching for us, I find that like opens enriching for you, but really enriching for us to hear from, from transnational perspectives, we don't do that enough. We also tend to rely on the fact that we are so diverse, and that we have such a wide network of people from so many different backgrounds coming together. So we tend to rely on that a bit too much, which is good. We know that when you come to a meeting with the chair, you're not expecting people to have the same opinion about the issue at stake, which is always exciting for me. But maybe what we can do more is around encouraging our availability for these transnational collaborations to over time, you know, too much that you have here a week I have in Italy with your team that comes together, I think in a very nice way.

Q: Yeah, I was thinking that worldwide…. There are many people out there that don't know about the existence of the UNESCO chair, even though they work with radicalization prevention.

A: That's not good, right? It's not good because we actually have a lot to offer and we can learn it's not that Oh, you don't you're not benefited from our expertise. We can learn as well right? But at the same time, do we have the capacity? I wonder about it.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention? So what would you like to promote?

A: It has to go back to what I believe in is essential in primary prevention, which we don't do enough about. And that is pluralism. So, this concept that we don't have to this, the concept is that we have to accept that differences of perspectives are

going to exist on thorny issues, like immigration, like economic equality, like racism, like sexism. You know, I would never condone any form of actions that promote inequalities. But I can only do so much as an individual. So how do we promote pluralism in the way we think about the reasons behind the root causes of radicalization? So to go back to your question around hate, hate speech and hate crimes, right? So I think how one of the main problems we have and that we can improve is creating these spaces for pluralism and I think Project Someone showing us some ways of doing that. The next aspect of things is how can we also treat… How can we stop treating every problem of prevention from the standpoint of security, security studies crime, we have to stop doing that. And part of that is being more inclusive of pedagogical, and communal, and social services, and mental health based approaches to thinking of prevention. The third thing that we should change is, yes, we need to evaluate, yes, we need to measure but stop thinking of a magic pill, where if you do this, and 10 less people are going to become radicalized, you cannot prove that that's coming from an empiricist… somebody who studied stats you're not, you're not going to find that relationship clearly. So think more carefully about what do you want to see as outputs? You know, what does cohesion look like? What does resilience look like? What is community building look like? And I guess the fourth thing is don't hold any assumptions too dearly, to your heart, because you're going to be very hurt. These assumptions are just going to be shattered, you know, whether it's around how to create more inclusive societies through immigration, multiculturalism, interculturalism programs to, you know, to… helping people who are at risk in precarious situations like refugees and war, victims of wars, I mean, all of this, you hold these assumptions to dearly, and you're going to fall into trouble, because at the end of the day, human beings and societies are built on a very important central tenet of, of self preservation. And if that preservation comes at the cost of shutting out the other, people are going to have to do that they're going to do it. We just need to be really mindful of that, especially that particular element of prevention. That's a bit too much of blue sky approach. Let's all learn to live together. I don't think that's the right approach.

Q: How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: The Sustainable part is, I'm sorry that the answer is going to be so simple, but you have to lobby funding agencies, to foster to spend the money to invest financially in prevention activities, without it being based exclusively on the effectiveness of the prevention activity. I think what you can do is create frameworks of evaluation of measuring its effectiveness. But don't base your funding based on how well you're doing it. Because I think that's dangerous. I think it's dangerous to expect the impact to be measured at a certain amount of time. I think it's dangerous to tie funding too effective work its way neoliberal, for

something that has a very human quality. And you're also not going to encourage multiple ways of doing things if you continue to fund the same program over and over again, that we need to find more, more funding. It's not a I don't think and I don't think also that my suggestion is just throw it away in the mud because you can budget for this you <u>can</u> budget for prevention activities to be funded over long durations of time. Just have to have the political will to do.

Interview n. 2

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?
A: I studied arts, I studied filmmaking. So I'm a filmmaker, artist, but I don't really use that in my practice now - this is something that I really keep on the side, because it's a passion. Now I'm working. I still work on visuals on representation of marginalized people. Who other than like, I learned from people. I don't really learn from school, I like to say like, I like to, to go out, I like to discuss with people who have different expertise. I learned a lot from books as well.
I'm doing my PhD. I'm working on two Salvadorian gangs, and visual representation of these gangs, and the question of masculinity and gender, and identities. So I decided to work on that, because I feel that criminal groups are really like, penalized and they're like, idealized by youth, and it's kind of fascination and we don't really know who they are. I wanted to take like two documentaries that deal with them, talking about the social, economical and political context. And to show that how can I say, like, in my research, I'm not saying that what they do is good, but I just tried to humanize them, like, okay, they took this path, they're like, marginalized. But there's a reason why. So I try to understand that through films.
 Q: How did you start collaborating here?
A: Last year, I did a research internship at another university. Then on the field, I met Vivek. So when I met Vivek, he saw me issue he saw me working, I began talking with him. Then we had a meeting in December, I had no visa. And he said, I'm going to have a visa for you. So since January, I'm working with the Vivek building the bureau de consultation with the communities.
Q: How did you engage in prevention?
A: Oh, actually, in France, I used to be an intervenente, I used to work in a high school. And in this high school, I was like the assistant of prevention and security. So I had my office, and actually kids used to see me as a counselor. So they would tell me like the problems with the family. And I was like, more like doing counseling with them. And at the same time, I was working with negotiators. So I was there to talk about sexuality to talk about like, the their body because some of them are doing prostitution. So we are trying to prevent this kind of like, of non

behavior, but just like to inform them that they haven't protect themselves. So I've always been really like, connected with prevention, but with the youth.

Q: Thank you. And could you tell me more about your first experiences here? And how have you learned to do what you do? And with whom?

A: Oh, Vivek endlessly. So Leslie used to work with Vivek. He used to be his postdoc, now he's a professor of the Ottawa in simple University. And so it was working through Leslie that I learned a lot, but as well, what can I say? I learned through myself to was in my life when I do when I go on the field, I'm like an ethnographer. I just stay on the field, like will normally my field I spent like, the last one I did, it was four days a week. But it was like five hours, like per day. So I really like to stay with the people or learn from them as well. I did a workshop with young men, and I learned a lot from them. I was asking them to tell me what it was to be a man. So I learn from them nicely. Leslie's working on the youth, and on the question of masculinity as well. And he worked with the with the record landscape of hope. So he's like what I'm doing now? He used to do it. I see. Yeah, he's working a lot with communities as well.

Q: Thank you know, the second part of the interview is about radicalization. First question, how would you define your approach to radicalization in only three words or expressions?

A. It's a process of isolating yourself from some part of society, because you feel not understood. So it's a process of you trying to find people who look like you, or have the same thought of you. But these people are not, like, into the society that are not listened into the society because they're like point of view or like deviant.

Q: Which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: Marginalization, isolation

(…)

Q: And what about here in Montreal?

A: Oh, there's one in my group. Yeah. On my workshop, that was you had really like radical point of view. Like for him a woman that was wearing a legging was like, it was not normal - she was going to get raped or stuff like that. I met right wing radicalized people as well. Like all the old men, I met one time through one of my works.

Q: What are the activities that characterize the center? Here? You can if you don't want to talk about everything, but because there's so much going on here, you can talk about the things that you do as prevention activities.

A: Okay, so yeah, Vivek puts a lot of emphasis on working with the youth and not working on them, but with them, for example the workshops. It's important also the collaboration with the colleges and schools.

Q: Yeah, if you could, like, give me maybe an example?

A: For example, that's when I met Vivek. Is to, to, is to build resilience and to show like how the youth can find resilience when they go throw cyber harassment, also racism and discrimination. So it was interesting, because we went to the streets, and the kids were like the kids and the young men and women were taking pictures. And they were explaining why they were taking the picture. Like, for example, one of them was taking the picture of the of the soccer field, like, Oh, this is something that we love. But the city doesn't like us, because we don't have a light on the night. But then the hockey one, they have lights. So they were explaining the struggle of being a youth in the area when they cannot even have like access to their spaces.

Q: Could you describe the steps of one project on this topic to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: No, I haven't been there. It's still at the beginning. So I don't have the full process.

Q: Maybe could you describe the company this beginning, what is your approach?

A: It's really difficult for me to be in this project as well, because it's I'm questioning a lot about like the research and like the way I do research, because research at the end is always extractive. So I tried to be less extractive, and especially working with my community, I'm like, I do want to do something that is wrong or be a part of the problem. So that's why when I begin the group de consultation, I wanted to ask the community "Do you think that the groupe de consultation will be helpful for you for what you need them? For the research? They said yes. So then I began interviewing. Now I'm meeting collaborators. And then after when I will have my collaborators, the first thing I want to do with them is a manifesto on how, like the researchers have to do research with them. Okay, it will be like, I will teach you and I will provide like feedback and guidance. So now I'm just like still working on my network and finding the perfect fit for the group.

Q: Thank you. And what are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Okay, I'm really radical. Because when I was doing my field, I worked with an organization at S. Michel. And the organization was the problem as well, because every activity was like linked to radicalization of like, gunfire like weapon, or like Islam, and I was telling the coordinator like "You are the problem because you are making them radicalized". I was like, instead of talking about that, we can go and bring them do jujitsu, for example, like do like some sports, and doing sports educates, like having like a routine and to be like, I don't know how to explain that to have like, a better way of living. So the critical aspect that I have is that but as well as, sometimes we go to them, like we're going to help you, or like when we go through them, it's like, okay, I know that some of you are radicalized, so I'm going to help you. So it's the assumption that they are radicalized. And actually one of the one of the guys I was working with, said, you know, your people make me on want to radicalize, because when you come here, you are just asking these kind of

questions like, like street gangs, or like the weapons or like Islam, he said, I want to radicalize myself.

Q: In what was your answer?

A: I said that I could understand. I said, Yes, I understand that. It makes you wants to radicalize because we always have the same speeches, but the same time while trying to find riches and to build bridges, to have like, a better understanding of what it was. And we are here as well to give you like, tools against that. I was like, for example, if you tell me you want to do sports, I can try and find like funding to make you have and do the sports. So I was like, at the same time, it's like a subject that is not like, Allah mode. We're just like a subject that is still present. And I told him that because her education is not only Muslim, because we have the perception that radicalization is only Muslim, but I said No. And I said to this guy, Vivek, for example, works with right wing extremists. And then he was like, oh, okay. So there's like, a big panel of like people who are radicalized, and it's not only us, and I told him, You should not always feel like it's you as a person. And it's like, as a society. So then we had another chat about research to interesting.

Q: And what are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Understanding and listening. Yeah, I think that we don't listen, you know, I think that we're just driven by what we want, as researcher or even like, as institution, we go with one aim or one goal, but then we just leave them with nothing. So for me, it's the way I try to do my research and yearning to give them as tools and to give back to them. So yeah, like, I've seen a lot of researchers who were going to communities and not listening to them and saying to them.

Q: What else comes to your mind? Doing the educational activities, what are you what do you think it's important? What capacities are important? Positive so If you think about positive things that people could develop more during these activities like, for example, resilience, critical thinking.

A: The ability of speaking, I think of having like, not a natural speech, but like to be able to have a conversation with the people in front of you and not being defensive. Like, okay, I'm, like, I listened to you, I think like that you think like that will never like cross paths. But at the end, I've listened to and with that, if the person is like really radicalized, and really has an extremist point of views, to give the tools and to be able to have tools as well, and to have like, a network of people that can help when we're like in front of a situation.

Q: How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: As I said, listening, the ability to have conversation, but as well as being an expert on the thing because I knew a lot of I saw a lot of people saying that they were expert on radicalization, but they were only expert on like, terrorism, Islam.

Um, like, it's like, it's a wide range. (…) You have to be like, you have to know all the polarities of radicalization and going there with the mindset that is open and not defensive.

Int. 3

Q: So, first question, could you describe it briefly your studying and working experiences?
A: Okay. I am a PhD student in communication studies, and specifically in Media Education studies. So, I am conducting a thesis about developing critical thinking about media and new technologies with young people. (…)
Q: Do you have working experiences?
A: No, only internships. I've done my bachelor in communication after my master in communication, too. And I only worked once before my PhD in an association in the Media Education Association. So during this experience, I've done a pedagogical module about freedom of speech and hate speech online
Q: How did you arrive here?
A: This because for my PhD, I have a PhD committee that is supervising me. And so in my committee, I have a professor who is working here at UQUAM. And so I asked him to supervise me here. And so that's how the link is done. And so, we are working here in a similar research than my own research, my own PhD research.
Q: Could you tell me more about what you're doing here?
A: Yes, of course. So, I am integrated in two main researches - I am doing some analysis with the software in vivo and I am analyzing interviews, interviews with students about their experience with augmented reality and virtual reality. And that was an experiment, an experiment that they have done last year. And that was during media lesson at school. For the second research I am conducting the interviews with the students and with the teachers to too. I go to the schools and I am observing to see how they use technologies. They're doing virtuality here, they're doing podcast, so that's something else. But you know, the goal here is to use my expertise in technologies and in analyzing technologies (…).
He's working with teachers that, you know, the teachers now, in Quebec, they are trying to… there are new I would say that curriculum with competencies with digital competencies that the teachers have to implement in their courses, even if their teachers in French or teachers in Arts. And so, we are trying as, as researchers to help them to implement these new competencies. So, they try to use digital with your people in arts or in French class and so on. So, you know, podcast, it's, it is during the French class, so they try to combine the competencies in French and the competencies in digital together. So, that's why I am here. I am only doing meetings

with teachers, but other researchers are doing also trainings. They are looking for new software's before the teach the software to children…

Q: Could you tell me more about your first experiences here? And how have you learned to do what to do? And with whom?

A: M. introduced me to his team of researchers while his working with I don't know the term in English but in French it's "auxiliaire de recherche" and Master students… so at the beginning was that I was introduced to them and then we began with first meetings about what is the project about literal reality and augmented reality. And so that is how I was integrated in the team. And yes, and we began like that and then I was introduced by two other research teams too… I am working with another professor to… She is a professor in media literacy in the Department of Land great debt didactics. So that is for other projects. So I am I think I am working in five different projects. Okay. You Okay, so the beginning was like…, a lot of meetings. And the goal was to see what can I do here? You know, where I, the My visit was planned. We, we did a calendar before. But when I was there, well, concretely how to do that... But that was very nice..

[After how long did you start really working on these projects?]

A: Very quickly, very quickly. I think I arrived here. First day… three March, I had couple of days, you know, for the jetlag. And my first meeting was on Monday. And that was not meeting but like, a welcome appointment... You know. And then two days, after two or three days, there was a real meeting to include me in the first project. So you know, I just said before that I was conducting, like, five projects in here. And yes, the projects came one after another. And maybe after three or four weeks, I was working on all projects. So yeah, maybe after two weeks, I was ready. Ready. I had a lot of stuff to do. So yes, it was very quickly and because of I'm not here for a long time. So the goal was to begin quickly on the activities.

Q: Could you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you? And with whom? And how have you felt?

A: I have something… that's not a big one. But you know, it was like, an informatics program because I was waiting for the interviews with, with the teacher, I needed to, to, to record the interview, and I wanted to take pictures of the class too, with, with students and, and so I wanted to

to hire some equipment, a camera and yes, to cursor. And so, you know, at Uquam there is a place where you can do that. So I tried to use my camera, and it doesn't work and you don't want to let you do the equipment if it doesn't work. So…day after I needed this equipment and so I just did that with my smartphone. It was not a big deal. But that was what you know, for. For the research for the archive. I wanted to have beautiful pictures and a good recording….

Q: Thank you. The second part is about radicalization. In your own words, and very briefly, maybe with some expressions, how would you define radicalization?

A: Something that is extreme…. And then you… when you know when you look in another direction I will say that and when you it is something about or so religion for me… or maybe not religion but about beliefs… and yes and you see the world differently… and you're in a in maybe in a bubble….

Q: Which concepts would you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: extreme and maybe violence... For me, that is bad - that's not a concept but… for example, I'll give you suggestions and you tell me if you think they have to do with radicalization. For …I thought about racism.

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? If yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: I think I met some people that were radicalized but maybe I just ran away from them and yes, and you know what, it was more but yes, I have a hidden an experience just recently but I don't know if it was a people that was We can color that was yes. Yes. But it was during the pandemic. So there is nothing about to receive. But it was someone that was trying to convince me that everything was you know, bigger. Faker. Yeah, that was a big fake…. But he was really insisting and you know, I was just trying to go oh, man, I Yes, it was too much. Okay, and I was I tried to okay to talk with him saying that I am a scholar and I, I know how to check my sources here in media education… So it's okay. And it was like he was never listening to me so….

(…)

Q: Okay, so the last part is about radicalization prevention. Could you describe the steps of one project on this topic, to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: Yes... I'll tell you about a project done just after the Charlie Hebdo's attacks. One association in Belgium asked us to create activities about that, so we created activities for young people to reflect about what had happened…. Yes, I was in Belgium at this moment, but just before I began my PhD, and, and yes, so, we, we worked in that was a set of activities, and we developed, I can send you the tool… It was kind of a problem of radicalization too. Yes. And we try we use one the caricatures to try to understand if it was about freedom if speech or not… And yes, and so that's a series of activities and we try with young people's to determine if we can laugh about that are or not and to position ourselves for that and we try to… there was some you know, notions about press freedom… I participated in the creation of the tool for the teacher. So first, there are activities that are done where we, you know, we trained first the teachers. So I suppose in the conception of the duties for the teachers, okay, and then my work was done, and then they developed the activities for young people. Okay, that's a two step project.

I'm not really sure about how it ended... But I think there is a book about that. It was part of a bigger project… And, yes, that was about hate speech about violence

Q: What are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: I have not a big experience, you know, it was only one month that took part to this project.

Well, I'll only say that, I think it is important to talk about what radicalization and you know, I am in media education. So I really say what it is radicalization and violence, it is so easy to do that on internet. So that it is because digital literacy and media literacy. And yes, I think that was maybe a will. Why I was really aware of that. When I took part in this project, so I was okay, it is so important to talk about that and to develop activities about that way for young people and old people, because we don't talk enough about that. I think it is better to educate to about that. Because they are, you know, we are not teaching that at schools. There are not curses on radicalization. So we don't teach you what is good to say, what's the pick to say? And that's a complicated matter. So I think maybe that's, that's something that that I would say, that's not something that specific negated, but just to highlight that it's important just to talk about that and just to maybe, yes, try to give a definition, but that let you not put a word on this on this program and yes, that is exist and people who are affected about that.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: I think that's part of as always a media literacy, digital literacy. I think. You know, it's my In my field and the person's parents is that we have to, to make a link between, you know, these competencies to the big issues. Just for example, radicalization, climate change and so on. Critical thinking sure is important… you know what I am trying to do with young people, it's, it's, you know, to give them knowledge. And I'm trying to convince them that something is very bad… but that's not my goal… I want to give them the knowledge, the competences and then they choose what they want to do. So, you know, the good of media education is not to protect children, it's just to help them to encourage them to see the world has as it is. So and then they choose what to do with that.

Q: How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable, and effective over time?

A: The big problem with media education is that the activities that are very short in time. So if I had the power, I would try that prevention and other activities that are necessary today in our digital age, that these activities would be part of our everyday activities at school. So I think prevention activities about radicalization and other stuff should be part of the school curriculum. I think you don't, you don't

have to do a class about prevention, but you can educate about prevention in all the lessons you know, it should be part of the interdisciplinary curriculum.

Int. n. 4

Q: First question is, could you describe briefly, your studying and working experiences?

A: Okay. I have many jobs. I work as a high school teacher - I think that's like the most. I always said that first, like, where do you like I'm a teacher, first label that identifies who I am. And then it informs all my other jobs. And I also work as an artist, so I produce music and videos and make some income from that. So I guess I count myself as a job as well. And then I'm on many, many research teams. So my guess thoughts, other jobs that I have, in terms of describe? I love everything I do. I've got enough.

I started a PhD. Yeah. So what I'm working on is specifically multimedia creations using social media as a way to interact with art museums. So I'm getting for my masters, I looked, I mainly studied the way people learn about art and museums through social media, and also the experience of people making this content for social media. And I noticed that it was mainly museums creating content and distributing it to visitors. And I wanted to see what happens if it was young visitors producing the content and how they could reach other youth and get them interested in art through them creating these, I say multimedia, because on social media can make sound creations, video creations, whatever, it's more of a for them to be creating the content themselves in order for museums to reach out to other youth. And especially looking through that. How does that change the aesthetic experience? And what are they learning through doing this? So I have to figure out how to carry that out. Yeah. How to measure the learning is and I have to develop a competency framework. Because I want to, I want it to be meaningful, not just oh, they learn. Like I wanna be able to measure it. So okay, yeah.

Q: And now, how did you start collaborating here, let's say here at Concordia?

A: I guess the most straightforward answer Vivek is my supervisor. And he knew the I was a teacher teaching media and communications as well. And he quickly brought me and I had also done a lot of evaluation work in museums. So I get no, my initial contract was mainly evaluation, it was less related to my…it was related to my team, because I was valuing art education initiatives. So he brought me in for that expertise. And then I guess it did a good job. I wrote a whole report. And we presented it at different events for UNESCO. And it was used at on concretely in his projects. And then he brought me in for a whole bunch of other projects, often for the pedagogical perspective of a high school, like, really, from my point of view, a high school teacher. So developing curriculum has been a big part of what I've

been currently doing. And I think I'll continue to keep up with those ideas to go, you could do this. And also, I'm an artist, so he always wants to get like I just worked on producing his new album.

Q: Yeah, super. Thank you. And how did you engage in prevention?

A: So, I mean, specifically, with my high school students, the first whole unit of like, the school year I teach is just what is communication? How do you communicate? How does that translate online? So that's part of digital literacy, and having… helping youth develop skills to communicate, I guess, just understand, I think they don't even understand what can come into interference make somebody can't understand the message that's being sent. So we look a lot at that. So I guess it's a form of prevention by that not saying Oh, don't do this, but more just understanding the mechanisms of communication. And then obviously, we do study again in my class, it's because I have a whole unit on social media. So I guess there is there's a prevention part. And then specifically for the center or and for my department and Concordia more. What I do here is we're working on a module, a whole pedagogical guide on online hate. And we do have a whole section on how online hate can lead to extremist believes and we break it down in its art for social change. So we look at how art can counter this and perhaps prevent it by creating or getting youth to create. One minute short videos like ours, that are very artistic are very literal about online hate and their experience. Or metaphor, it can be also just like what to do, or it can be completely unmet, like, your emotions, it can really take any shape or form. And we do provide different examples in the guide, and we bring youth to create these and then to inform their communities, their schools, depending on what capacity the teacher has to take on the project. It can leave the walls of the school to if they want to, it really, really depends. So that's another form of prejudice it I guess it's all mine. It always ends up targeting high school students – what I do, in general.

Q: Could you tell me more about your first experiences here? And to be more specific? How have you learned to do what you do and with whom?

A: Well I think having a lot of specifically at the center, I have a lot of freedom. And I think the Vivek never… he has general ideas of what he wants. But I think this freedom allows me to explore and that's how I learned what works and what doesn't work. But I'm gonna Yeah, I'm a very autonomous and creative person in itself. So I'm, I generate ideas very, very quickly. And I guess we've asked him to help say, oh, yeah, that's good idea that wasn't like, Hey, let's go more in this direction or that direction. But I would definitely say that I've learned through having, or having space and doing what, because it ends up being something I'm passionate about, because he always lets you make it your own. And I think that's solely for this pedagogical guide for coming here. Nobody really wanted. We have a mandate on this, and then I came in and said, all we could do this is like he gave

the space to allow… to allow that exploration which you end up learning, you end up learning a lot. Because as a, as a graduate student, you don't I mean, you take some courses, but you know, you're You've done so much you can learn whatever you need to learn to do the things you want. By following those interests.

Q: Thank you. The last question of this first part, as you have noticed, why didn't like your working practices? Okay. Can you describe one critical episode of your work? So tell me what happened? Where Where were you when at home? Or have you failed? First thing that comes to your mind? Doesn't mean doesn't need to be exactly related to probation? Big, critical episodes, something that related to What? What? How did it evolve?

A: I mean, I have loads of examples from my high school, but I don't know if that's relevant. Yeah, what you're doing, is it Yeah. I guess the most stressed have ever been? No, not such I say this very dramatically. A situation where I was like, Oh, my goodness, what am I gonna do with this? And I had to think critically was when my students were podcasting. They're making podcasts. And I had a group of students who decided that they wanted to do it on female masturbation, and I work at a Catholic school. And I remember being like, okay, am I allowed to let this project take form? Like, a boy, I'm comfortable with you doing it, but will the school allow it? So I think navigating that was definitely challenging as a teacher and figuring out what to do to make sure you companies to not just censor the idea altogether, like that was certainly not what I wanted. But to make sure the school understood why I was allowing them to go forward and not for you know, so I think, learning how to navigate the structure of the school. The project occurred, they did it my so I got permission from my principal. And I had a sex ed person because I was like, I'm not qualified to accompany young girls mother like 16/17, during a project like this. And I wanted the information, first and foremost, to be like, useful. And I think a good teaching point for me was to ask them why they wanted to do this topic too, because I wanted to also meet the requirements for my class project, because I had certain objectives, I was teaching them certain things. And their first response was actually like, oh, we want to mentor the younger girls. And I was like, Okay, well, this is not a mentorship project. Like this is like, how are you going to meet the other objectives of the project, which they had to explore cultural references, and I really had no idea how these were cultural references to this topic. I was like, you can't play porn. You can't play this. Like there are rules for school, you know? Sure. And they ended up pulling it off. Oh, yeah. They found cultural references that were appropriate for school. anyways, okay, thank you. I don't know if that's what you were looking for.

Q: The second part regards more specifically radicalization. First question, in your own words. Yeah. And very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: An extreme position on something and like, the extreme end of the spectrum.

Q: The second question integrates the first, which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization? So if you had like a meaning map, what concepts would you put around requisition?

A: Yeah, and I had a discussion recently about this, because I talk about concepts and how we often associate them to things. I wrote a whole pedagogical guide on online hate. And I wrote about, like echo chambers, and I wrote about algorithms. And these are definitely things for example, that are for me that are directly linked. And we had a group of teachers as a focus group to read it, and they're like, Oh, well, you take it, like you're not new. They were like, oh, but you're not nuanced enough. And like the power of an echo chamber in the way you're writing this guide, so I think that was like very, so those were the first words that I associate with it. And now with this perspective of all these teachers who are giving us feedback. Yeah, I mean, I still associated to it, but what yeah…

Q: What is I'm interested in your opinions? What would you put there?

A: Around radicalization? I mean, like, everything they have up for me, it's all it's all vocabulary words. Related to? For me, yeah. Online, the online sphere. So the internet, echo chambers, algorithms, beliefs. Set of like, systems of thought. People clogging up, being close minded. Tunnels. It's really not my it's not my area of expertise.

Q: It's okay. Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? And if you ask, could you tell me more about it?

A: But I mean, personally, no, not like. But I guess friends, if you always hear you know, like, through your networks of certain people have strong strong sets of beliefs. But no, not personally. No, definitely.

Q: Then could you describe the steps of one project on this topic to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: The only project that kind of touches is the online hate that I did

Q: Ok, try to tell me how, how was it thought and programmed and put in practice?

A: so we're a bit we're so busy putting it into, like, we're at the final stages and Jeff translating and everything, but it was first thought out as how we wanted to help university professors learn about online hate in order to then train university presidents in tutor for teacher training programs to be able to teach student teachers, students that are learning how to be teachers. And then also there's a section for the students in high school themselves. So it's kind of we were really thinking about the different actors involved, that would be needed to be informed to a certain extent to be able to bring like make the project come alive. And then we designed, we started with the teacher section, and like everything we thought a teacher would need to know to teach students and then from there, we built on how we would help those teachers develop those… that knowledge, by finding readings and designing

essentially a course structure for a university professor. And I guess it was really interesting because we really want to focus on reflective practice and like observing things in your, your own experience. But then if we have also is very empathetic where we understand that not everyone might have experienced certain things that we addressed. So we also have it open on like, how do you observe it? Or how do you think you might feel? If so we because it's, it's very starting, we start from the individual and your own community and your own experience. And then from there, they're introduced to it's through art - I'm an art educator. That's why, and most of my knowledge, about teaching, and everything is through art and media arts.

Q. So at this moment, which point is the project?

A: Oh, I mean, the pedagogical guide is complete, we just haven't like I have I'm getting started giving workshops next October to teachers. So like, both, so the guide is completed, it needs to be translated. But overall, yeah, then we would meet through art lessons that we show images, and we asked, I could share, I'm gonna show you examples where we ask you to think about how the image make them feel, why does it make them feel that way? In order to help them think about their own experience, and then we look at how art can be used for social change. And it can be something that can be a tool for good in a way. And then we look at different examples, not just about online hate, but how art in general can serve different anything from countering racism to… we have a whole bunch of examples of art, like art about different experiences of immigration to Canada. So we cover like a vast range just to show the extent of how artists explore these topics. And then youth are brought to create their own art specifically in response to online hate that can teach in a way people about their experience dealing with it, or the way they've seen it in their community. Anyways, that's coming off that screen, those are all the steps for the activity.

Q: and what are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? And is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Well, the example I gave was, I think, just a few moments ago, where a student teacher looked at what we did and how we were so caught up on the fact that we want to be like "echo chambers cause this", that it was just, it was almost like we were adopting this black and white perspective. And we didn't even notice we were doing that, because we were so caught on like teaching that they were bad. But we didn't, it wasn't nuanced enough. So I think that's definitely something that we've reworked since we've had these discussions with a bunch of teachers. And I almost feel like I was completely blind to the fact that we were doing this, but we were so caught up on getting our message across that, that it happened in the way the way we were formulating our sentences, and just that's what came up. That's what came

across. So that's definitely what we do different already. We're already reworking that specific aspect.

Q: Thank you. And what are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities

A: I think you need to have in this… it's not just developing the guide, but then we've been saying how we want to train the people. So that's why we're giving workshops. If you just hand a hand off, we've developed these activities, for example, if we just give them to teachers, they won't use it. They need to like experience it with us. And this is why there's going to be we're giving a bunch of workshops

Q: could you try to give me examples like in other words, if instead of thinking about radicalization or violence prevention, we were talking about some something promotion, what should these activities promote? What capacities should they promote?

A: In my case, just being able to be open to hearing many people's perspectives? I think in general, I think it's the most important. Thank you.

Q. And how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Specifically, with again, teacher and teacher training, I think it actually needs to be incorporated into teacher's training, which it isn't… it just isn't, like we had a mandate to create this thing. And I don't even know if it's going to be integrated or not. And if it's integrated then it needs to be kept up to date with. Like right now all our examples are about tick tock specifically, but that's just because it's for right now, but in two years it will be something else.

Q: Thank you. Would you like to add something?

A: No, no, no, I mean, I hope I was semi useful.

Int. n. 5

Q: So first question is, can you describe briefly, your studying and working experiences?

A: I have former university studies in Fine Arts. I have working experiences mostly in the field of academia, art, finance, education, higher education, and University. I've been a university teacher for about 10 years in different institutions. So I have an active working career as an artist and as an academic. I've taught in the past what very early stage and at some, some primary school private classes, stuff like that, but mostly I started teaching academia was after my master's degree.

(…)

Q: How did you engage in prevention?

A: Well, I can say that, from my professional experience, I mean, as a teacher, there's some ethical and also a moral component of pedagogy that could deal with prevention, of course. And I have had experience to deal with youth and young adults, too. I could say no, I'll be honest not specifically in programs that aim to prevent that, but I mean, I think I have certain I'm their experience working with this group of people could give you some sensibility to know about how necessary is to prevent certain negative approaches to an entity.

Q: Thank you. And could you tell me more about your first experiences here and how have you learned to do what you do and with whom?

A: My first experiences here at this at this job have been providing an added adding a point of view of a program that is going on and helping with the coordination of communications between the three sites that I've been working for ISP [Innovative Social Pedagogy] like Edmonton, Chikoutimi and Montreal. Basically, yeah, I started supporting or the coordination with when W. I've been supporting him since then, so we have constant communication what's going on? I think I started being like, an extra eye to the thing… giving my opinion on what's going on to take decisions in a smarter way between the whole team.

(…) I started working in January. So yeah, it's not been that long. But he was working in the project for months. He said, not from the starting point. So he knows a lot about communications and certain logistics and administrative situations. So he has been guiding me to understand them. So I'm always copied on the conversations. And we also have a direct communication channel, where we share opinions about what's going on, or the procedure or to have like, kind of another opinion on the on the things that we should do. How should we approach certain obstacles that come up? Who should we talk with? How should we talk about certain situations? What to put on the agenda of every week? taking minutes? I do most of the minutes of the of the meetings… Yes, they are. He has been guiding me through the process.

Vivek is also part of the coordination team. But I think he delegates some of the of these logistics and procedures to us. So he's in the same channel of communication board. But yeah, he keeps an eye on that. But he's not really into the most of that. We asked for him his opinion on approval when we think it's necessary. Well, yeah, most of the time we solve it by ourselves.

Q: Thank you. Can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you? When, with whom? How have you felt? I don't know. You have little experience here.

A: I could say… couple of months ago… And yeah, I mean, I was our I was most of opinion supporting the session about communications on certain budget when W. realized that he was missing to stay certain budget that one of the sites needed to hold in order, not to spend it. So he means he means that he told them, like, we

have certain amount of money, we have to demand money for today. We had to give up options. While when they he realized that there was a small crisis to how to handle that, you know, and how to put that in order not to affect the requirements of this place that was already happening and based on our own budget. And, and we've had several conversations about that. I think, at the end, for example, it didn't have to scale up to be back at right at the moment. So we were able to solve it in a very transparent and fair way. I think before it was like a huge fire, you know. So I think that was kind of a small, small critical moment that, yeah, what I feel I was involved in giving my opinion on how to handle this small crisis.

Q: Okay. Thank you. So the second part of the interviews about radicalization, and the first question would be in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: Right question, because I think that's, that's the main point of, of the problem, I guess. Well, I think radicalization is a state of belief - it could be philosophical, social, existential, or practical way…. believing in a structure that you take up to the limit, I mean that you defend it no matter who has believed the opposite. And you defend it as a truth and you take it to a moment when you are able to change your conduct. Based on that belief, you guide your conduct by a belief that is never questioned. I think that radicalization appears, because you don't question the root of your beliefs, and you are defending those beliefs.

Q. And which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization. So if you had like to build a meaning map, which concepts would you put around?

A: Concepts? I would say... Life philosophy…. affections – like relation to others, like affections… I'll say power or power unbalance too… I would say.. very important factor is identity, of course, identity can lead to identity crisis of identity form is essential. And I will say territory – it could mean an abstract or concrete way.

Q: Okay, thank you. But there's something else also in this question. But also, I wanted to ask, when I when I talk about other concepts. I'm also thinking about other like, constructs that are linked.

A: Violence of course. Harassment, indoctrination. Terrorism too… public manifestation of hate, we could say… And intolerance. And, yeah, again, power imbalance.

Q: Have you ever met radicalize people doing the activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: I don't think so. I don't think so. I may, I mean, sometimes you can't detect them, you know, but sometimes you do. I don't know. Because we don't have like, radical scale. Which I think is part of, it's part of problem. (…)

Q: Okay. So, the third and last partis related to prevention activities. So.. could you describe the steps of one project on this topic, which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: No, not really concretely to that. I mean, this is the first project I'm participating that is explicitly about that.

Q: I mean, what are your feelings and experiences in this project?

A: Now? I think it's really one of a kind project. When I started in this project, I felt that it was kind of finishing its first year, and if I felt there was some kind of need to expand it a little bit. So I think the people that have been involved every day, it's been growing, like the meetings turning to different people coming in, which is great. And I think more people are getting involved. So I feel that it's moving. It's moving, and it's trying to detect more possible links to this to work with this. I think so I felt that's good. But it's in a good shape. I feel it's in good shape. I cannot say of course. This is what has happened. These are the results and I can't evaluate the results. Of course I can't. It's a work in progress. But I think is going towards more ambitious.

(…)

Q: Okay. Thank you. And what are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently? Again, in your experience…

A: I would we like to do many things, in terms of, in terms of collaboration, and to, to talk more in the, in the working space about these problems, and to just to be more present about this, to have this more as a present thing, because I think sometimes I feel it's still a site of part of the agenda, for example, pedagogy. Academia. And that's where I come from. Not too far humanities in general, but I feel for now, it's still an aside to something aside. So I will, I think should be addressed more, more consciously and more often. For example, in a Ph. D program, none of the courses I've taken during this year approached for a single minute, this topic, which is very important, because I think we are dealing with potential teachers, or teachers already. So what's going on with that?

Q: What are the main topics of the courses you have to take?

A: Mainly things related to pedagogy and methodology, a lot of methodology. So in that sense is very conventional program, because it's how to research on these topics, how to put together…

so there is, at least in this first year, I don't know about the rest, there is a link missing.

I think it's in the in the offer does link missing because I keep the round to the year, and now the causes are repeating. I'm going to be over with my courses very soon. That's how you take there are some selected topics or create the theme topics that sometimes come up but never seen anything related to real social problems, real

world problems, things that really happen in that space. For me, there's something missing.

Q: Thank you. In what are the main capacities that you consider important to developing primary prevention activities?

A: I say not just art education, but in general institution education lacks of contact with the real world. So capacity would be to work without walls, to really work in the real world problems, to address real world issues, to bring up real examples of things that are going on in real time in the real world. To me, I think schools are still very isolated from real world problems. And I think that's a red flag and a huge red flag. Even UNESCO points out that these since years ago, the necessity of art of education to be transdisciplinary in the sense of not putting together disciplines but transcend the disciplines in order to address real world problems. So I think that is, from my experience is not fulfilled in in any program. I've never seen it in the humanities problem. Maybe in sciences, maybe in social sciences, of course, I will I yeah, I feel like probably it's going what means in humanities, miss. Now it's so far away. I mean, we just give opinions that turn into the same - hate speech and things that are radicalized, but with because we don't work with real world issues, I mean, so that's very rare. But I've seen that going on outside Academia, that I've seen it. (…)

Q: But more specifically, what I mean in this question is I'll give you one example because it relates to the project you're following. We talk about resilience. So, it's one of the capacities qualities okay that you want to promote. What are the other things that come to your mind?

A: Resilience is one, another one could be compassion, empathy, I mean practical solidarity in a more practical way. I don't know how to describe this, but it could be like, when you get when you get the mindset and you get trained to address this problem, when you detect it, you know, when as in from the teacher point of view…. critical thinking could be a standpoint.

Q: Last question, how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Good question. I'll be more conservative in that. I think it has to do a lot with family. Like the sustainable is like, from my point of view, (…), and there is a big crisis in family situation, family education and family, lack of support for education and a huge amount of internal violence, domestic violence. So if that is broken, I can you sustain a project like that?.... I mean, you can go to the nicest school, I'll teach you how to prevent that. How to Train yourself into mind and your thoughts to be more open and whatever. But as your house is fucked up everything what do I think most of the people that I've seen in rage, anger and need to be heard? For good or bad? They have family issues. I will say, I mean, the crisis is by the I don't

I don't think a program could be sustainable by itself without the support of social health and family situation.

Q: Thank you very much. Would you like to add something?

A: No. I think these are already thoughtful questions, make us think about our experience, our procedures. That was a problem. So I'm very curious. Looking forward to know more probably research a little bit together about other contexts, background and context.

Int. n. 6

Q: First question is, can you describe briefly, your studying and working experiences?

A: I have a PhD in Education, a Bachelor in Elementary Education, I'm teacher certified and I've worked for at least 10 years in early childhood education, either as a teacher or as an administrator. And I have worked as a professor tenure track or tenure for about ten years.

Q: How did you start collaborating with Project Someone?

A: Okay, so I was… my office in the old buildings was across Vivek's… so I got to know him a little bit that way and then we talked and he was interested in my work in curriculum studies and in early childhood education. So hoping to, in a sense, extend some of the work with youth to possibly with the younger age groups. I don't remember if that was his idea or my idea. You know, I remember at the time making clear to him that you know, radicalization wasn't really a project that I saw, as within my purview of early childhood education. So it was more about talking to children about… how, you know, ….. really understanding how children form their ideas of other people, of difference in and issues of identity, and possibly resilience. So that was one aspect and then the other aspect was just curriculum, just looking on how to develop online tools…

Q: The following question would be "How did you engage in prevention?" but I don't know if you consider yourself engaged intervention.

A: Yeah, maybe not so much. Prevention more in terms of you know, preparing young people to be critical thinkers before they get to the point of dealing with lots of online messaging and hate. Working like building up their critical faculties before.

Q: Could you tell me more about your first experiences with Project someone? When did you start and

A: I'm gonna say like around 2016, but I'm not sure exactly. I think it was around issues of social justice. You got to realize that I don't really fit in that well, maybe with what much of what my department or my unit does is, looks at how to teach children in school. Right. So, language, arts, ethics…, but I feel like my interest has

always been outside of school curriculum. So, how kids play, what they watch on TV, who they admire, celebrities and so on… the sort of stuff that draws them out in a sense, I think that that's really important. And, and I guess, with Project Someone when we talk about media, and influences of media - that's kind of how I felt there might be a connection. So yeah, it was probably a media literacy connection. So I do research in children's pop culture, and I teach a course on toys, media literacy and pop culture. And I think that can again with that idea, not of radicalization, but really of equipping children earlier. It's what are the sorts of things that they naturally reach out to and feel gives them a lot of meaning in their own lives. What kind of messages are they getting there? You know, so for instance, in Disney, certainly, in traditional 1980s, Disney, there were a lot of messages that would prepare children to be pretty racist, right? Just things like that.

Q: Just one question more and how do you see this change about early childhood - they have access to all kinds of media always earlier... What is your perspective?

A: It's gotten worse with COVID… Because now it's a survival. We just like you know, I need time to work. So I gotta get my kids… and with iPads, so much easier… I think, you know, there used to be a sense of protectionism, particularly in early childhood education, I would say keep kids away from it. Keep away from certain programs, keep them away from certain technologies, get them outside to play. And then it sort of switched over to well, if you're gonna let them use it, have conversations with them, talk with him or just leave him alone with it. But now… Now, it's like, now it's scary. I've just given a workshop to kindergarten teachers and they're telling me that kids are playing Fortnight and Grand Theft Auto - kindergarten kids and their parents aren't aware of it. And they're asking me for, you know, tools or readings to give the parents to let them know that this is happening. And I'm thinking well, but you know, it's not something that an article is going to change it, except the watch it - on Grand Theft Auto, you get points for running over a prostitute…. It's like, do you know that your five year old is playing with that? I mean, I think that if any parent could saw that, they would intervene, right. So so there's gotta be some sort of a line. I'm not a protectionist - I think children, you know, can be exposed to lots of things and you can talk with them, but you know, some content. It's supposed to be 18 and above, right. So how do I feel about that? I feel like both ways, I think like I try not to get too panicky about it and say, "Oh, it's terrible, like was so much better 20 years ago", because I think they're even like in board games… And you know what I actually stick to my kids very quickly that in the "Game of life", if you're a teacher, you lose, right. So you have to, it's all about capitalism money, so you have to be a doctor or something to win. And so those offline messages weren't great. Disney as I said had other messages… so I think it's really something to think of.

So yeah, I do think there's a lot that we can do with young kids just in terms of the types of messages they get through pop culture. Yeah. Yeah. So I try not to freak out about you know, what kids are being exposed to. I think it's been really hard last two years on children and parents and sure they would love to go outside and play, socialize…

Q: Can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you and with whom and how have you felt?

A: Okay, one thing that comes to mind is that there's this discourse of plays and playing is like this… you know, all good process for young children. But recently, I was teaching a graduate course on Play. And, you know, there are these articles... So, as teachers were encouraged to provide children with representations of Equity and Diversity and Inclusion, so we gave them all sorts of different dolls, you know…. It was these children in a daycare setting probably represented with the diverse dolls, and they would play and they would take this little black doll and say, "Okay, this is the bad guy". And one of the beliefs in children's plays that teachers should not get interfere. They should just let them play and figure things out on their own. But what do we see there's just this continual reinforcement of like racist stereotypes. And so it clearly isn't enough just to provide representations to children. What we really, really need is to help teachers and parents and adults to be able to talk with children… but then how do you talk with children about race and sexism and so on? So, there's a teacher at the observation nursery, she's white and the children in her class are white. She says "Well, what am I supposed to do? How am I supposed to do it, like even if I bring in these dolls, what am I supposed to say to them?"

I've been learning that there are lots of books, there are different types of picture books, and there are so many short videos that are available, that are interesting, not overly pedagogical or anything but just different vantage points for kids to get and I think it's a really hard thing. I think what kids need all around was just someone just to talk with them talk through, but it's hard to talk with young children, but people still want to protect children. They're innocent, right? So we don't want to talk about hate, about differences, about people hurting other people. We just want to keep them innocent, but then they get you know, innocence is only allowed for a certain portion of children, right? Yeah. Other children just get maligned, the whole time. So it's difficult…

Q: In your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: Okay, so as a non expert, it brings up in my mind is the sense of children or young people or adults who may be… you know, I feel like identity is the thing that really drives education and drives a lot of our lives that there's a bookmark, Bratcher wrote about, about how identity and how important identity or central identity is and so I guess I feel like sometimes if people, you know, people who are searching

for an identity might be very vulnerable to extremist views of the world. You know, for instance, if you feel that you've been downtrodden… you know, the example of Incels…

But that idea that oh, yeah, I found a group who's going to support me as you know, disenfranchise, let's say, in this case, white men who want to become white men, disenfranchised white men. And so I'm going to go with this, and I'm going to do good in the world and maybe try to get rid of a certain type of people who I feel threatened by, and then that gives me an identity that makes me feel like I'm less disempowered, right? So that's, that's what comes to mind. Okay, when I think of that… but it could be anything, any sort of extreme position – religious, political, you know, "anti" whatever, I think…. I like psychoanalysis as a as a theory. So I feel like a lot of our own anxieties gets projected onto the world and are to other people. And that can be very dangerous, so that self-knowledge is important in order to actually do good in the world.

Q: Which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: For example, we have already talked about racism. Power, I mean these days, I think social media, belonging, identity for sure.

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities during the activities?

A: I've been to some panels of Project Someone, but directly no.

Q: The third and last part is about prevention practices. Could you describe the steps of one project on this topic to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: I think that my contribution has more or less been more on the media literacy. So that say, you know, helping people understand. Okay, so if I can think of that one module that we created, it was about helping people understand what hate speech was. Okay. And so it was, I think that the idea was to make it accessible to libraries, and so like a general public, and I mean, it was interesting just in terms of being able to… I guess it was on hate speech and then how to be more critical through our use of social media and our use of media to find information. Right, and so what it was involved looking at different members' projects and how they could be applied and useful to a general public. That was a lot of time ago.

Q: Okay, thank you. And always, in your opinion, what are the positive and political aspects of prevention activities? And is there anything that you'd like to do differently? Different from how it's done at the moment? If you think about prevention activities.

A: I guess, I mean, if you would think about radicalization as involving in some sort of hate, or some sort of, you know, grouping together of certain peoples in order to focus one's ire at then and that's something that that probably has foundations in our young lives in you, right. Yeah. So I guess, you know, and then like you said, it's kids pick up not just, you know, what you say to them, but how you behave, you

know… that's far more that they'll stay with them a lot more that something you say to them. So, I think…. Yeah, I think I would take that actually, very seriously, how anybody cuts across everything from the histories that we present to our children, you know, which are very biased, to the types of novels that we give them to read you know, who ends up teaching them? Right, to the types of music and television shows and films and games that they play. If you look at some of the video games that kids play, it's you know, a lot of the you know, when you think of Barbie, a lot of the videos made representations that are highly sexualized, and that's something that girls get exposed to, you know, so early these days so the boys. I mean, I think in some ways, it's better than that when I was younger. I think that there wasn't social media, so that you know, yes, issues of race are changing, shifting, but then social media has a far further reach where kids are just using it much more closely than they did in the past. So I guess, you know, media literacy probably should start younger and younger.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Well, I mean, the two things that we worked on someone project what I was that for instance, that last year this critical thinking but also resilience. And what does resilience mean, what's it look like? How do you build resilience? You know, when I've had some teachers and some teachers say, we've failed the kids, you failed them because then they can, they know they can do, they can they can come back from it. But you know, what kind of failures are there? I don't know. I don't want to sound too pessimistic about the world we live in.

The projects that I'm looking at now, I'm trying to take what kids you know, how they play. They say that the first thing that goes when people are stressed is playfulness. And I'm thinking about creativity and stuff like that. So it'd be nice to, you know, highlight that, not just in in early childhood grades as well- playing, resilience, critical thinking... Stuff that that really mean something to kids.

Q: Last question: how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: You know, one thing that I am interested in because I've been studying children's pop culture for a long time, but I always make it clear that it's children, not youth. But even with children's pop culture, I always felt like, I don't need to know what the latest toy or gadget is. Because foundationally it's still something you know, it's that criticality is something that you just talked about, and you can think of it regardless of what the item is. So I feel like we need to go back to that and just think about don't get all freaked out about the latest. You know, I think now, I mean, I think it's still Tick Tock is the latest thing that's still going strong, but I wouldn't feel like oh my gosh, I'm so behind the time. I feel like as researchers, we have to not fall it fall prey to that sense that if you're not, you know, in the latest, then you're

passe and your work doesn't matter anymore and that sort of foundation of it, you know? Being able to make decisions for yourself and be really thoughtful and knowledgeable about what things mean is important.

Int. n. 7

(…)

Q: How did you engage in prevention?

A: Hmm. I think it was mostly like working with Cécile here and like a project and then with Ghayda too, and how the training was designed because like, like, intervention seems quite difficult and like, prevention is like seems to be the more useful and more important, let's say before, when I was doing my PhD, I worked like most on violence conflict, like political violence. Not at the level of prevention, but kind of after the conflict like peace process, things like that. So I think it was interesting for me to see like the after the intervention part, but also the prevention that seems important.

Q: Okay, thank you. And could you tell me more about your first experiences like in this let's try to focus this this first questions are a bit more general about your working experiences, but the since you have a different background, if you can think about these prevention activities, and so your first experiences, how have you learned to do what to do and with whom?

A: okay, so in general, I think it will be like during an event a bit before but during my my PhD working about, so I worked in the north of Ireland with a peace process there like Israel, Palestine conflicting areas, and I was more looking at the psychological consequences for communities and people of these conflicts and violence and how they, they managed to resist and still exist in this context.

Q: So, you did like fieldwork there?

A: Yeah, it was like mostly going there and talk to ex-members of military groups that were now part of the peace process. And in Israel was mostly like Israeli who engage for peace in different peace organization. So yeah, it's I think that's where it started a bit, like conflicts and extremism and violence at this level. So that brought me the interest of contacting Cécile, and then like, going more into the reality of Canada and Quebec.

Q: And what about Ghayda?

A: I was working with Cécile and then either was part also Raps and part of the clinical team there. So I had to be there. I was working with her too about a training on gender based violence. So that's how I met Ghayda. Then she was like we CPN she had like a training team and wanted like to do training for practitioners around Canada. So that's how I got involved.

Q: Thank you. Can you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you when with whom? And how have you felt? The first thing that comes to your mind is critical episode, it doesn't mean necessarily to be something big, a huge problem.

A: I think one tricky moment was… I was giving a training, it was like, culture more, like, let's say like, it was more like sensitivity, but it's also to prevent, like, racism and things like that. And, and one person shared with the group that he felt disturbed that some people can say black pride, but he cannot say white pride. And, and he was having this kind of discourse, it should be allowed to say white pride? If he's not, he will not allow other people to show black pride and stuff like that. And I think that was quite creating some tension within the group. But someone like it was not explicitly racist, but it was bringing some ideas that are the common ideas, like white groups, white supremacist groups sometimes. So yeah, it was quite I was with a colleague, too. So we were like quite having a moment of, okay, how do we manage that? How do we keep this person in a way in the training, but how we protect the group that was I think, well, afterward that how I'm telling that at the moment, was, okay, we want to continue with this group. And there is this element that is bringing some ideas and creating tension with the group. So I think we let him bring about something he was proud of, we went about this with a white identity about Quebec, about saying, okay, like, for example, some people say they're proud to be like from Quebec, but it's also linked to the fact that there is a history that it was like, Anglophones were more powerful and Canada. So we went a bit back into that, to find a way that something could identify ways in a way to understand the power dynamic. And that the power dynamic with white and black is with not doing like a shortcut, but it's different. It's like What does he feel, like there is like Canada, Canada pride and things like that, for example, you know, like comparing to white pride in terms of power and things like that. And because he was like, really into Quebec, that was something that, like, could help him I think to, to understand a little bit more. I'm not sure he changed in mind, but at least to keep it in the group.

Q: Participation continued afterwards in the group, he managed to go on?

A: Yeah, yeah, he stayed until the end, we could see that sometimes he was not very convinced… But yeah, it was a way for him to stay. Yeah, there's like, several little incidents like that.

Q: So the second part is about radicalization. Okay. First question is, in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: Well, that's not an easy question. Let's say I will say, in general, and I will talk about radicalization and violent radicalization. I think it's been a way to label the other we don't like.

Q: Which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: Okay, I'll go with change, like social change, like changing the status quo, like all the wanting to change thing. I will go with a bit outsider. Like and yeah, like to change like, the center in a way so like, I will put like, radicalization as something around the center trying to make to move to shift a bit the center, to challenge for the this part, and I will maybe put in, in some corner the concept of violence, like radicalization into violence, but not as the first like part as it could go more into social change, like, like evolution or, like evolution that like, so building like, like a social connection, and the opposite, or in a different part like violence, I could also connect to social change linked to violence.. in other way more going into violence and maybe hate another part that is different from social change. (…)

Q: Could you describe the steps of one project on radicalization prevention, to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: So I think in terms of prevention will be more going to do training for the general public, like students, for example, giving a training for Cegep, like Cegep students. So, like, we have some basic training like content, okay, what is the reality in Canada about extremism, violence, but then to change and to make it a bit interesting for Cegep students and make them like, close to their reality. And going about what we know, like, in terms of prevention is not directly sometimes talking about radicalization, but talking about some causes that could lead to radicalization, like discrimination, bullying, violence, like trauma, and so on, for being more to go in this training, and try to talk about that, like conflicts, racial conflicts, how they feel something like that. So it was like, if I thinking about the Cegep one was like, designing short activities…

So the activity was more like bringing magazines headlines, like news headlines, were some was portraying the situation in different way more right wing or left wing, and make them react and discuss about this social topics with them. Which I think was quite interesting to bring, like their own opinion on things and how they managed together to discuss. And yeah, until they're, if they can still talk to each other, even if they are different and confronting views on some topics, but I think that was the prevention.

Q: Okay, thank you, and what are positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Yeah, I think that when I began, I was reading into contents, giving contents to people in terms of prevention, so they would know… that they would have more like cognitive information. I think that's not the right now, I will realize that I think that maybe I'm wrong, that the cognitive aspect is like a lot of people know, racism, or violence is wrong, but they're doing it for other reasons that is less rational. So I'm already going more to the experimental and doing experience of people together, instead of dealing with concepts, going into dialogue and talk to each other. So that was maybe the shift like that we try a little bit with CPN after it's like,

to be less content based and more experience based. Because yeah, that's what I think that works better.

Q: In your experience, you noticed that you have better outcomes?

A: Yeah, it's difficult to evaluate just like that. But yeah, I would say… it's when people do something together, and realizing things together since more effective than just the learning part, even if they don't have the words of the concept after.. so it might be more difficult to evaluate exactly. But I think you can find more like group dimension and cohesion that if you're just providing content.

Q: And what are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Some flexibilities, like in terms of thinking, like, not just to think in terms twist Ids and positions too in a way that you can like, yeah, reach some understanding. I would say the capacity to be at ease with uncertainty with the fact that you don't understand things, and that understanding is a process and that's something like that is fitted to you. The fact that we start, and we don't know, at the end. We don't know, but we don't know together.

And then, well, all the critical thinking, like, I think that's to media and scientific literacy, like, in a way that people could have tools to understand, you know, like, like, provide some tools, so they don't find like people are lying to them, or it's very obscure, like, the world is very obscure, and politics is, is organizing everything, given them the tools to understand what is politics, what is like conflict, power dynamics, stuff like that, I think that's probably a capacity to, to after, like, critical thinking only theories.

Well, I would say also the capacity to be centered, like, being able to understand that other can have a different worldview based on their experience, or somewhere like their social position and, and be able to hold your own your own, you know, centered worldview to be able to understand the other.

Q: Last question. How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: That's difficult to see the result of prevention. I think it's to believe in prevention is worth it. Like to know that, I think it's like, it's a political view that we always, you know, process of living together. And there is like, conflict will happen. So prevention is all the time, like society is based on conflicts. And like, so I would say like, yeah, so people realize that social conflicts are part of human social world. And so prevention is always necessary. And pragmatic. Social justice, like radical democracy, resilience, helping people to get to know better each other…

Q: Thank you. What do you teach at the University?

A: Psychology, psychotherapy, logical approach like a psychodynamic and humanistic approaches, as well as a class on supervision. Like, like lifelong education, psychology. So I bring some elements around, like prevention of

violence in those classes, because I think it's important for like, like every psychologist could have some knowledge around that.

Int. n. 8

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?
A: I started my doctoral I did my PhD in developmental psychology and focused I did intersection of developmental psychology and cross-cultural psychology. So I was working with the on the social psychological adjustment of immigrant early adolescence, from three ethno cultural communities so the Morocco community, the Romanian community, and the Chinese communities. And I worked with schools, around their social emotional adjustment and risk and protective factors for their adjustment in our positive youth development perspective. During my, my PhD I met Cecile Rousseau, who was who's a psychiatrist and professor at McGill University in the Division of Social and Cultural psychiatry, and I started working with her so at first I worked on that project on the attachment issues between mother and infants of South Asian origin. That's how we started and then I got involved on many projects. And among these projects there was also one on the prevention of violent radicalization. And that's when I started working on issues of social polarization and then moved to Montreal for my postdoc in 2017. And was to work on a project that was really on the risk and protective factors related to support for violent radicalization among college students in Quebec.
Q: At McGill, right?
A: Yes, the postdoc was at MacGill, at the Division of Social and Cultural psychiatry I was under the supervision of Cécile so and Y.(…). And then he moved to the University of Massachusetts, in Boston. And it was a mostly a quantitative study. So it was really in charge of big surveys, administered online to students in Cegeps. Then what did I do during my postdoc, I tried to apply positive development framework to the study of support for violent radicalization, trying to find ways to support youth so that they can you know, focus their energies into non violent ways of contributing to society. And I started working on several projects related to socialization, especially in the education environment. So I was one of the researchers assistant. I was a research assistant with David Morin and when they worked on I conducted some focus groups for them and universities to try to understand what was going on related to the freedom of speech also and all the tensions that were happening around like sensitive issues in universities. And then I'm co-researcher in many projects. One is around the evaluation of a theater piece, used in schools to raise awareness around issues of violent radicalization in schools, it was in high schools "Who killed the free bird?" that's the name of the piece. So we worked on that and then I'm co-researcher on a public safety project that aims

at evaluating the impact and the effectiveness and the implementation of the clinical work of the social polarization team in Montreal. And there is a qualitative and quantitative component and it's a longitudinal study. So I'm working on that one. Besides that right now, I just got a grant to work on risk and protective factors for support for violent radicalization, the positive youth development perspective in high school, so I'm going to start to go and work with adolescents on the issues in high schools. And it's a mixed method study. So again, I'm gonna have qualitative and quantitative data.

It's a Canadian funding over a two to three years. So it's ongoing. This is what's coming next. I'm sure whatever, what am I forgetting?

I'm co-researcher in Raps (Equipe de recherche sur la polarisation sociale), that brings together basically a lot of actors across different fields and areas of expertise that work on one way or another on social polarization.

Q: And in this project for that you're starting in schools, you'll be doing like primary prevention with all the students?

A: It's not an intervention (yet). It's related to primary prevention, in the sense that we're really trying to understand what is going on in schools. What are the factors that are associated with positive attitudes towards violence towards violent radicalization, but I'm looking at specific potential risk and protective factors such as different aspects of the school climate and the class climate I mean, attitudes toward masculinism in adolescence and so gender identity, identity aspects, discrimination experiences related to the school climate also.

It's quantitative because I have a longitudinal device. I'm gonna have a data collection at the beginning of the school year and one by the end of the school year, in some classes in I think… I planned six high schools. It's not huge, like it's sort of a pilot study to start to get into schools. It's not easy to address social polarization, violent radicalization in schools, which is a very sensitive issues for the school directors also, school boards are defensive when you name those. So usually, we talked about living together. We have other ways of addressing it and my way, I speak of positive development and contribution to society. That's my vocabulary when I work in schools, but ultimately, I'm also talking about social polarization. So I have questioners two times, in two time points. And then I have focus groups with adolescents around really, what I'm observing around sensitive issues, the relational dynamics and experiences… many people at school and their lives around these issues and what they think. And then I have interviews with teachers that describe something that happened to them in relation with something that was polarizing or sensitive, and how they addressed it and how they felt around it. So just to kind of understand what are the needs in the schools and that will inform eventually prevention interventions and so on. So it's not "per se" an interventional

project. It's more like going to see on the ground, what's happening, to be able to understand what their needs are and then offer some support.

Q: Are you planning to offer the support maybe in the second year?

A: I plan on one side attending the results, for applying for some funding, so that we can do something and make links with the social polarization team where some needs arise. So one thing I haven't mentioned is that I am one I'm a professor now at department of educational psychology and andragogy at the University of Montreal, and here I'm teaching to teachers, right, and interveners in schools. So in my courses, I teach a course on adolescents and adolescent development for future teachers in high schools, and I also teach a class on prevention models in schools, and I've introduced a class, like two workshops, on social polarization and violent radicalization in my two courses. So that I'm starting to talk about it and I have I've had feedback from teachers I teach to that is something that no one has addressed with them that they really need in their daily lives. There's a lot of these polarization tensions that happen and they don't, you know, they deal with it based on their own training and their own experience, but they never had real training or class on these issues. So they really appreciated the possibility to talk about it. And they said that in their training, no one else had ever spoken about these kinds of issues.

Q: So there could be like also training for teachers in these schools where you're starting the project?

A: Yeah, we have some ideas. My idea, in a positive development framework, is that once you have the results, you just go and present them to the classes that participated. And normally you propose some reach out activity to the community or in the schools with young people so that they can engage and get involved. So if you want in that sense, could be a Research Action thing, but per se, I'm seeing the intervention as another and next steps. So in two years when I have the results, and I have been in on the ground, and I've talked to teachers and students, I can maybe understand what they need, but in the process as I am involved in many projects, and I know many resources on the ground, and again, surely make the link when I go to schools right now and they talk to me about some delicate situation. I already give them the contact information of a social polarization thing, for instance. It's not my prevention program, but it's some resources that they can use. So it's, it's, you know, you create some links and then you mobilize the resources that are already available.

Q: And how did you decide to engage in prevention?

A: Well, I do believe… you know, when you work on schools, students or the general population, it is prevention because you're not targeting a specific group at risk, right. And I think primary prevention and focusing on the general population is key in violent radicalization because the way it starts and focusing on groups or radicalized individuals is important, but it's something different. And there's also a

risk of stigmatizing. Like if you focus on specific communities because someone says they are at higher risk, it can have some negative effects on inter-community relations and on the stigma that these groups leave. That's what we've seen with Muslim communities after 9/11. So, when you talk about primary prevention, and you try to understand risk and protective factors, you want to go to the mainstream population to like see, what's the situation. The idea behind that is that, you know, attitudes towards violence…. there's no linear relationship between attitudes toward violence and violent behavior, in the sense that you can have a positive attitude toward violence but it doesn't mean that tomorrow you're going to be violent or do something violent and all social psychology research tells us that there's a difference. However, if you think in terms of social psychology and public health and prevention, when you live in a context where a lot of people share positive attitudes toward violent radicalization, it doesn't mean that all these people that share these attitudes are going to do something, but it creates an environment where the more vulnerable individuals that also support violence are more likely to act out in violence. So the lone actors that we're seeing my way of seeing, like, violent radicalization, are directed towards certain ways of expressing their violence because there's a context, a broader context that is shared by the general population that sort of normalizes and legitimizes the use of violence. So in terms of primary prevention is prevention in school. So with the general population, you want to try to understand what can reduce this polarization, these attitudes towards violence, how you can intervene on those and what I've seen so far is that people need to be empowered, they need to be a bit in control. So they need another way out. If they just don't want them to go towards violence, you need to give them a voice in some other way. And that's prevention. So like, censoring, you know, if you don't let people speak, when you create some divisions within society around some polarizing issues and dialogue, dialogue becomes very difficult... It's when you start seeing more violence. We've seen it with the pandemic. There's been a lot of conflicts and then also by increasing violence linked with the tensions around the pandemic, vaccines and so on. So it's something that we it's, you know, it's in history, we've seen this kind of trend, it repeats itself. And it's not new like so. It's not a new phenomenon, like this idea of attitudes. You can work on attitudes in terms of prevention. So that's why in terms of schools and general population I like focusing on that. And I'm very careful not to… because as I said, I started as a researcher on immigrant populations…. But right now I'm extra careful when I talk about social polarization... I tend to avoid to talk about my previous studies… I'm still working actually with immigrant populations, but when I put the two together, and even if I say they're two separate things… the risk is that people misunderstand easily and think that I work on violent radicalization in immigrant populations, which is really not the case. I'm working on both. But immigrant populations have

not at higher risk of radicalization, at least not here in Quebec or in Canada. And we have data to prove that, but once you put these two things together in the same sentence, you can get easily misunderstood, so you see… it's kind of delicate. But that's why prevention is general populations not targeting any group, although you can check what subgroups may be at higher risk, but what we found is that there's not a profile of a person that is at risk of violent radicalization, it's an interaction, a unique interaction of many, many variables and factors. And so it's, it's not like you can really do all the profiling that people do, I don't really…from what I've seen in my data, I don't think it leads anywhere. I don't think you can use the scales to score attitudes, to prevent, to profile and target people that are at higher risk, because that's not how it works.

Q: Can you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened where were you and with whom and how have you felt?

A: Oh, there are many… Well, as I mentioned before, there's like some episodes that come to mind like around when you mention violent radicalization and you get shut down. There are very polarized reactions from people in schools or even evaluators of research grants. So the vocabulary that you use and the sort of strong reactions that you get in relation with the vocabulary that you use in just the words finally, radicalization, that's, that's something that surprised me, especially at first, because as I said, I tried to go in high schools earlier, but it didn't work. And I learned my lesson that you really need to build an alliance and try to use a vocabulary that doesn't scare people off, because it's strong words that sometimes are, are also misunderstood. And then, other things are… really the… how much context dependent like violent radicalization and how you intervene on violent radicalization depends upon context, like even in Quebec, if you go to quick Quebec City or if you're going to school that is like 99% White. Or if you go to a school where there's like 70% of immigrants like in Montréal sometimes happen… sometimes just the teacher is white for instance, and everyone else has an immigrant background or one way or another….I think that was also something very significant in terms of how people perceive violent radicalization, social polarization, and what kind of experiences you have, like I'm talking about schools because that's where I've been working... So even the "Free bird".. like what we found when we were showing the theater piece, when it was playing around the schools in Quebec City… It really opened teachers and students eyes because they, most people are not with an immigrant background and second generation immigrants probably are more assimilated in a way, like because of the structure of society. But in Montreal, like the teachers were saying that yes, like in our class, when there's a shooting or whatever, there's always like one of the kids like saying, "Oh, another white guy", because they know that it's always white guys who do that… So the awareness, the perception, the knowledge around issues that can vary

171

a lot from one context to another, and the need to adjust the interventions according to the situations because if it wouldn't, you couldn't do the same thing with you know, in this in the fabric in the, in the school composition of people that do not see any immigrant and people who like are immigrants themselves, and have been maybe stigmatized because of violent radicalization or whatever. So they have two different levels of awareness. The other thing is that young people are really immersed into this social polarization and this tension. So when you do prevention, sometimes you have to take into account that it can turn into an intervention because there's been incidents. There's been things happening in the community or in the school.

Q: So, the second part is more specific about radicalization. The first question is, in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define violent radicalization?

A: Well, in my work, I actually refer to Schmidt's definition of violent radicalization, so that's the one I use… I think it's very important distinction, especially if you want to be careful around heights. Okay. Well, the first thing to say is that there's not one definition, which everyone agrees Okay, so it's a very good question, but….

So, yeah, in my own words, like, how can I say, Well, I think I'm gonna use part of Schmidt's words, because it's what I say all the time, but it's really it's a process whereby, like, some individuals go, like put aside, become more and more engaged into violent attitudes that can lead sometimes to violent behaviors in the name of a cause, on an ideology, a cause or to reach a specific goal. Like when we mentioned ideology, normally we talk more about extremism rather than radicalization, but it's really a process and it's a gradual thing, where you're actually little by little get more comfortable with violent and ways of resolving conflicts between two groups or two individuals that have opposite ways of thinking and then you know…

Schmidt' definition is what I use in my work. I like the distinction between radicalization, violent and non violent, and that it can be an individual or a group and that it is a process, that there is a sort of legitimization of violence that happens step by step, somehow, to reach a goal. That's that there's a goal at some point, it can be political or religious can be ideological in some cases, so it overlaps with extremism.

Q: Okay. And now we come to the other question is Which concepts they consider as linked to radicalization?

A: Extremism…, but radicalization per se, for me it's also social change, for instance, like if you think of, I don't know, the right of women to vote like, you know, you have to put radicalization into context. Like at certain times or just society what is radical is not what it is in other societies. So that's the thing and in our history, radical ideas and growth to social change and improvement of our societies, and not necessarily through violence. So I think about, about that I think

about social change, I think about contribution to society. I think about non violence, civic engagement and violence. I can think about terrorism when it comes to radicalization. I think about polarization societies and tensions.

We can think about terrorism, it is associated, but it's not the same thing. Like there are some processes of violent radicalization, if you get associated with terrorism is in the name of who defines terrorism? A State. So it's all about the definitions and who is deciding what is radical, because what is terrorism for us is probably like, you know, it's something else for someone else. It's defined by a State but it's a government also. Like mass shooting is not considered terrorrism because it's not an attack to the State… unless the mass shooting or the mass killing is an attempt to democracy or to government or whatever, then it's defined as terrorism, but you know, it's a fine line. And it all depends on what the State and only who is at the government at certain moments, like what they decide. Surely, we have to be aware, to acknowledge that there's some bias there too. Like it's not like with Cécile, she started working on violent radicalization after 9/11, but she had been observing that more and more it was the Islamophobic like movements and right wing movements that were responsible of violence. But it took like now I think in the US for the first time they have like published like a report where they say "oh, yes, white supremacist and the right wing extremism are two problems of home terrorism" and so on. Like, in the US, it happened now. She started working on this like after 9/11. So it's been 20 years and we've been seeing that for 20 years, but it took 20 years to say that that was terrorism, but when 9/11 happened, it didn't take more than 20 seconds to say, well, this is terrorism, you know, too. So we have our own biases and governments have their own biases and governments can radicalize to you, so

Q: And have you ever met radicalize people doing activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: I have, okay, it depends on levels of radicalization, because if you don't really go into extreme violence, like I define most of the people I work with as radicals, because we really want to change things and we have our own ideas. Many of my colleagues are a bit like that. In terms of violent radicalization and like patients in the clinic or so on, not directly because I'm not working as a direct clinician, but I've been in situations where they've been discussing cases for instance, so I know the stories but I haven't met the actual patients.

Q: Could you describe the steps of one project on this topic to which you have contributed from the beginning to the end?

A: I cannot talk about the high school one because this is grant I just got in. But I have like, depend on what other people have talked because like I have this big service in Cegep and universities. But those are my quantitative service. Or if it's more of interest for you, there's the public safety like the polar project that is really on the evaluation of services.

Okay, because I think that one maybe given the aim of your PhD, maybe it's more of interest to you. So what is that? that's a community resilience found, so we started by applying for funding, of course, and it's, it's a bit tricky because the Community Resilience Fund is a public safety funding. So there you go. It's already sort of a conflict of interest if you want, because they're giving us money to evaluate the effectiveness and the implementation of the work of the social polarization team, which is a multidisciplinary team in Montreal. Multidisciplinary because we have social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, and that works in with a systemic transcultural approach. So in team really and tries to avoid the stigmatization of people that are referred by working with the community or in the community as much as possible. So basically, they go to patients houses, they go to school, rather than making them come to the CLSC if they think that is more appropriate, and you know, so a lot of these kind of things, so this is what the team does. The team has been working I think, since 2015 or 2014... And their work hadn't been evaluated. They see now, I don't know I don't have the actual numbers because we are working on the data right now. We are in the in the data collection process. Okay, so we started we have submitted a couple of papers. But like every year there was like, let's say 50 to 100 new patients, but the number of patients very has been growing because you could think that because violent radicalization has become more common. I think it's also because the team has become more known in the community. We've built relationships with the police, with the schools with the communities so we get more referrals. Okay, so we got money for this evaluation. And the first real big obstacle was about ethics. It was very long, it's, it took us one year and a half I think, to get just ethics, okay. Because it's of course, it's at risk population, it's sensitive data... And we have the project has a chart review. So we go into the charts of all the patients that have been treated by the team to see you know, a lot of aspects related to an intervention. So how many people were referred how many people were treated? How many times did they come? When did they drop out? Why, what were the diagnosis, were they man or women, from where, like, you know, just to have a description of who are the people who use the service who refers them for what results for what ideologies, you know, so that's the chart review. And then we have a quantitative study where we actually… as long as new patients arrive, we enroll them if they if they want, of course, and we ask them to, to fill in a questionnaire but in a one-to-one interview, so it seems it's a quantitative component, but it's very, it's done by clinicians and social workers and people who have training because you know, it's patient, it's delicate situations. And, and we do this like every six months, so we monitor, we collect information on level of risk also because we used… clinicians used the start - it's a measure of risk assessment. And so we ask the patients to complete some questionnaires around their social integration, their future orientation, their mental health, and at the same time, we

have access to this risk evaluation that the clinicians do regularly with the patient, so we monitor, it's a longitudinal study, and we monitor and we try to find out the fluctuations of risk and what works for whom basically, we'll try to see over time, like, remember when we were making hypotheses we wanted to say we hope that over time the risk diminishes, but actually a realistic objective would be for the risk to remain stable with ups and downs, but overall to remain stable, that would be already a success, because in some cases, you don't really reduce the risk of violence, but you control it.

So there's this component, and then we have all the qualitative study that is with the clinicians, so qualitative interviews with clinicians around their experiences working with these patients. We have qualitative data on the team meetings of clinicians that discuss cases to understand the dynamics that are created in the team. So it's like, it's more ethnographic anthropological way of analyzing the data and we there's Jeanique… she analyzes the images and the discourses that come out in the group discussions and then we have focus groups with the mentors, because there's also a mentoring service that is offered to patients. And we have mentors that assist in their daily lives - some of the patients, the youth especially, in their integration and they provide them assistance. And we have focus groups to monitor the impact and the implementation of this.

Q: Is it like peer-to-peer mentorship?

A: Mentors are not necessarily the same age, but it's real mentorship, of accompanying them. It's not a clinical relationship nor therapeutic per se. It's really the assistance. It's inspired by the peer to peer but we don't have only young people. You know, we have some young people like adolescents but we also have men up to the 40s.

They are trained and they are supervised regularly from the clinical team. Yeah, so that's, that's this is more of a clinical project. And so, there's the clinical activities are ongoing, and then there are all these research activities to evaluate the activities, and it's still going on.

It was a project funded for five years, I think we are now at the end of the second, beginning of the third now - we got a delay because of the pandemic and because of the Ethics. The to happened together, like when we were going to ethics the pandemic arrived. So that complicated things even further because you know, with these patients, you cannot easily ask them to record because they really don't trust anyone or institution. So having things recorded because you're doing it, you cannot do it on Zoom. So it was it added sort of a layer of complexity and we have to wait to be able to see patients in person and restart and everything. And right now we are in the first quantitative data collection. But we have already conducted some focus groups actually with clinicians that originally were not even planned, but to support some of the descriptive quantitative… to better understand the quantitative

findings because right now we are just publishing the descriptive papers on the characteristics of participants. We have one paper on children of radicalized parents, one paper on gender radicalization, one paper on autism and violent radicalization, because these are things that we found.

Q: Thank you. What are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Yes, I'd like to do more. But, yeah, well, there's a lot of critical aspects. I mentioned some already, I think like the risk of making it worse. Rather than making it better like and we really need to invest into primary prevention and to evaluate what we do. There's many people doing many things. But if we're not documenting the impact and how we do it, and whether it's working, it's not gonna help much because we don't understand what's working for whom and so there's not much like how our project to evaluate this like… the few projects we have, they're not very strong methodologically, because it's very difficult to get data on this.. sometimes on the evaluation of especially secondary and tertiary prevention – it's sensitive data, so it's difficult to have data. When we do literature review, there's not much with data and solid evidence.

There's also a lot of variability, so it's always super important to, you know, so sensitive and polarizing and ideological in a way that it is true that everything you present is biased and you really need to interpret things and express some limitations and clearly describe the samples and the methods and everything to explain who you have in your sample. Like a lot of problems come because for instance, when I work in schools, with college students or whatever, and then I have a bunch of literature reviews that actually work on delinquent youth for instance or on youth that are already radicalized, but these are you know, you cannot generalize a study that was conducted on at risk youth to the general population of youth. But there's a lot of small things that focus on important variables on people that are radicalized or at risk youth or communities and not much on the general population. So in terms of prevention, we really need to understand what's going on, because social polarization is at all levels of society and it influences the general population, not just the people who act out after that are the ones we focus on. But I see that as a symptom of a problem that is, you know, at the base of the pyramid as you as you say, if you don't work on the base of the pyramid, it's hard. Another problem is that sometimes…. Right now, I am the one who speaks about resilience and positive development and everything but now everyone seems to say we do resilient oriented activities, like when you go see what they do, they don't really empower people, right? So you cannot do a primary prevention program, saying that you empower communities in a bottom up approach and that you have resilience oriented and so on, without accepting that there's going to be a change. Right? There's power dynamics at play. A lot of the programs I see they call themself primary prevention,

resilience oriented, but then you know, there's a resistance to change in the upper levels of society. And that does not depolarize because if you tell adolescents to work on a project and they do a super good job, and at the end, you know, there's no follow up. There's no real impact because there's resistance to change is so strong. That's not going to work. So if we want to empower youth because we find that that's protective for violent radicalization. We need some, you know, intersectoral and government, you know, collaboration to accept that some things need to change. We are in a moment where things need to change.

Q:You kind of anticipated my last two questions, but I'll ask them anyway. So one was, what are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Critical Thinking, dialogue, the ability to understand like young I'm talking about young people sorry, but just because that's my focus, but it's to understand that you can disagree and still be friends with someone, that you don't need to agree on everything and that doesn't need… you don't need to have 100% agree… that there's things on which you won't agree, but you can still keep the relationship going, you know? So the possibility to dissent in no violent ways and to contribute in non violent ways. And so what I was saying before in terms of empowerment, so to really redistribute powers and address the real issues - inequalities and problems in society, and with a of sort of a social justice approach, that's needed

Q: You have also already anticipated the last question: how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Yes – all I said, and there needs to be long term funding. Like what is violent radicalization? It seems to be political. So maybe people that are in political sciences can get funding, but the political science normally don't work on professional intervention, right? Like doctors like you have psychiatry, you have public health, you have psychologists, you have people in education that work on prevention. But the agencies that fund these professions and these fields they are… I think they are scared, you know, like violent radicalization is a polarizing issue. So you get polarized reactions, like when you get even the evaluator like reviewers for papers. You get two - one love your paper, your ideas and the other is like what the heck are you saying that you're just like, you read the same thing, but one loved one hated it, and it's always like that. So even for funding is the same. It's so hard to get funding from the agencies for the people that want to work on that. Because as soon as you name it, you get, you know, polarized reactions, and you get people say "this is not a public health issue", "But this is not psychology". So that's it. If we want to, to make it happen, we need to have money, we need to have collaboration, coordination, we need to have a bottom up approach and not a top down because that risk of stigmatizing and you have the opposite effect. You keep polarizing society if you just impose things from top down.

Q: What do you think is the future of this research field?
A: Well, it depends on us. And if we go in the right direction right now, I do think we are in a very crucial moment right now. But I can say that in the past decades, it has gotten worse and not better. And so it doesn't look like it's getting any better but it's true that it goes up and down with what's happening in society. So like we have a study where we looked at attitudes or violent radicalization over six months, and was in a moment where, you know, there was a debate around vaccine getting the vaccine here in Quebec and then after the summer, which was very quiet in Quebec, because like the number of COVID cases gone down and so on. So we found that all in all, divided like this, the attitudes toward radicalization, they were sort of going down in the overall population because you know, it was quiet around there still, just go look at some groups of people like the Novax or whatever, while the picture quite changes, so there's always you know, but I think we have so many there's so much uncertainty right now. And you know, there's the warin Ukraine, the climate change, if you want just to mention the pandemic and all what the pandemic brought, these are things that are there to be last, they're gonna be there. And these are things that affect future generations. And we haven't mentioned yet, but another thing that I would focus on intervention and prevention for sure with young people in the next future is digital literacy, like internet. A lot happens to internet and it's becoming a new developmental context. So I'm also I have submitted a paper with data on this, because it's another project I haven't mentioned actually, it's really it's unded by the digital citizenship program. And so we really look at the use of internet and digital literacy and its association with support for violent radicalization. And so this is also something where you need to train people to it's in relation with critical thinking because you really need to teach people how to use the internet of risks and how to handle and behave online.

I haven't mentioned it earlier, but in the project in high schools, I have many skills on the internet. Because I mean, you have this sense right now. And a lot of discrimination and racism and relationships are online. You think of the pandemic it just accelerated these processes. I think about the long term effects of the pandemic on the development of young people too… I think it changed many things, it didn't provide the same opportunities for people to socialize, or adolescents to socialize.

Int. n. 9

Q: Could you describe briefly your study and working experiences?
A: I've been working and studying at Concordia and my PhD here, this is my fifth year.. I'm working with the center as an evaluation specialist on the innovative

social pedagogic project – and that's been around a year. I focus mostly on race and construction within educational structures, specifically in Canada, and black identity in Canadian universities.

(…)

Q: And so how did you start collaborating here at Cslp?

A: So, I had applied for a job a while back with the center but I didn't get that. So they kept my CV in the database. And when this job became available they got in touch with me, because my experience was appropriate, because I did work a lot on research institutions before as well. So I started with Vivek and he's also my co supervisor now, after I started, I said, maybe I'll have to drive my committee supervisor for some changes. I've been here only for a year.

Q: And how did you engage in prevention?

A: Actually I don't work with prevention, so I can't answer to this question..

Q: Ah ok, let's skip this question. And could you tell me more about your first experiences here in how have you learned to do what to do and then with whom? I think in your case, you had already your experience. You can tell me in general.

A: I think the main difference between previously and now it's I did program evaluation before that this is the first time I'm doing program evaluation for projects or programs that engage with the community. So this is kind of a new landscape for me. But I've been working closely with the brain trust, everyone in the brain trust, but I've been also working closely with project coordinators in Chicoutimi and in Edmonton. We meet every now and then for evaluation, what we call evaluation sessions or workshops, depending on when it's been interesting, I would say because we don't necessarily have access to the communities with which they work with directly. So it's also a different territory for me, how to develop mechanisms, to receive participant feedback without our physical presence.

Q: And can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you in with whom? How have you felt?

A: I think what I've mentioned earlier about how it can be a bit of a struggle to do evaluation if you don't have access to participants, but that's also something that I'm developing within my evaluation framework is that we're also giving complete and full authority to our collaborators to work with the communities. So in sense, we do need to respect the needs and the privacy of different community members for taking them to different workshops funded by the project. So I think that is not necessarily a critical episode, but it's a critical part of the way of building the evaluation framework – How do we build evaluation without receiving direct access to participants? So how do we facilitate the channels of communication between us and collaborators and at the same time, we are receiving feedback, and also not overstepping on the privacy boundaries of communities?

Q: Can you talk a bit more about your evaluation process? Is it like quantitative, qualitative?

A: It will probably be a mix of both. So this is a three years program. So what we're doing is we're doing process evaluation and outcome evaluation. And throughout that there are… because it's again, a long and lengthy project what I'm doing is that I'm developing also an evaluation mechanism for the end of every year. And where we see whether the projects that have been implemented in the first year should and can continue. That feeds into as well sustainability of a given project because a lot of projects take place and then that's the end of it, right? But I think the work that we're doing with ISP is very important in a sense that it engages community partners with university partners and that's an important gap between theory and practice in my opinion. So what was a question

So this is the method is mostly what we do is have evaluation check in after every before and after every event. So it's kind of like an interview but more of understanding the process how it's happening. A lot of times I will also go to some of the workshops, if possible for me to field notes. Sometimes I would partake in the workshops to have also the perspective of participants, and as evaluator at the same time. Although of course that creates some sort of little bit of… I can't necessarily separate participant from evaluator when I'm in the workshop, but at the same time, I think being there to see how different workshops align with the general project is very important. But yeah, a lot of interviews with our collaborators, so that has to take place frequently and we set them up in accordance to the schedule of their workshops. We're also I think I work closely with the documentation specialists. So what we're creating this sort of a platform for evaluation documentation, where we should describe what's happening, and that's part of being transparent as well with that something that's available out there for a viewer to view and to know what is happening throughout the project. And we write it at least from our perspective, but at the same time using that we're giving the space and platform for our collaborators to share specific things if they want to. And that way we're not overshadowing the work that they're doing.

Q: Can you try to explain one example of the workshops that are done?

A: Yeah, sure. So they've had in Chicoutimi for example, and maybe you'll learn more about that... did a two days workshop if I'm not mistaken, and they work with indigenous communities. So we're not sure how the workshop is structured, but from what we understand there's a lot of group activities. There's a lot of work also between university partners and community organizations to see what the community needs and how to frame the needs of the community within a specific project. I think also another example would be what they're doing in Edmonton, which is using, I guess, art improv, to address issues of, I guess discrimination and anti discrimination mechanisms. You know, it's also engaging with those partners

with their community partners using that particular tool of Improv, and they're an Improv group as well. So that's it's very interesting to witness in action and the last workshop I went to, it's more about kind of understanding how people slow down or understand the concept of slowness and academia specifically after the pandemic. And the way that workshop it's also using art pedagogy. So the way that we're trying to as well Yeah, exactly. And they also use such specific art prompts for us to do during so they had that activities or on the deputy centered around it, but it's more of free flowing. So one of the things like that there is to see how that fits into that.

Q: Thank you. So, the second or third parts are more specific about radicalization and radicalization prevention, even if you don't work directly with that, I'll try to show you the questions and then if there is a question that don't have anything to say, we'll skip it, okay? So, the first one would be: in your own words and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: I guess first of all, it has an element of like, there's a lack of no necessarily choice, but there's some sort of informing, for civil processing, in a sense that you've become radicalized by some sort of power. So be it politics, be it religion. But I guess radicalization is some sort of separation from the norm. I guess also synonymous with extreme - I'm not sure, however, I don't really have much familiarity with it. But I wonder if there's a difference between extremism and radicalization. I feel there would be and I feel like that would be a significant difference to distinguish the two. But I do I mean, just from reading and being exposed to news and I mean, I'm from an African Middle Eastern country, and I grew up in the Middle East. So the way things are put into perspective in the news, at least not Middle Eastern news is that Islam and radicalization in particular. But I do think again, extremism and radicalization can be different.

Q: What do you notice, which main difference do you notice in this field between Canada and Middle East? What is your perception?

A: I mean, I'm not sure what the views are in Canada, but also they seem to me that the general assumption is radicalization is synonymous with religious extremism and I think particularly since we are in the West, kind of anti-East and Islamophobic perspective is that Muslims are radical. I would say that because of being in Qatar, I think it's not necessarily the way it is perceived as that radicalization is not only within Islam, and a lot of other fields and practices have that as well. But I think we are generally speaking, I think I have been more exposed to it than I was here the concept of radicalization being universal instead of just a specific concept, because I think here the tendency is to be to paint the West as a beacon of freedom, safety, but I don't necessarily think it's the case because I think for example, that the far right can be radicalized and I think that's the case here. I would consider that a lot

of racist attacks that happen or they're kind of part of that radical agenda. Like anti, I don't know, perhaps specifically anti black radical agenda.

Q: Which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization? You have already mentioned some -extremism and racism? Is there something else that comes to your mind?

A: I think also with gender, if we think about the some of the few attacks on woman groups in particular, or that were a target that target woman and specific in the US and one here in Montreal. That's also within that. I think what I'm trying to say is that I guess anything, there's a radicalization aspect to a lot of things, a lot of social issues. There's a radicalization aspect, but I don't know again, how if you can be radicalized and commit an act of violence, or does that mean that you're an extremist? If we commit the act of violence, would that be considered as extremism or radicalization.

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people? The question was during the activities, but not necessarily doing activities, I mean also in general? If yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: I would say no, I haven't. I was assumed to be a radicalized person just because of my passport and where I come from. So a lot of times when I entered through European countries I get unnecessary checks because people, for some reason….

For example, when I travel from Sudan, they assume that I am traveling to Syria to partake in the war there for example, so there's oftentimes have

They're clear, especially when you're at the airport. The treatment is very clear. You're not going to be told why you're being held for extra interviewing or why we need to take your passport and verify it, but at times, they do tell you it's because they need to verify you're not traveling here for the wrong reasons…

Q: So the last part is about radicalization prevention. So again, let's see if you can tell me about your experience? The first question would be Could you describe the steps upon project on this topic, to which will have contributed from the beginning until the end, but maybe you don't have experience with that… From your point of view, what are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently - so here maybe you could try to answer even if you don't work directly with that? I think you have seen and heard about the prevention, what is your opinion and even from outside?

A: I mean, I guess prevention activities need to be educational, but they also need to be context specific for I don't think you can design a universal prevention activity. That's my opinion, because I think it depends on what you're preventing, what aspect of radicalization you're addressing because radicalization as a concept may be universal, but how it's practiced, I think is very context specific. But I wouldn't, I haven't really engaged with radicalization prevention, so I don't know exactly how to approach it.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: I think it needs to start very early on, because I think these ideas develop in specific spaces, different social spaces, they develop also in schools. They develop in the households, I think there needs to be an approach where we assume that all entities contributing to an individual's life or educational in a way. And this is also the importance of keeping collaborations between educational institutions and different social spaces, like community organizations because I think these have a very big role on educating on not what's right and what's wrong, but at least what's wrong. What should not what are considered to be acts of violence or thoughts that are violent. But I do think it's very important to start early on, and I don't think they should come in as like a treatment they need to be put in place. This is not to assume that people will be radicalized, or at least as radicalized is just to kind of stay clear of that pattern of radicalization. But I do think there are things that they don't have to explicitly be ordered under this area of radicalization, but they can be inserted into the curricula somehow and this is why I think conversations about religion, about race, about sexuality need to be addressed at a very early on in educational curricula… and community organizations to develop also workshops and rather than simply to speak about the acceptance of other, regardless of what the other is.

Q: So this this would be one: acceptance of the other. What else comes to your mind?

A: I definitely think dialogue is part of it… because conversations to be had me speak about this often is that how do we address these conversations that come up? Or how do we encourage people to say what they have to say and then take it from there? But I think it's often very difficult to draw the line between freedom of speech and hate speech, and at times, so speech can be very hateful, but it's not necessarily very easy for communities who are exposed to frequent hate speech for them to accept it and to continue conversation with that. I think we put a lot of burden on communities that are impacted by radicalization or communities that are impacted by hate speech or impacted by hate in general for them to educate. But there's also a role in society as a whole, to educate and to be educated because we're, frankly speaking, people need to kind of take that educational initiative. But at the same time, these are very awkward conversations. Like I often speak to people about how awkward or uncomfortable it can be for people to speak about race for communities who are marginalized, because there is this lack of knowledge surrounding it. And this is why we need to incorporate that into every aspect of life from a very young age. Like for example, we can't live in a society where we assume that everyone is the same because reality is speaking for power structures. Everyone wants the same thing, right? We might be to assume that we're equal that how we're treated or not

treated equally. So that assumption itself I feel like it can be harmful because it stops us from doing the necessary work to actually move forward. I think acknowledging that problems are there is the very foundational to the development of mechanisms to stop the problems… so I definitely think dialogue is another thing.

Q: Okay, thank you. The last question is how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective overtime?

A: I think they need to be tested out. Speaking about this from very different perspective, and this is a project that I'm working on another project on campus, with another professor at the Education Department on digital literacy, developing interventions to help high school students to evaluate online resources. And what we're doing now is first is that we put it forward, we engage specifically with the teachers will be teaching the lessons. We run several feedback channels between us and then and then we actually tried out the intervention in schools. I think that's very important is to test it out because there's a process of trial and error that has to happen before we actually put something forward that is sustainable. But I do think there is an element that's necessary which is maybe related directly to my role, which is evaluation, there needs to be an evaluation mechanism that takes that into consideration. And if sustainability is one of the goals, as it should be, these projects need to be evaluated, but we also need to kind of to develop something sustainable is to see if that works for the groups that we're targeting. I guess the word target is very militant, so the groups that we're working with, so… to see what they need because at times we develop things that are not necessarily very needed and that's why they don't really care for.

One of the issues also with the field of evaluation is that usually in every space there's a kind of a power structure and even that field needs to be diversified quite a bit. And I think this is maybe one of the things that I'm liking about this project is that my role as evaluator is very friendly… instead of being kind of from outside coming in as an external evaluator, and I think that gives you a little bit of it's a it's a plus, because you become very closely engaged with the people that you work with and the projects that are put forward. So you have a state of seeing what works and what actually not, and that's very important and I do think also coming from like the background that I come from, working with different community organization brings them to something to the field. So I think the role or evaluators need to have some sort of experience with the field they are working with.

Int. n. 10

(…)

Q: How did you engage in prevention?

A: There were two attacks in Montréal between 2014 and 2015, and in that period there were cases of young people leaving for Syria. Government consulted a group of experts to try to understand the problem - in particular, it was decided to analyze the role of the internet and families in the radicalization process. My thesis dealt with the impact of Islamic videos on young people, that's how I started working with prevention.

I have worked with Cprlv, and I still collaborate with them, but not frequently.

We created there a helpline, that received more than 1,000 calls over the years. Sometimes from the center it is enough to just give reassurance about the situation described and explain to the family member that it is not problematic, but sometimes they perceive risks and have to design an intervention. There is no one-size-fits-all solution; you have to adapt and be creative.

Q: Can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you when with whom and how have you felt? The first thing that comes to your mind?

A: In general, I think in the early times the positioning of the organization and the way the organization worked with law enforcement and the police services was not completely well defined. So that was very strange at the beginning because the organization was completely independent from law enforcement. But at the same time, there was some confusion. I think this situation led to several I would say typical, kind of misunderstanding between the center and law enforcement. But very quickly, I think we defined ourselves and we've decided that if we really wanted to make this work, we had to require distance from law enforcement and from police services. And so that attention that was that was that was there between the center and law enforcement because they were thinking that okay, we should go cooperate more closely and at the same time, we wanted to differentiate ourselves from law enforcement. I think that was not simple at the beginning, because there was a lot of pressure in terms of police services really pushing to have information, saying that they were not available that way, because we didn't want to communicate information about individuals that were requesting our help. So that was the situation and at the same time, there was other critics, coming from people working in social services, healthcare systems, that we're seeing the CPRLV as too close to the Police Services and law enforcement. So that was really uncomfortable for me and the CPRLV in general – at the beginning, to try to find the right position… being between… not being too close to the services and at the same time not being too antagonistic towards them because that's that was the main challenge and it's still a critical challenge that CPRLV is facing. Because it's something that I encountered all the time I was at CPRLV kind of challenge to position the organization.

(…)

Q: So, the second part of the interview is about radicalization. The first one would be: in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: The definition that I have of radicalization is the same that the CPRLV has been working on. Okay. It's this idea that radicalization is this kind of this reunification of belief that can lead towards violence - if the people don't have the critical distances towards those beliefs, and I think that's the way I define it.

Q: Which other concepts would you link to radicalization?

A: It took me several years… and I've been working a lot on that. But when I entered the field, there was just a concept of terrorism. And so then the concept of radicalization emerged… and beginning of the center, we were working with radicalization, violence and terrorism. And so radicalization was leading to violence or radicalization was leading to terrorism… and trying to develop these theoretical thinking about how to frame radicalization or how to think about radicalization…. I was always uncomfortable with the way of radicalization was linked directly to violence and to terrorism. And it took me few years to realize that there was a missing concept in the middle between radicalization, violence or radicalization and terrorism, and this missing concept was extremism and violent extremism. And so for me, I think there is a continuity between radicalization that can be good or bad. There is no… for me radicalization is a neutral concept, it' neither good or bad. It's describing the fact that someone is getting more entrenched into his belief. So it can be good can be bad. But extremism it's kind of the negative side of radicalization, because it's describing this entrenchment of belief that is actually in break with the rest of the society and violent extremism is the next step. So those beliefs in a breakup with the society that are leading toward violence, and there are different aspects of violence that can be hate crimes, that can be terrorism. And so it's pretty much how I finally decided to see and to frame theoretically, this idea of radicalization.

Q: And the last part is about prevention. What are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities and is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: I think the way we tried to develop prevention activities at Cprlv... Again, I think it was through trials and errors for many months.. but I think there was one moment when I realized that in the PCV fail…. We tried to reinvent something that is, has been already invented by other fields. And when I'm saying that, I don't know why after doing you know, awareness activities, training activities, I realized that okay, all these kinds of prevention activities have been already developed. Somehow, on different forms by other fields, which are the prevention of criminality, health prevention, for example. And so I realized that okay, prevention is quite universal. The only thing that is changing is the content of what you're trying to prevent, but

methods and the way of doing prevention is always the same. It's universal prevention. And so when I understood that I was like, Okay, so that's, that's a way of thinking about a phenomenon is quite simple. And you can pretty much develop all intervention activities in making sure that you're going to have an impact on what you're trying to prevent. Because I think the big challenge in many PCV programs is the fact that they don't really know what they are trying to prevent. And sometimes they don't make a link between the activities that they are developing and the real impact that they have on prevention, because they, they are, they aren't reflecting exactly about what they are trying to prevent. So for example, you have many activities about diversity, tolerance, stuff like that. They are important, but what are they really trying to prevent in terms of PCV it's not always clear if it's if it's if it's developing tolerance, intercultural dialogue. Okay. That's what you're trying to, to to develop in order to prevent violent extremism. And if it's that, you have to make sure that your activities are connected directly to this development of intercultural thinking, that kind of stuff, but that's not always the case in PCV. Sometimes it is much more general, much more clearly defined. And so I think one of the key challenge for PCV activities that it's not well, clear, right, it's very often developed with common knowledge. But it's not very it's not very researched sometimes, because people think, Oh, if people are getting radicalized and falling into violent extremism, it's because they, they are not tolerant. If we make them tolerant, they are not going to go to violent extremism.

Q: You kind of anticipated my following question that was, what are the main capacities you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: So, primary prevention, I think it's a general world. And I will still use you know, the model of universal prevention for health, for criminality prevention. At Universal prevention level, you have two dimensions: one is making sure that people are aware about the phenomenon. So if you want to prevent in healthcare, heart disease, for example, you have to make sure that people know about the disease and when they are actually exposing themselves. And then you have also to make sure that they know what they can do to prevent having heart disease, and so for PCV, that's the same. You have to first explain to people what is violent extremism, and I think that's what part of the of the universal primary prevention, and the second element you have to teach people what they should do, not to get involved into violent extremism. What are the skills, what are the knowledge that they can build, to prevent or prevent others to go into violent extremis. I think these are two dimensions that are critical for prevention.

I think one of the key critical elements, it's not tolerance in maybe the way we commonly understand it - it's not about you know, tolerating others, stuff like that. I think one key component is to, for people to be able to always think in grey, I mean to push against these kind of black and white polarization thinking that is so

common, and that gets faster by social media, by how political discourses are developed, and I think it's easy to say, oh, yeah, it's easy to see in gray and to call it but in reality, we all do that. It's not just the people who don't have education who think black and white... Even ourselves, people are having a PhD degree, sometimes think black and white… and I think the black and white thinking is a key element that is leading people towards radicalization and extremism. If you work on that, you are going to prevent a mass, a huge majority of people of falling into this first black and white thinking and then falling to the extremism process.

Q: Okay, thank you. And the last question is: how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: I think the first element is about capacities. And for P/CVE, I think it's the same with other prevention field that existed in the past. Sometimes when the issue is, is very present, is crucial for parties. They're putting a lot of money, capacities and resources towards the prevention of these specific issues. When the issue is not any more important or not in the media, it's like… the authorities are just cutting the money and saying oh, okay, so realization of this work is not as important so, let's invest in something else. So, the discussion of the year is not about radicalization, but about gangs. So this kind of effects of politics, of investing and putting it forth on one issue and then moving on to another issue when the first issue is nothing more the hot one. I think it's really detrimental for the sustainability of PVE in general, but intervention in general, because you take years to build expertise, to build capacities, for people to have the knowledge to raise awareness, and then you move on with another issue and use your expertise or your capacities? People are not getting awareness more about the issue. And so I think, yeah, the fact that authorities are committed to sustain the prevention of PVE, I think that's one key element. And the other one is the fact that you are able to build a strong ecosystem and infrastructure in terms of prevention. Because if you don't build this infrastructure and you don't get routinized practices of actors in the field - so schools, teachers, social workers, stuff like that. In 2/5 years, they are not going to think about radicalization, they're going to think about other issues. So you lose your capacity to do prevention on the ground. That's one key element that is very detrimental. When you want to sustain that kind of, of work on the longtime.

Int. n. 11

(…)
Q: How did you start collaborating with the UNESCO chair?
A: Ah, I started collaborating with them through David actually, when I started my master, I had I had quite an interest for radicalization and extremism.. prior to my masters, I worked summer internships with the CPRLV… I worked with them for

two summers. So with them I worked on a the development of an awareness campaign on critical thinking through community organizations.

I worked with B. on this campaign, it's still online. It's called What if I was wrong? Yeah, so we developed it all. And we publicized it by going through community and just raising awareness and talking about some topics from the, from the, from the campaign itself, but yeah, so you know, with once I had this kind of experience, I did two summers there and then I wanted to, like go more into academics' research.. and that's how I ended up going to the chair I called. I spoke with David and I told him like, I've done a lot of practical work with the Cprlv but now I would like to move on to more Academic research stuff. So that's how I ended up there.

Q: How did you decide to engage in prevention?

A: Well, the very first prevention I did was very with the CPRLV because we were on the field and speaking with youth and people from this, like, racial communities and stuff like that, but why it's kind of hard to explain. I've always had an interest for helping my community which is the Arabic and Muslim community. And I don't know, I felt like there was a connection between violent extremism and national security which national security was something that I had prior interested in, and radicalization and extremists I like we saw in on the news, but I didn't quite understand the groups and the movement. So I wanted to know how people could like just get into it that deeply. So when I saw an opportunity of working at the center at the CPRLV it was kind of a nice first step to get into it. Like to get in the prevention level.

Q: Can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you in with whom? How have you felt?

A: Okay, well clearly the first major issue I had to get myself like, along with the CPRLV when we first made contact with the community organizations because I, I never really did that kind of outreach. And I felt like it was very important from my part to use certain language, just the communication that I needed to have with young people talking about it, you don't really want to get into radicalization at first, because it's kind of a hard word to understand. It implicates a lot of things... So you want to adapt your communication level to them so that they understand you and that that was a major issue I had at first. I've learned a lot from people around me on the team. There was people younger than me and people older than me at the CPRLV at the time so we kind of had both opinions on it. So it was just a question of adapting.

Q: And what about UNESCO chair? Do you have something in mind?

A: One thing that was pretty hard was at the beginning of the of writing the report of MEI (Ministry of Economics and innovation), we had like, a big like.. David and Marie-Eve had a big, big, big idea. And at the beginning it was kind of hard to seize what they really wanted out of it out of it. So we kind of started in multiple direction.

So when we started this a report…. So when we did this, it kind of started in a bunch of different directions and different angles. So for a research auxiliary, it's kind of hard to see myself, like the work that I was doing was it like… Where would it go? So it was hard to fit in. But through meetings and stuff like that by asking the right questions, we've kind of figured it out. But that was a that was difficult at the beginning.

Q: Okay, thank you. So the second part of the interview is about radicalization. The first question is: in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: I would define it as like a linear… multi linear chain of thoughts which would bring you to… not a simple answer, but I would say that…. it's hard to tell in English because I'm mainly French…

[Q: if you want to say something in French, go ahead. I'm sorry, I forgot to tell you at the beginning]

A: Je définirai la radicalisation comme un construit idéologique que.. au départ on peut avoir un pluralité d'opinions, de façons de voir les choses, puis tranquillement par des éléments externes, par des facteurs de vulnérabilité, on arrive a une rigidification de tout ce qui si pense, de tout ce qu'on a dans la tête à cause de notre environnement, tout se déconstruit, les expériences qu'on a vécu… c'est important dire que la radicalisation n'est pas toujours violente. C'est une rigidification des idées, mais pas nécessairement violente ou que veut être un' influence pour les autres non plus.Il y a des gents qui sont été radicaux dans leur vies, mais ont fait des changements dans la société – Martin Luther King, Malcom-X… ils ont fait des mouvements pour les libertés individuels. Donc c'est pas toujours négative, mais reste une rigidification des idéaux.

Q: Okay, thank you. [I'll keep on doing the questions in English if you don't mind, but feel free to switch to French whenever you want.] So which concepts do you consider as linked radicalization?

A: Ideas, extremism… maybe also political views, maybe hate… what else… discrimination, loneliness,

maybe oppression but I'm not sure.

Q: Thank you. And have you ever met radicalized people doing their activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: Yeah, we met we met once… actually there were three.. there were two people that we interviewed at the CPRLV, but there were once radicalized, and now they were not. So when we Yeah. So when we when I met them personally, they weren't. They weren't any more there were skinheads at the base. But they were not when we when we interviewed them. So maybe it's not that useful. And there was one but I didn't really exchange with him. So because there was there was like, a clear distance between like me when I was at the CPRLV and radicalized people that

would come for interventions or stuff like that. So I didn't really like and I didn't really intervene with them, so…

Q: Thank you. So, the third and last part is about prevention activities. The first question is: could you describe the steps of one project on this topic to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: Well, clearly the awareness campaign. Well, during first my first internship there, we constructed the whole thing. So creating objectives, the principal mandate, strategies for the public, the outreach strategy, who we wanted to reach, the communities... So this is clearly the project that I and it's it was very centered on preventing radicalization and extremism.

[So, the question was about the steps of the project. I don't know if you were there at the beginning, when it was decided what to do, was there a mandate?]

A: The mandate was to raise awareness and to build critical thinking… I , there when they voted the project, but once they wanted to put the project in place, and so that's when we that's when we entered that when we started working on it. So the steps the first steps were developing the documentation. So it was about writing everything that we could about it. So such as agreeing on the mandate agreeing on the objectives what are the results we want to meet? Agreeing on which committee to reach and then the following year, it was the steps of putting it out there. So, there was a lot of graphics needs, just to put it into image, to try to… it would be like easier for people to just see what we meant and try to create a bond. So we actually put like, a big strategy of diffusion, like in the metro in bus stations and industry.

[Was it used also in schools?]

A: Yeah, it was in school, we developed actually a cash educational like program for teachers to create more space into there.

Q: What are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: I think in preventing radicalization, I think, like there's… because there's different classes of people that you want to address and these different ages of people that, like you're not going to address them by the same communication channel. So I would think one of the main thing I should improve in order to prevent would be to adapt the discourse differently from talking to a 15 year old, who's asking legitimate questions about society and about everything, versus talking to a 45 year old who has a bunch of experiences and who's his like we, like we said earlier, maybe who's rigidification of ideas is way more advanced than someone at 15 year old who's a little more unsure of what he's thinking. So I think there's a lot of adaptation on the discourse, when you're trying to prevent and I would say, maybe try to speak about these subjects, even if radicalization sounds kind of harsh or difficult to address. It's, if we're not talking about it, there's someone who's going to talk about it. And he's gonna take the curiosity before the prevention units. So if

the recruiters of ISIS or the recruiters of skin-nazi groups they reach you, and then you don't even know what is a rigidification of your own thoughts. You can't really reflect on it, especially if you're young. So that's why I think talking about it is and being adapted, like adapted discourse, but at the same time, like it's important to say that to say some maybe some difficult words because someone will eventually use them anyway.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Well, I would say yeah, critical thinking for sure. That would be like pretty important for me, but we could talk about polarization, which could be something pretty important to address.

Then we could say, inclusion, diversity.. and just not talking about just only diversity but what comes with it, what are the positive impacts of it.

Q: Okay, thank you. How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Well, first, I would say when they are integrated into educational spaces, like if, if teachers at a young age are already using these tools to promote, critical thinking, inclusion and working with the young, the young public, I think that's a good way to make it sustainable and so that it lasts and I mean, maybe focus, like publicity and the presence online, definitely could play a big role because people are spending maybe 60% of their days online. So yeah, there's a lot of policies that could be done about it by the by the government, by developing public policing about it. Make it sustainable about hate crimes. There's a lot of that could be done around that. Trying to get resources out to promote it, but to promote these same topics that we just talked about.

INT. N. 12

Q : Est-ce que tu peux décrire brièvement tes expériences d'études et professionnelles ?

R : Ben je vis avec mon âge, je ne sors pas de l'école, donc j'ai fait à l'époque, il faudrait. Je me souviens de mes années, mais c'est bon avec le profil des Roms, ça fait un peu une vingtaine d'années qu'eux. Un bac maîtrise en sociologie. J'aurais d'abord fait des études un peu en économie, mais je me rendais compte. C'était pas pour moi, c'est tellement dogmatique, mais bref, sur un autre sujet. Après ma maîtrise en sociologie, je suis allée travailler dans différents domaines, surtout en communication, puis éventuellement en politique. Donc je faisais de la, j'étais coordonnateur d'une boîte de communication, donc on faisait du web, des messages, du messager, de la rédaction, des slogans. C'était le fun, c'était une coopérative. Puis on travaillait uniquement avec des organisations de gauche, donc du

communautaire, du politique. Mais tout ça, c'est connoté politiquement. C'était pour ainsi donner les outils pour qu'ils fassent de la meilleure communication.

Je suis né à peu près ou j'habite maintenant, donc à mi chemin entre Montréal et Sherbrooke. Puis je suis arrivé du dit. Je suis déménagé à Montréal pour étudier dans très gros cégep à 17 ans. Puis j'ai habité là jusqu'à la fin de ma maîtrise parce que j'habitais un peu plus au Québec. Mais je suis revenu travailler essentiellement en communications. J'étais à Montréal, mais je travaillais à distance. Puis idem après un client de gauche en communication sur un parti politique au Québec qui s'appelle Québec solidaire, puis un parti de gauche. Il y en a évidemment qui disent d'extrême gauche, mais il n'y a rien d'extrémiste dans les propositions de ce parti clairement à gauche. Donc, prendre par exemple une meilleure égalité des revenus, une plus grande implication de l'État dans l'économie, donc rien d'extrémisme. J'ai travaillé avec eux en communication ou stratégie politique et puis j'ai réussi ce que j'ai beaucoup aimé et ce qui va marquer. Mais après seulement un moment. Mon parcours gérer la démocratie interne du parti puisque des partis ou c'est juste le chef qui décide de tout. Mais Québec solidaire avait la particularité d'être un parti qui souhaitait avoir une démocratie interne très très très très active. Donc ça, tu sais, ça nécessite toute la médication de débats internes, les prises de décisions, tout ce qui vient en amont d'une prise de décision, tout ça.

Donc en gros, c'est la somme des tâches. Ceci dit, je passais le huit ans, je commençais à avoir l'impression de faire, d'avoir un peu le tour du jardin. Puis j'ai un ami intime qui m'a suggéré qui était prof d'université à l'Université Saint-Paul, école d'innovation sociale. Il s'appelle P., qui m'a suggéré des contrats de recherche pour diversifier un peu parce que j'avais beaucoup aimé la recherche. J'avais travaillé quand même sur des projets quand j'étais au bac, à la maîtrise. Donc j'avais travaillé pour des profs comme auxiliaire de recherche. Mais j'avais beaucoup aimé. Tiens, ça me tente. Fait que j'ai fait des projets avec P., qui a fini par me mettre en lien avec David pour faire des projets communs. Donc P. travaillait surtout côté sécurité militaire, mais il voulait développer avec moi un projet qui était plus sur la protection de la démocratie, donc faire le lien entre la démocratie comme facteur de pacification sociale en quelque sorte. Mais il m'avait parlé de ça au milieu de la sécurité, pour leur dire s'il y a une démocratie fonctionnelle. Bien les risques, les risques de dérapage, les enjeux de sécurité pourraient être améliorés. Donc c'est un peu la piste de départ qu'on avait. Puis ben c'est comme ça ça.

J'ai commencé en 2020.

Ça me donne un parcours de recherche quand même assez court. Et puis donc, c'est ça qui est puissant. Philippe est en congé de santé actuellement, donc je travaille seulement qu'avec la chaire. Donc on avait des projets sur les temps, mais nous en entendre parler. On avait des projets sur le conspirationnisme surtout. Puis là, on

est en train... Là, je vais prendre en partie la relève de Sylvana cet automne pour faire de la coordination de la chaire. Parce que, évidemment, j'ai un background de coordination avec les projet. Euh, mais je vais aussi continuer la recherche. Donc on peut continuer à développer un programmes de recherche. C'est justement la piste de le lien démocratie et radicalisation.

Q : Donc maintenant tu travailles comme coordinateur et rechercher?

R : À partir de septembre, j'aurais coordonnateur, probablement pas temps plein pour être capable de travailler aussi sur des projets de recherche spécifiques.

Q : Donc je crois que tu as déjà répondu la deuxième question… c'était comment a tu commencé à collaborer avec Unesco-prev?

R : Donc, c'est ça…c'est Philippe qui m'a mise en lien avec David.

Q : Et c'est peut être aussi le troisième. C'était comment? Est ce que tu, toi, engagé dans la prévention? Mais je sais pas si tu te considères….engagé

R : engagé dans la prévention… Pas tellement. C'est à dire? On fait, on fait des projets de recherche. C'est sûr qu'on se demande toujours comment ça peut être impliqué. Mais puis, je ne sais pas si ça va cadrer ou pas, mais je le lance quand même. C'est effectivement l'intuition qu'on veut tester. C'est que de préserver dialogue, de préserver des institutions démocratiques qui permettent que tout se discute et que tout s'échange, est une prévention, mais une prévention très primaire. Donc on sort presque de la question de la radicalisation, puis de la prévention. Mais pour moi, la santé démocratique et un vecteur de prévention potentiel très puissant, mais qui est tellement en amont que la question de la radicalisation qu'on est un peu à cheval. Est ce que c'est de la prévention, de la radicalisation ou c'est juste du bon fonctionnement de la société? Vous savez, on est, on est pas mal sur la clôture à mon avis. Mais oui, dans ce sens là, ce sur quoi je travaille, je considère que c'est de la prévention.

Q: Est-ce que tu peux me parler un peu plus de tes premières expériences ici? Comment as tu appris à faire ce que tu fais et avec qui?

R: Ok. Apprendre à apprendre à faire de la recherche. J'en avais déjà fait à l'époque. Donc ça fait quand même longtemps avec plein de projets de recherche, avec plein de profs. Donc j'avais une petite base de quanti, une base de quali aussi, d'analyses, de discours, d'analyses documentaires. Oui, j'avais des gens, un peu tous les outils de base. C'est sûr que quand j'y suis revenu, comme 20 ans plus tard, il fallait avec tout ça, c'est.

(…)

Q: Ok, merci. Et est-ce que tu peux me décrire un épisode critique de ton travail? Ce qui s'est passé ou est ou était tout avec et avec qui? Comment tout t'est senti?

R : Est bien la finalisation du rapport. C'est un premier rapport sur le conspirationnisme quand même est un peu intense. C'est à dire? On avait quand même une grosse équipe pour la taille du projet. On était quand même cinq, six,

sept. Beaucoup des des auxiliaires de recherche qui avaient ramassé des données, qui avaient rédigé des bouts de textes. Tout ça, c'était ramassé dans un document, mais c'est un peu donner qui c'est pas trop clair. Qu'est ce que le rapport a essayé de dire? Il y avait plein de données, mais c'est un peu compliqué ce qu'il essaie de dire. Il y avait plusieurs méthodologies, il y avait un sondage, il y avait une analyse informatique des réseaux entre les différents leaders conspi. Il y avait une analyse de contenu, de discours que moi j'avais fait. Tout ça se ramasse un peu pêle mêle. Puis bien, on est en retard et je ne sais pas pourquoi. Mais on est arrivé que le document était complètement bordélique. Puis il n'y a pas vraiment personne qui prenait le lead, c'est à dire que tout le monde avait l'air d'essuyer sur David Marie-Ève pour dire « C'est vous, les chercheurs, faites la finalisation », mais dans les faits, ils étaient occupés. Puis, il y a plein d'affaires qu'on pouvait faire, qu'on n'avait pas nécessairement besoin que ce soit des chercheurs qui le fassent, même si c'est peut être pour ça que je me ramasse aujourd'hui avec des tâches de coordination. J'ai pris le truc, je suis super fiable et je vais le prendre mon document. Je vais essayer de raconter quelque chose qui se tient. Je vais peaufiner le langage. Les liens entre les sections de la biblio fait que dans le fond, j'ai pris un draft de rapport qui était plus un assemblage de morceaux pour prendre. Puis je suis content du résultat. Un rapport final a quand même 150 pages mais milestones.

Puis qu'à partir de là. Mais là, David Marie avons pu prendre la relève, le lire, faire quelques commentaires. Dans les faits, le rapport, c'était pas mal fini. Ça fait que c'est un enjeu. C'est à dire que les chercheurs ont dû, en étant limité puis en besoin, n'étaient appuyés. Mais et souvent, les gens qui collaborent sur les projets, à mon avis, ils n'osent pas aller loin, puis proposer quelque chose. Ils livrent leurs morceaux, puis ils disent vraiment mon travail est fait, mais ça prend quelqu'un qui porte le lead d'un projet. Puis je pense, ça, ça s'appelle de la coordination, même s'il n'y est pas chercheur. Donc pour réussir à ramasser tous les morceaux, mais pas juste, c'est pas juste une tâche administrative, c'est une tâche de recherche. C'est une tâche ou il faut que tu sache. Qu'est ce que l'équipe peut créer d'intéressant ou de pertinent? Qu'est ce qu'on peut dire de le fun avec les données que là? Donc, ça ressemble à une tâche de chercheur, mais il faut la faire en dehors des chercheurs, parce que là, je pense que c'est comme ça dans les autres universités. Mais ici, au Québec, les profs d'université ont beaucoup de travail. Il faut que j'enseigne, il faut que je cours genre université. Puis il faut qu'ils gèrent des équipes de recherche qui ont un temps très limité. Donc il y a quand même une zone tampon entre le staff de recherche et les profs qu'il faut réussir à combler correctement. Je pense que je pense que c'est c'est comme ça qu'on peut raconter cette histoire là de rapport qui n'en finissait plus et qui ne voulait pas sortir… Personnes prenaient le lead de la portion en premier, la portion en changeant, mais c'est une position peu délicate.

Q : Merci, merci. Donc la deuxième partie à propos de la radicalisation. Donc la première question est dans tes propres mots et très brièvement, comment définirais tu la radicalisation?

R : Ben bien, ma définition sera probablement pas standard parce qu'elle connoté par le parcours que j'ai racontée tantôt. Pour moi, c'est pour moi, c'est une mise en retrait de la société puis en l'occurrence de la démocratie. Donc c'est de se dire moi j'ai plus raison que tous mes concitoyens, puis ça me donne tous les droits sur mes concitoyens. Donc pour moi, c'est un c'est une mise à l'écart de la démocratie, c'est comme ça que je l'interprète. Ce qui fait que pour moi, la question de la violence, évidemment, est grave et elle mérite une attention, même pour moi, la radicalisation, ce point chronique bien avant ça à l'idée que je ne veux plus discuter avec quelqu'un et que je pense que mon concitoyen, il y a juste des idées complètement farfelues ou qui est complètement brain washed par le système. J'essaie de reprendre les différentes versions de cette incarnation là, mais à ce moment-là, ce qu'il n'y a plus de dialogue démocratique. Donc pour moi, la radicalisation, c'est quand tu t'es enferme dans des pensées qui pour toi sont plus importantes que les gens qui tantôt.

Q: Quels sont les concepts que tu considères comme liés à la radicalisation?

R: La gens disent que des choses dialoguent ou pensées dogmatiques. Puis… conspirationnisme ou extrémisme en général.

Q : Ok, merci. Et est ce que tu as déjà rencontré des personnes radicalisées au cours de tes activités? Et si oui, est ce que tu peux m'en dire plus?

R : Non. Pour avoir une discussion, non. J'en ai croisé puisqu'on est allé, moi et David, à la manifestation de Québec contre les mesures sanitaires pour aller voir dans quelle mesure est ce qu'il y avait des citoyens normaux, dans quelle mesure les gens là-bas étaient extrémistes? Dans les faits, ils n'étaient pas tant que ça. Il y avait quelques mouvements d'extrême droite qui étaient présents, quelques pancartes clairement conspirationnistes dont Tout le monde nous ment et Il faut se révolter. Mais non, je n'ai pas eu d'échanges avec des personnes particulièrement radicalisées.

Q : La troisième et dernière partie à propos de la prévention de la radicalisation. Est-ce que tu peux décrire les étapes d'un projet sur ce thème, auquel tu as contribuer du début à la fin?

R : Peut-être le projet sur le conspirationnisme.. on a terminé le rapport avec quand même un bon nombre de recommandations….Même si le lien avec la prévention n'est pas toujours évident. Même si c'est un peu ça qu'on veut. Donc la structuration du projet?

Bien, évidemment que si je prends ce cas-là comme exemple, tout est conditionné par la structure de financement de la recherche dans le milieu universitaire. Donc ça commence par un appel de projets de la part des ministères. En l'occurrence,

c'était tout de suite après le déclenchement de la pandémie, mais je n'y étais pas. J'ai une vision très partielle, mais tout de suite après le déclenchement de la pandémie, le gouvernement du Québec a débloqué des fonds pour différents projets de recherche pour suivre ce qui se passait. Puis, David, Marie-Ève, avec peut être d'autres à l'autre jeune, c'est le genre d'éléments qui me manquent pour lancer un truc sur plus largement désinformation. Ça a fini par être conspirationnisme plus précisément, mais sur désinformation et pandémie. Donc eux faisaient déjà ce pont là, là que je fais de plus en plus, entre la désinformation, la radicalisation, le vivre ensemble. Donc eux faisaient déjà un lien entre radicalisation puis désinformation. Hum, faque ils y ont fini par observer. Ils voulaient observer les sources de désinformation, mais aussi l'effet sur la société fait qu'il y avait d'une part à regarder l'action de certaines personnes sur Internet qui pouvaient faire la diffusion des informations et d'autre part, la réceptivité de la population à cette désinformation là et aussi leur rapport à la confiance des gouvernements ou ce genre de choses là fait que ça est devenu deux morceaux ou finalement observés qui diffusaient de la désinformation.

Eh, ils en sont rapidement venus à se dire que c'est pas de regarder le citoyen moyen qui partage quelque chose sans trop regarder les sources parce qu'ils ont fini par trouver. Puis c'est à peu près à ce moment là que j'allais devant le projet de recherche. Ce qu'ils ont fini par trouver, c'est des gens qui à longueur de semaine. Ce qu'ils font, c'est de la promotion d'une certaine vision de la pandémie négationniste. En gros, il n'y a pas de pandémie. C'est pas dangereux tout ça. Tout ça, c'est faux. Et donc ils ne faisaient pas juste de la désinformation ou il faisait un peu de conspirationnisme, c'est à dire de vouloir révéler les faussetés de la société, mais ils faisaient surtout de la propagande politique, donc c'est du qui venait vraiment et il y avait un bon public. Puis ils venaient vraiment implanter leur idéologie de départ dans le débat sur la pandémie. Donc ça, c'était d'un.

Q : D'extrême droite ?

R : Extrême droite un côté, un petit new age aussi, qui pouvait être aussi à gauche. **(…)** Et on a vu aussi peut être pas l'extrême gauche ou quoi que l'extrême gauche pris conspirationniste quand il parle des collusions des grandes entreprises du monde avec les gouvernements, c'est clairement conspirationniste, mais dans le cas de la pandémie, on ne les a pas trop entendus. Ce qu'on a eu par contre, c'est euh vaguement gauche, mais plus en santé naturelle, version un peu hippie ou beatnik qui finalement se sont ralliés à l'opposition. Mesures centrales des gens qui étaient déjà contre le vaccin par exemple, qui ne font pas nécessairement confiance à la médecine mainstream, donc qui se sont alliés avec des groupes qui étaient plus clairement d'extrême droite. Puis il y a aussi une troisième composante qui est plus

antigouvernemental, donc qui ressemble un peu à ce que tu dis. Des gens méfiants du pouvoir en général ne sont pas et ne sont pas nécessairement racistes ou sexistes, et ils ne sont pas nécessairement hippies non plus. Donc ça devient une troisième branche. Mais pour qu'on les considère comme comme extrémistes ou radicalisés, il faut qu'ils soient convaincus que l'État doit être et tout doit être complètement détruit pour qu'on réussisse à s'en sortir. Je ne parle pas de Dieu, ils sont un peu méfiants du gouvernement. C'est pas mal les trois sources, mais on s'est rendu gang. Bref, il y a, il y a, il y a des gens qui font de la propagande, que c'est comme leur action politique.

Ce n'est pas tant au niveau d'organisation, quoi, peuvent se réseauter entre eux. C'est surtout des gens qui décide de prendre la parole. Donc ça pose, ça pose un autre enjeu aussi, c'est que ce n'est pas nécessairement que les méchants de l'histoire. C'est à dire que même si on n'est pas d'accord avec vous, même si on dit que globalement il n'y a pas vraiment de débat, mais dans les faits, ils apportent leur voix dans un débat et ils ne font pas nécessairement de l'action violente. Donc il y a quelque chose au niveau de la réaction qu'il faut qu'ils soient mesurés parce qu'ils sont à la fois une contribution au débat, mais à la fois une destructuration du débat sur les mesures sanitaires en l'occurrence. Mais bref, ça. Ça nécessite des actions qui sont subtiles, mais toujours est il que ce qu'on a révélé, c'est à quel point c'est politique le travail du fonds et ou c'est apparenté à l'extrémisme dans le sens large que je mentionnais tantôt que les idées sont plus importantes que la discussion avec les concitoyens. Ils sont enfermés dans des idées, peuvent ralentir une possible avec eux, ils deviennent hargneux, ils deviennent méchants et peuvent devenir torrent. (…)

Q : Quels sont les aspects positifs et critiques des activités de prévention? Et est ce qu'il y a quelque chose que tous souhaiteraient faire différemment?

R : On peut dire que de sortir publiquement sur la question du conspirationnisme, comme David et Marie-Ève, on fait plusieurs fois. C'est de la prévention aussi, c'est à dire qu'ils vont inverser la population, que ça existe, puis peut être susciter le débat public sur la Qu'est ce qu'on fait avec ça? Le problème, c'est qu'on a de la misère à élever le débat. C'est à dire que la plupart du temps, une fois qu'on dit qu'ils sont conspirationnistes, le monde, à entendre ce qu'ils veulent bien entendre, c'est à dire qu'on considère qu'ils pensent tout croche, qu'ils n'ont pas de ligne, ils n'ont pas voix au chapitre et qu'ils sont en train de nous tuer que bref, c'est le méchant de l'histoire. Oui, mais comme je disais tantôt que l'on peut rentrer dans le penser différemment. Justement, qu'est ce que je ferais différemment? C'est que le problème, quand tu lances une recherche sur le nom conspirationnisme, c'est que ça discrédite essentiellement les gens que tu décris, parce que c'est très péjoratif, l'expression conspiration, alors que, comme je le disais, c'est des gens qui cherchent

à contribuer au débat ou ils cherchent à gagner le débat, bien sûr, mais à quelque part, ils cherchent aussi à contribuer au débat.

Donc c'est comme si l'étiquette qu'on leur donnait nous empêchait d'emblée de faire une description un peu plus subtile, de dire bien il y a de l'opposition mesures sanitaires. C'est organisé de telle manière. Plusieurs idéologies étaient impliquées. Là, à partir du moment ou on dit conspirationnisme à la fois, on fait de la sensibilisation, mais à la fois, on dirait qu'on se prive de goût, de réflexion. Comment contribuer au débat public? Les gens, il y a une liberté de croyance. Les gens peuvent croire des trucs un peu débiles. C'est pour ça pas nécessairement des idiots pour autant. Donc c'est comme si on s'en chargeait nous-mêmes dans l'étiquette, qui est pourtant un bon objet de recherche. Mais en matière de prévention, quand vient le temps de le sortir publiquement, risque d'avoir l'effet un peu contraire de ça. D'ailleurs, les ça dit souvent pas du tout les leader conspirationnistes, ça lui convient pour d'essayer de mieux contribuer au débat public. En fait, je décroche complètement.

[....]

Q : Donc là, c'était à propos des aspects positifs et critiques. Donc tu dois parler de...

R : Ce coup-là de parler publiquement de la propagande extrémiste. C'est une forme de prévention parce que les gens n'aiment pas, pas généralement se faire convaincre de quoi que ce soit du genre de réactance, donc ça peut activer la réactance. On appelle ça l'inoculation aussi d'avertir les gens de la tension. Il y a des discours qui vont tenter de vous convaincre que ce qui n'est pas inintéressant comme stratégie de prévention, parce que je dirais, c'est que ça vient avec le problème de stigmatiser les gens parce qu'on les présente comme des méchants qui essaient de convaincre, alors que ben c'est pas tout à fait aussi simple. Donc on ne veut pas que les gens tombent dans le panneau, mais on veut quand même que tu sois libre d'adhérer à des pensées, même si elles sont marginales. C'est une zone un peu délicate.

Q : Et quelles sont les principales capacités que tu considères comme important à développer dans les activités de prévention primaire?

R : Peut-être le je ne sais pas si ça répond à la question, mais c'est peut-être la question du dialogue, c'est à dire que c'est pas évident. C'est pas évident d'avoir un dialogue face aux deux. On est d'accord, il chassa du poste et à ce moment-là une allusion. Mais un petit désaccord, ça se gère bien. Mais un dialogue entre des personnes convaincues du bien fondé de leurs croyances, comme on dit, comme on l'a vu avec les anti mesures sanitaires tendance conspirationniste, mais sur ce à quoi ces gens là se sont confrontés tout aussi une autre forme d'extrémisme beaucoup plus inoffensive, qui était celle de dire ben non, c'est important les mesures sanitaires. Puis il faut écouter la science et la raison surtout. Mais bref, le dialogue, c'est pas une capacité facile à développer. On ne sait pas trop non plus si on peut

bien mettre dans une pièce des gens de nous d'un point de vue de l'autre. Mais est ce qu'il va vraiment se créer quelque chose qui vont juste se polariser encore plus, puis retourner chacun de leur bord encore plus fâché? Donc pour moi, de développer la capacité de dialogue, c'est de développer la capacité des gens d'échanger qui ressortent avec mieux que ce qu'il y avait au départ. C'est pas juste de que les gens échangent. Donc puis puis à petite échelle, c'est déjà un défi. Mais l'objectif, c'est un peu de d'activer le dialogue à l'échelle d'une société au complet. Mais comment on fait ça? Il y a les médias des fois qui nous aident. Des fois, ils nous nuisent, c'est à dire eux mêmes leur façon de dépeindre les conspirationnistes. Et qu'il fallait juste écouter la science. Ils prenaient clairement parti, ce qui n'a pas aidé. Puis les médias sociaux. Il y a des dialogues qui se passent sur les médias sociaux, des échanges, mais ça devient vite hargneux. Il n'y a pas vraiment d'arguments qui s'échangent. Donc bref, pour moi, c'est un truc de prévention qui est super intéressant et prometteur. Mais en même temps, on est un peu aux balbutiements de cette piste là et honnêtement, on ne sait pas trop encore comment on peut s'y prendre.

Q : Dernière question : comment penses-tu que les activités de prévention peuvent être rendues durables et efficaces dans le temps?

R: Des sous entendus qui font qu'à un moment donné, le truc qui fonctionne tout seul, c'est quand ils sont pris en charge par une multiplicité d'acteurs. Je dirais donc c'est sûr que quand il y a des chercheurs qui n'aiment pas vraiment notre rôle mais ou des intervenants rémunérés, c'est une chose. Mais il faut qu'à un moment donné, il faut que ça émerge des gens eux-mêmes. Donc c'est là ou du fait un changement de, un changement de culture ou un changement d'habitudes. Il se maintient lui-même parce que les gens vont faire des micro interventions. C'est bien là. Ça n'a pas de bon sens. Qu'est-ce que tu racontes là? Mais ça, ça me bouleverse. Mais j'aimerais ça qu'on s'en parle. Ou tu sais à un moment donné que la prévention de… Peu importe la forme de radicalisation qui nous intéresse… a les mains des gens eux-mêmes. C'est là où il y a une pérennité qui s'installe avec. C'est pour ça qu'il faut s'intéresser à outiller les gens. Donc on prend de l'expérience en étant des intervenants professionnels ou des académiques, mais éventuellement c'est les gens. Même si oui, il faut cibler ce genre d'actions.

INT. N. 13

Q : Est-ce que tu peux décrire brièvement tes études et tes expériences professionnelles?

R : Ok, je vais les faire en deux étapes. Premièrement, ce n'est pas parce que j'ai quand même eu, on pourrait dire, deux vies professionnelles, plusieurs, mais deux vies, comme bien des gens. Avant d'entrer à l'université, je suis rentré à l'université, moi, très tard. J'ai commencé mon bac à 31 ans. Avant ça, je travaillais surtout dans

le domaine de la restauration hôtellerie et ce que je faisais? Oui, exactement. J'ai été autant gérant de restaurants que là aussi, représentant dans des entreprises ou on équipe des restaurants, donc de A à Z. J'ai fait ça plusieurs années et en parallèle, je continue toujours de faire beaucoup de trucs un peu médiatiques représentations dans des journaux de ventes, de publicité, des trucs comme ça. Et je faisais aussi beaucoup d'humour du stand up comic. Et j'ai commencé l'université... Je suis rentré à l'université en 2004, j'ai commencé mon baccalauréat, j'ai fait un bac majeur en politique mineure, en communication. Après, j'ai fait une maîtrise en sciences politiques. Finalement. Après ça, j'ai commencé… J'ai travaillé ici pendant cinq ans. On pourrait dire à peu près entre la fin de mes études de maîtrise, de 2010 jusqu'en 2015. Et pendant cette période-là, j'ai été professionnel de recherche et on appelle ça professeur enseignant, c'est à dire voilà poste de professeur enseignant. Mais en 2015, j'ai décidé de quitter mon poste pour faire mon doctorat en sciences politiques et j'ai soutenu ma thèse il y a un peu plus d'un an maintenant.

Alors, j'ai été embauché pour travailler au département de science politique de l'Université de Sherbrooke. C'est là que j'ai connu David. Après ça, il est devenu un ami clé. Après mon doctorat, j'ai décidé de faire un post-doctorat et compte tenu que mon poste au doctorat accès beaucoup. Et le regard était porté sur les liens entre l'humour et les discours haineux pour lutter contre les discours haineux.

R : J'enseigne depuis 2009 ici. Je vais vous donner un scoop, mais il n'y est pas…. Mais il n'est pas si c'est pas, c'est pas encore complété, mais c'est presque complété. J'ai obtenu un poste de professeur au département de communication. Je devrais commencer au mois d'août. Alors. Mais j'enseigne ici depuis 2009 à l'école, au département de sciences politiques. J'enseigne aussi à l'Université de Montréal parce que mon champ principal de recherches et les communications politiques. Et j'enseigne beaucoup la communication politique.

Q : Et comment as-tu commencé à collaborer avec l'Unesco-prev?

R : Pour mon post-doctorat. Ce qui est arrivé, c'est que je voulais... Mon sujet de doctorat, c'était le vivre ensemble. C'était le lien entre l'humour... Comment est-ce que l'humour peut alimenter les stéréotypes et les préjugés religieux et culturel. Parce que oui, bien sûr, il y avait une partie qui portait sur le fait que l'humour ne permet de tisser des liens, de se rassembler, tout ça. Mais il y avait un autre aspect qui était celui de l'humour, qui stigmatise, qui alimente les préjugés. Donc c'était donc mon travail de ma thèse portait là dessus. Et quand j'ai fait une demande de financement pour le post-doctorat à un organisation ici au Québec, qui s'appelle le Fonds de recherche Québécois en sciences sociales, pour financer ma recherche, j'avais fait une demande. Ou là, il fallait trouver un angle qui pourrait être un type qui est en lien avec ce que j'avais fait auparavant, mais bien sûr, qui pouvait me mener un peu plus loin et ailleurs. Et c'est là ou la question des discours haineux m'est venue en tête et j'ai trouvé que c'était super intéressant parce que dans mes

recherches doctorales, j'avais vu une tension qui était très présente entre la liberté d'expression, l'humour et les effets de certains discours. Et parfois on les mélange avec des discours haineux notamment, ou on va cacher un discours haineux en disant c'est juste une blague. Et c'est là où dans ma demande et je devais établir des partenaires et parmi partenaire principal, j'avais la chaire et t au départ j'ai été… J'avais donc… la chaire était strictement un partenaire. C'était pas la supervision de mon post-doc. Maintenant, c'est David, mais ce n'était pas ça. C'était une autre personne, une autre institution, mais peut être financé sur deux ans. Et à la dernière année, j'ai transféré l'ensemble. Donc mon lieu principal est devenu l'Université de Sherbrooke et la Chaire. Pour travailler vraiment avec la chaire, avoir comme superviseur David en lien avec les discours haineux, les radicalismes et les contre discours. Parce que mon objectif, c'est de trouver des méthodes pour lutter contre la circulation des discours haineux.

Q : Ok, merci. Comment est-ce que tu t'es engagé dans la prévention? Je ne sais pas si tu sais, tu te considères engagé dans la prévention?

R : Euh, je vois. Oui, je dirais de plus en plus. Ouais, je …. Je pense que de plus en plus, je me considère engagé dans la prévention. Je ne me rendais pas compte, par exemple, que j'étais déjà engagé dans la prévention. Je m'aperçois que souvent, je vais aborder des sujets de tension. Je vais aborder des sujets, beaucoup dans les discours. Comment est-ce qu'on va? Les discours? Vont, vont, vont parfois radicaliser, polariser. Et ce sont des questions qui me préoccupe depuis longtemps, mais que je lis vraiment arrimées en lien avec les luttes contre les discours haineux. Ça, c'est plus récent. Je dirais de façon concrète que ce n'est post-doctorat vraiment révélé. C'est cette préoccupation de façon plus forte.

Q : Est-ce que tu peux me parler des premières expériences ici? Comment est-ce que tu as appris à faire ce que tu ont fait et avec qui?

R : C'est une super question. Euh. La première réponse qui me vient en tête, premièrement, c'est l'humour. J'ai commencé à faire de l'humour, j'étais tout petit, il était tout jeune. J'avais peut-être sept ans ou premier numéro sur scène, j'en avais neuf. Et puis je me suis aperçu du pouvoir de l'humour. Ça sert de faire rire et de perdre… Et ça m'a permis de de rejoindre les gens alors que des fois, on semblait plus difficile. Donc ça m'a permis souvent de me faire une place. Elle m'a permis aussi de lutter beaucoup contre mes propres angoisses, contre mes propres peurs. Et ça m'a vraiment… Et des fois, on me joint. J'ai joué des tours, c'est à dire? Finalement, je me suis construit une carapace autour d'un thème psychanalytique. Donc. Je pense que ça, ça a été un élément qui contribue beaucoup, beaucoup à développer autant ma façon de discourir, mais de comprendre les discours et de considérer les liens.

Ensuite, sur le plan académique, je dirais quand je suis rentré à l'université.

Il y a eu un cours qui a quand j'ai fait le certificat en communication. Il y a un cours qui était en formation multimédia et compte tenu que j'avais voulu faire de radio. Des trucs comme ça, je trouvais ça super intéressant. J'ai dit OK, je vais essayer ça. Et ce que j'ai trouvé super agréable, c'est que ça m'a permis de développer des outils. Ça m'a permis de comprendre comment fonctionne le montage vidéo, audio et à partir de là, j'ai donc entrepris de créer des capsules, de développer des outils de communication et je pense que ça, c'est le deuxième élément. C'est sur un plan académique que je suis allé chercher un paquet d'outils pédagogiques pour faire circuler la connaissance. Tout ça et ça a bien fonctionné. Et le troisième élément qui est toujours sur le plan de la méthodologie, c'est qu'au doctorat, j'ai appris à faire ce qu'on nomme la méthode expérimentale. Je ne connaissais pas beaucoup la méthode expérimentale, mais ça m'a permis d'aller chercher un outil pour voir les effets que pouvaient avoir notamment des capsules, des extraits que je peux monter sur les études de réception avec une batterie de questions et de faire des croisements. Régression quantitative. Et là, ça a vraiment pour moi ça comme ça m'a permis vraiment de développer autant une approche pédagogique qu'une approche empirique sur le terrain et de voir les effets que ça pouvait avoir. Et en ajoutant à cela, en gardant toujours en tête un peu la question de l'humour, mais en ajoutant à ça les préoccupations politiques qui sont bien sûr très présentes le vivre ensemble, les dynamiques politiques, les enjeux que je vois de plus en plus qui se été dans toute l'actualité. Les contextes ont beaucoup fait en sorte aussi que j'ai, j'ai été interpellé par les enjeux sur lesquels je m'attarde, puis sur mon objet de recherche, sur cet objet de recherche, en particulier sur les discours haineux, mais en lien avec le radicalisme, puis ma participation à la chaire, tout ça me semble. Ça a contribué à faire en sorte que je suis devant vous aujourd'hui. C'est que votre réponse.

Q : La deuxième partie de l'entretien à propos de la radicalisation. Ouais ok. Donc première question dans tes propres mots et très brièvement comment tu définis la radicalisation ?

R : Un processus menant des individus, des communes, ou des groupes à… prendre des positions en rupture avec certaines conventions sociales. Voilà.

Q : Quels sont mes concepts que tout considère comme liés à la radicalisation?

R : Polarisation, divisions, extrémisme… je voulais dire discours haineux, hein? Tu peux le noter. Je pense que oui, c'est ce que je dirais. Cependant. C'est pas systématique ces gens, mais ça fait partie de cette nébuleuse. Mais ce n'est pas systématique parce qu'un certain radicalisme... On pourrait dire on des… des sources plus nobles… mais les discours haineux non…. Et puis je dirais même à la limite contre discours, ou beaucoup plus, peut-être même contre discours. Donc une façon de ne réponse ferme à une domination, à une exploitation.

Q : Est ce que tu as rencontré des personnes radicalisées au cours des activités?

R : Je n'ai pas rencontré de personnes radicalisées, je ne crois pas personnellement. Je m'inquiète par contre. De certaines personnes proches de moi qui. Et qui ont des comportements ou des propos qui peuvent mener à la radicalisation. Moins disant, moins, moins poussés. Justement dans le contexte, soit de la contexte de la Covid, mais dans d'autres contextes. Ce que je pense, entre autres, à une personne très proche de moi, une jeune personne qui, après une rupture avec sa copine. Il s'est senti isolé, rejeté par tout le monde. Et quand je la vois, quand je lui parle, elle entretient une amertume, une haine, une rancœur. Elle fâchée comme toute la planète, là, et de façon les propos qu'elle tient cette personne sont parfois violents. Alors oui, je pense qu'il y a un militantisme.

Et voilà... j'ai pas vu ça, mais j'ai juste craint et je crains.

Q: Donc la troisième partie est plus à propos de la prévention. Est-ce que tu peux me décrire les étapes d'un projet sur ce thème?

R : Oui… C'est le projet. La recherche post-doctorale… dont l'objectif est de développer des outils, des formes de contre discours pour lutter contre la circulation et les effets des discours haineux. Donc première étape. De quoi parle-t-on? Définition conceptuelle, comprendre au-delà des définitions, comprendre de quoi il s'agit. Ça, c'est important. Quand est ce que les discours haineux, quand on entend par discours haineux? Où sont les tensions? Où sont les complications? Où sont les problèmes liés à ce concept? Même chose pour les contre discours. Donc, qu'est-ce que c'est un contre discours? Est-ce que ça existe? Et puis, et voir encore une fois les tensions... Donc établir les bases sur lesquelles je vais travailler, mais aussi les bases… ce sont les éléments qui ne font pas consensus... Donc ça, identifier certains groupes concernés qui peuvent être utiles ou pertinents. Dans cette.. pour lutter ou dans ce, dans celle pour lutter contre ces enjeux là ou s'en préoccuper, donc des organisations politiques, des organisations de sécurité. Des organisations de recherche. Donc ça, c'est, je dirais, la première étape, c'est de faire cette espèce d'inventaire.

Deuxièmement, c'est d'aller voir les acteurs, les gens qui luttent donc contre les discours haineux ou qui, justement, on connait... On fait des recherches là-dessus. Donc mélanger le terrain, la recherche. Pour moi, c'est super important. Donc qu'en disent les chercheurs? D'accord, et cetera. Qu'en disent les gens sur le terrain? Les organismes de lutte… qui sont concernés? Puis, est ce qu'il y a des ponts à faire entre les deux? Il y en a des fois qui font les deux aussi qui font de la recherche et qui sont ceux sur le terrain. Alors avoir leur point de vue.

[Q Et comment tu as fait ça? Est-ce que tu as déjà fait des rencontres, des entrevues?]

R : Avec deux choses. Premièrement, dans la revue de la littérature, on a déjà beaucoup d'éléments qui nous permettent de voir. Il y a des outils qui ont été mis en place, des expériences qui ont été faites pour ça. Deuxièmement, oui, aller faire

des entrevues, donc rencontrer des spécialistes, des chercheurs, des gens qui sont sur le terrain. Il y en a rencontré. En fait, on a rencontré une douzaine. Et puis en Europe et au Canada… Union européenne, au Parlement européen relié à la désinformation.

Ensuite, une fois qu'on sait ça… essayer de comprendre quelles stratégies, quelles stratégies ont été mises en place. Qu'est ce qui marche? Qu'est ce qui ne marche pas? Et en parallèle de cela, développer.. faire des tests. Donc, et là j'en suis à cette étape. Et donc faire des tests. Dans ce cas-là, j'ai fait deux capsules en ligne. Je les mets en ligne, je regarde les réactions. Je pose des questions. Sondage c'est de voir comment est-ce que les gens qui reçoivent ce genre de document, qu'est-ce qu'ils en pensent? Et essayer de faire un mélange d'études quantitatives et qualitatives.

Donc essayer de voir… Dans quelle mesure est ce que certaines variables sociodémographiques peuvent jouer? Certaines conditions préalables peuvent jouer…. Et dans quelle mesure est ce que le fait d'avoir été exposé à un document plutôt qu'un autre peut jouer?

Et enfin ça, ce sur au plan quantitatif et sur le plan qualitatif. C'est. Quels sont vos commentaires sur ce que vous avez vu? Quelles sont vos réactions? Donc il y a toute une section dans le questionnaire qui permette aux gens de…. Est-ce que vous partageriez ça en ligne? Pourquoi vous partageriez pas ?

[Et avec Unesco-Prev ? J'imagine bien qu'il continuera…]

R : Oui, absolument. En fait, cette conférence-là, en particulier, va être chapeautée par un sens commun. Le partenaire principal, c'était la chair. Alors c'est la Chair, ma recherche sur discours haineux et tous les partenaires. Et même à titre de prof, j'ai effectivement, j'ai l'intention de continuer ma collaboration sur ces questions-là, en particulier.. l'accès de plus en plus aussi sur des questions qui me tiennent à cœur, c'est à dire la médiatisation, es médias, les discours dans les médias, les discours haineux, comment ils sont traités, la couverture, le framing, le cadrage. Ces enjeux-là qui sont aussi très, très importants. Parce que je suis aussi chercheur pour un autre groupe qui s'appelle le Groupe de recherche en communication politique où il y a vraiment des vases communicants… Je trouve que ça l'est. Il y a vraiment des liens à faire entre la médiatisation, les médias sont plus réguliers, mais aussi tous les discours haineux, toutes les questions qui sont très présentes aussi. Puis la question des médias qui est aussi présente dans la chair. Alors pour moi, tout ça, c'est un point, c'est tout, c'est tout, c'est un magma.

Q : Quels sont les aspects positifs et critiques des activités de prévention? Il y a. Est-ce qu'il y a quelque chose que tu aimerais faire différemment?

R : Il y a quelque chose. Il y a deux choses qui m'embête. Je ne sais pas si je ferais différemment. En fait, j'ai l'impression que c'est difficile de faire différemment. Mais il y a quelque chose qui m'embête, la première chose qui m'embête… C'est de traverser les lignes de l'université et les lignes de nos réseaux avec lesquels on

communique, à qui on parle. Ça, c'est pour moi, c'est un défi énorme. On a de la difficulté... J'ai de la difficulté à communiquer, à pouvoir contacter d'autres personnes que mon groupe… Et ça, c'est pour moi, c'est un gros problème. C'est un gros problème qui est relié à un autre problème. C'est celui que je trouve personnellement un peu prétentieux. C'est à dire? Voilà ce que sont les discours haineux. Voici moi je vais vous expliquer que ça ce n'est pas bien. Ça, c'est bien ça. C'est pas bien ça.

Oui, c'est top down et c'est trop tape dedans qui amènerait un troisième en jeu, c'est à dire une espèce de cloisonnement, qui… fait qu'en sorte, qu'on ignore des pans complets de gens ou de groupes de personnes qui, qui dit qui et qui entendent pas ce qu'on a à dire ou pis, qu'on entend pas ce qu'ils ont à dire. On en entend pas dans le fond... Il y a un élément qui est au cœur de ça. C'est à dire qu'est ce qui mène au radicalisme? Ça le faisait aussi. Quelle est notre responsabilité dans la radicalisation? Quelle est cette responsabilité? Au delà du jugement, particulièrement de l'extrême droite… combien des gens ou même la droite ont de façon générale plus forte, c'est le genre ou certaines attitudes très d'intolérance. Mais d'où vient cette intolérance? Et moi j'ai eu l'impression que pendant trop longtemps on (et je m'inclus là dedans) leur ignoré. On a juste la négligé et avec les résultats que qu'on a, que l'on observe. Et cette impression que moi, si je prends, moi par exemple, j'avais l'impression que je faisais partie du camp des gagnants et des bons. Et tout à coup, j'ai l'impression que je suis peut-être moins dans le camp des gagnants, des moins bons. Et ça, j'en ai. Et là, bien que faire la gueule, moi, je le sais, il y a beaucoup de défis. Là, il y a beaucoup, beaucoup de défis.

Q : Quelles sont les principales capacités que tu considères comme importantes à développer dans les activités de prévention primaire?

R : Écoute, écoute, observation. Analyse. Compréhension. Ouverture. Ce sont tous des thèmes qui doivent être prioritaires au départ. Ensuite, et ça, c'est plus compliqué, mais il faut le faire. C'est à dire? Pratique. Donc ça veut dire poser des activités réelles, concrètes - voir, tester, explorer. Et ça, je pense que ça rejoint peu le premier. Mais aller vers les autres? Aller vers les autres? On n'aura pas le choix, je pense.

Alors pour moi, c'est socle de départ extrêmement importants. Et ne rien prendre pour acquis. Je dis ça parce que je pense à l'humour. Après, c'est ce que prend souvent. Ça arrive souvent que certains, certaines prennent pour acquis le rôle de l'humour… Son efficacité, sa pertinence, tout… et pas tout le temps, et même son effet ou son efficacité. On disait Bon…On va faire des blagues donc, et on va trouver une façon de lutter contre un discours. On va faire des blagues, puis ça va être..les gens vont trouver ça drôle, donc ça, c'est pas comme ça que ça fonctionne. Et l'autre élément, je pense très important, c'est que c'est. Quand je disais compréhension, c'est voir aussi le monde dans toute sa complexité et ça c'est

partage. Il y a un élément je pense qu'il faut enseigner et il faut partager dans nos sociétés… C'est expliquer…. Essayer de partager la complexité du monde. Il y a de bonnes chances que de cette façon-là, on puisse être plus à l'aise dans les zones grises…. Qui sont les zones dans le fond les plus paisibles.

Q : Merci. Dernière question…Comment penses-tu que les activités de prévention peuvent être rendues durables et efficaces dans le temps?

R : Première réponse… quand elles sont internalisées. Quand elles sont internalisées par les individus, par les groupes, par les communautés. Quand elle est socialement, quand c'est socialement partagé… Je pense que c'est la première des choses. Et là-bas, on revient à des éléments qui ne sont pas très, peut-être pas très à la mode dans les termes, mais qui peut être sont peut-être pas moins importants, c'est à dire le civisme. Par exemple, quand je parlais de tolérance, de bienveillance. Probablement qu'il y a une grande prise de conscience de l'autre. Donc, autrement dit, une plus grande conscience de notre demande, de notre vie en société qu'on fait partie de tout. Donc …. parvenir à internaliser ces valeurs là et ces éléments-là dans les individus? Je pense que c'est ce qui va faire, que ça va être durable. Et c'est donc et ça, mais… Je me réfère à des jeunes chercheurs qui étaient à la conférence ou j'ai été à Paris justement…. Des chercheurs de l'université de Madrid, puis... Leur ambition était de changer la culture. Une énorme ambition et je ne pense pas qu'ils pourront voir les résultats concrets avant leur mort. Mais ils y participent et ça, il y a. C'est un élément fondamental.

C'est très profond, c'est très… Je pense que c'est comme ça que ça va être. Ça sera pérenne, que ça va être efficace. C'est pas très concret, c'est plutôt philosophique….

INT. N. 14

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: So I'm a music therapist, so I did an undergraduate in music therapy at the University of Windsor and then a master's degree in music therapy here at Concordia. And then in from 2018 to 2021, I was a lecturer in music therapy. So I taught music therapy full time, and that's how I met Vivek Venkatesh, actually. So I was teaching a research method class and someone had said, Oh, we have this new professor coming to the Faculty of Fine Arts, and he does this research on heavy metal. And I was like, This is so neat. So I invited him to, to come and speak to my research class. And you spoke about his heavy metal research, but also a lot of the other things that he does, including his research on radicalization and one of the projects he was involved with at the time was analyzing videos of extremist propaganda, if you will. And so I just thought, like his approach is you use a lot of arts based approaches was just super interesting. And I said, I think we should collaborate. And so from that, I began to be involved in Landscape of Hope, and

that's what was my first year as an LTA. So I've been involved with that project ever since. That was one of my big sort of involvement alongside my teaching for the past few years. So Landscape of Hope. And then I also joined in Landscape of Hate.

Q: Okay, you already answered my second question (how did you start collaborating here?) And yeah, maybe also the third. The third - how did you engage in prevention?

A: That's right, yeah, through Vivek. So, you know, it's interesting for me to be interviewed for research about radicalization because I certainly do not feel like an expert on that, although I know that the work that we do with landscape of hope and landscape of hate is related in some way, you know, being a music therapist and if I'm not mistaken, you're a psychologist as well, right? So I come more from that individualized sort of approach, right? So in terms in thinking about prevention, I think from, you know, like when we engage with landscape of hope, landscape of hate, we're not necessarily engaging with people who are in an active process of radicalization. I mean, not that we're aware of anyway. That's not how we're recruiting people. And so when we work with them, we're looking more like the base sort of foundation that can prevent it. And one of the main thing I think we've been working towards is this idea of the having plural dialogue, right? So dialogue that feature different opinions and being able to have these difficult conversations because one of the things that we know is that in radicalization, people are frustrated with society and you find people that are like minded and that don't judge them when they express feelings of anger and feelings of hatred and frustration and all of those things, They find people who think like that and that gives them comfort, Right? So if we don't if we don't provide spaces that allow people to express these sort of basic human, very valid feelings of isolation, anger, frustration, sometimes one of the path people can take is a path towards radicalization. And so I think that's where I come from in terms of my views of prevention is like, how can we provide spaces where people can express these difficult feelings that are not socially accepted? I mean, not here anyway. And how we can we use the arts to facilitate that process. Because certainly the art is a way more socially accepted way of expressing tough and contradictory or even, you know, like people… ideas that not everybody agree on, right? So like in the arts that some place that I feel provides some safety for people to explore that.

Q: Can you describe one critical episode of your work - what happened? Where were you and with whom and how have you felt?

A: Well, actually, you know, just recently I was at a conference and it's not relating to this. And in my PhD research I look at digital wellbeing. So I would say that, you know, we could even conceptualize radicalization as sort of like one of one way in which we can be digitally unwell, that's one of the path that people can take. And

so I presented at a music therapy conference, and it's there's so little to say about our digital wellbeing in that specific profession. And as we started to talk about, like I asked, I engage sort of like the participant in asking them know, like, how are you socially engaging with online content? What's your experience with technology? What are some online activities you'd like to keep, keep having, or online activity? You don't want to engage anymore? You'd like to cut, cut back on. And just seeing, you know, like I just asked a few questions and there was such a flood of responses like people wanted to talk about this. Right? And it just really confirmed that, sorry.

[Sorry, the public was composed by students, professionals…?]

A: Some of them were students, professional music therapists, all mostly music therapy people. But what was interesting to me was that a lot of students and younger people were there because digital was and my my title of my presentation and people started to talk about, you know, my gaming community is so important for me or, you know, like I'm having a lot of conflict with family members on Facebook or, you know, like I'm really worried about my safety online sometimes. And lots of my friends have suffered harassment online, you know. And just by asking the question, those things starts to unravel. And of course, we were in a room full of therapists with feeling safe. But, you know, like, there's just so much that happens and very little opportunities to actually talk about it. So to me, in terms of prevention, that space, providing that space where we can actually talk about these confusing things, right, because they happen in public and private spaces sometimes and all of that. So to me that confirmed the importance of that and then how we can use the arts to facilitate that process. So, you know, I gave a lot of examples of ways that even the therapists in the room could address it with their clients. So to me, parts of my prevention effort is educating therapist, educators of therapists to help people sort of think about issues related to mostly online radicalization and online wellbeing and those kinds of things. Is that ok?

Q: Yeah. There are no right or wrong answers. I'm really interested in your experience. So now we're going to the second part of the interview that is more specific about radicalization. So, the first question is in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: So to me, radicalization is, you know, is related to extremism, right? So people start to adopt extremist way of thinking and start to support or engage themselves in acts of violence that are that are motivated by extremist beliefs, often of political nature or sometimes, and that often can include religious nature, racial realities. And it can happen. You know, the radicalization process is layered in my understanding. Right? It's not like next morning you wake up, you're radicalized. Right? It's like I think it's lots of contextual lots of contextual variables to be considered. And it sort of happens over time and especially in radicalization that

happens online. We talk we talk a lot about the echo chambers, right? So people find forums or spaces where they're hearing the same ideas over and over again and their beliefs are validated and slowly people are sort of inching into towards more radical ideas, ideas.

[there are some theories that try to build like a path, you know. What do you think about it? Do you think that there is a certain path towards radicalization, or it could be different from case to case?]

A: I think we can start there's certainly like some generalization that I think might make sense and they might uncover some things, but. I mean, you know, why is someone becoming radicalized to me? I mean, my, in my personal opinion, has a lot to do with their life experiences, even from childhood or before. If you think about intergenerational trauma and those kinds of things that affect our basic attachment and our way to be in the world, I mean that has to have an impact. And you can't study that as clearly as you can, just like it's not a direct thought in my opinion, but I think that certain groups of people that have lived certain experiences, it can be interesting to see sort of some of the paths that that exists. And certainly there might be some that work, but it's not just one path.

Q: Thank you. And which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: I mean, for sure. Like the relationship with extremism, racism, religious extremism is one that comes to mind. Unfortunately, like I it's a word that comes to my mind, which is not a representation of my personal belief is like Islam, right. Which has been so heavily associated with radicalization and terrorism. Right. That have been spoken about. You know, 9/11 comes to my mind. So that's sort of what brought, you know, just even the media, mediatic use of the words radicalization and terrorism in my lifetime is a lot associated with that, even though that's not a new thing. Yeah. Like those X out of the main words and then you know violence, hate, isolation. You know, I think of that online radicalization.

You know, use of media to write like we talk a lot. I talk a lot about how the arts can help us think about those ideas. But the arts are use all the time for radicalization purposes. So that's a tension as well. You know, in terms of like the videos, the way videos are used to do that music. Absolutely. To share. There's a great book, Music for For Hate, I think it's called. And I attended a talk about it was interesting, you know, even into like, you know, like anti Semitism. Right. Idealization is in a lot of songs.

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? And if yes, could you tell me more.

A: I don't believe I have or I don't believe I know if I have.

Q: Okay. Thank you. The last part is about prevention. Could you describe the steps of one project to which you contributed?

A: So for a landscape of hope, I'll speak specifically for Landscape of hope. We when started, like we usually have a group of people in mind. So sometimes they're university students or students from a specific community, a specific physical community, or like other students communities. And we often engage them in sort of workshops that lead to a performance. And those workshops are really meant as a way to sort of like start to think about issues related to cyberbullying or online hate or their experiences of resilience. And we usually use a lot of electronic instruments to do that. I think part of it is because they are attractive to the people we work with just because electronic instruments are fun. And then we also use visuals as well. So one of the main method that we use at times is sampling. So we might have some participant coming in either before they come in for workshops or in the workshop. We have them do some sampling, sampling of sound, sampling of images, videos, and we might use like a sort of a prompt question to sort of guide their search of images or sounds or videos. And then during the performance or even the workshop, what we do is we remix and we use these samples to create sort of new narratives so that we can then use this in the public space to generate conversation about the topic of the specific workshop or interaction of Landscape of Hope.

Q: Could you give me like more also practical details how, for example, a workshop, how long does it usually take?

A: With Landscape of Hope, we've tried a few different sort of configuration. I think that it's nice when we have more than one day, like a couple of days can be helpful. It's nice also if like the participants are able to engage in a little bit of reflection before they come in so that they're sort of a little bit primed to talk about it. And so, you know, like sometimes workshop we might have like a series of small workshops, like an hour or 2 hours depending on what kind of topic some might be a little bit more not theoretical, but like more they might learn about something in particular, you know, like something that's more didactic is the word I was looking for. And then there's generally something that's more like, Let's learn to use the instruments or the visual software we're going to be using for the show. So there needs to be enough room for all those things to happen. And then some lone time is important to. We often also use sort of like the surroundings. So if we're doing something in Montreal, we might send people like in the city to do their sampling. So that requires some time as well. So that's why it's nice if, let's say we have at least two days so that say in your evening, you know, like try to look at your surroundings and find some things that remind you of what resilience might look like in the in your environment or in yourself.

Q: And what are the positive and critical aspects of this activity. Let's say this activity. Let's talk always about landscape of hope. Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: I think it continues to change, right? So I don't have a strong feeling like, wow, I really want this to be different because each time we do it is a little different. And I've been away for a little while with my maternity leave, so I haven't been in the latest sort of iteration. So I'm curious to see where it has evolved. Right. You know, I think that I'd like to try to infuse even more sort of music therapy inspired activities where we do a little bit more of containment around the music making, you know, things like a referential improvisation where we might ask the people to really think more specifically about a metaphor or a feeling that they might have expressed and really sort of like provide a little bit more structure in that way. Um, but still, it depends on the group. Right. So yeah, so I think I want to continue to explore sort of like how much structure and how much freedom we we're giving, right? So and my rationale for that is more like I'm still, I'm still thinking of what safety looks like when we're discussing difficult topics in, in a group in a short term environment with people that we're going to see for a few days and probably won't see again in our lives. Right? So that's where I'm at.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Well, digital. Yeah, digital wellbeing is one of them. I mean, it's specifically for online radicalization. So that's that's what led me to my PhD. Actually, part of it is like I'm seeing how many, especially youth, are having really horrible experiences online and feeling really stuck and not recognize like there there's a lot of hateful behavior and violence that's normalized online. And so to me, like having these discussions and workshops and therapy around in psychoeducational initiatives, looking at what does it look like to have a healthy relationship with technology, what does it look like to have a supportive online network? What does it look like to have a good life, life online and real life balance? That's to me is at the basic, basis. And I think all levels of prevention are important. I think we also need more overt anti radicalization initiatives. But I think that if we can start especially with younger people and more like what does being digitally well look like and, you know, having good social support and those kinds of things, I think that's where we need to start. And another correlate of that is making mental health a public health issue much more than it is now. And backing that up with like policy, which is really important.

Q: Is there any other concept that comes to your mind other than digital wellbeing and mental health? And we were talking maybe at the beginning about plural dialogue.

A: Yeah, pluralistic dialogue is super important. Absolutely. And to me that's something that's part of digital wellbeing, right? So one one thing that I you know, that's part of sort of the conceptualizations I'm working on right now is, you know, like it's in your social and your feeds. It's really important to have multiple perspective, right? And to me that's part of that, that dialogue.

Q: How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Yeah, that's always a hard thing. Everything costs money and it's hard to get funding. And I know that, you know, people here at the center have worked so hard to receive the funding necessary to continue the activity. I think it needs to be included in all aspects of social life, right? So we put so much onto our educators. So I mean, of course it needs to be part of what's talked about in school, but they have so much on their plate already. So I think that it needs to be considered also in our health professions. And that's for digital wellbeing as well, right? Like our doctors and our, you know, like our health professionals need to be asking about the digital wellbeing of people because it has real life impact and physical impact on people. And so those are things I think will help be more sustainable if more people are bringing in efforts. I think too, like we just need to have some commitment from our governments to prevent some of this. I mean, the like, so international collaboration is important and I think like your chair, the UNESCO's chair for the prevention is a really good step.

I feel like I have a bit of a blind like a blind spot for this because I'm exposed to it because I'm following, you know, like their activities on my social media and all of that. So I feel like I'm exposed to it more. But yes, you're right. Even, you know, like, I know they developed that massive online course on hate and hope. Like, I think that's great. You know, it's open source and in multiple languages is like, you know those kinds of things are really are really great. Yeah.

INT. N. 15

Q: So could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: So, I have studied law in France. I was born in Africa, raised in Europe, especially in France. And I am living here. Here in Canada since 20, we can say 20 years.

A: I have been working as executive director of different kind of nonprofit organizations. The first one. Before that. When I arrived here, I was deputy clerk in the Superior Court. And after that, I have been directing non-profit organizations and mandated to work with women in women entrepreneurs. So it was women's entrepreneurship here in Montreal. After that, I changed organizations. So I was the executive director of a Microcredit network of Quebec during four years. I did four

years for previous four years and four years in the microcredit network. And now after that, I went to work as a senior consultant in Oxfam, Quebec.

International Development. So and I came back three years ago. And actually presently I'm here. Executive director.

Q: And how did you start collaborating here at CPRLV? How and when?

A: March 2020. It has been a special mandate because I started with the pandemic. So it's new for us to be at the office. So it was working from remote from for everyone. So it's kind of a new experience to work that way. And, you know, public security is it's a new field for me. So I had to understand everything and the ecosystem here and the team and all the context.

Q: How did you learn to do what you do and with whom?

A: Oh, a lot was by my own, because it's the same thing, you know, being executive director of that kind of sector. The other one you have the base, the basic skills you have to have. So it's it's most of the more important is the subject. So radicalization is two reasons, you know, to be familiar with that. But I'm not, you know, research person, so I don't have to go deep, you know, to understand everything and the data. I have a team to do that.

Q: But was there like a transition between you and the person that were before?

A: Or two days and one day, one day of two days or one? I think it was just maybe two days. So it was very intense and…Two days and he was there during the first six months when I needed something. If I wanted to, you know, had a question, but I had the team was there so to direct me when I needed something.

Q: Can you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you, with whom and how have you felt?

A: You know, when you arrive in an organization, you have to deal with the past of the organization. So it was most human resources situations that I had to solve and doing that by remote. So it's a first step to understand what is going on after that, you know, to to communicate with people involved in that situation and after that, to take time to. To think what you have to do and, you know, take time because human resources and its problems, you are not there when that began, but you have to deal with that. So it took time to have strategy, to know what to do, to communicate with everybody, and to say this is a situation, this is where we are. We have to go there. And between those two places, I don't want to see that kind of situations anymore. And if that it happens again, I will have to take decisions, but based on what I see and hear, why, while I'm there on this position, not what I was the best that if I can see on the. That's, you know just notes of things and this I'm like giving a second chance and let us work together and you know, bring more peace.

Q. Thank you. The second part of the interview is more specific about radicalization. So when you want to skip one, there are only three questions, but you can answer or not, you're absolutely free. The first question would be, I in your own words and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: It's really that process… Makes. People, you know, want to apply violence to make sure that the ideology, the opinion, you know, can change situations and… This is really the way I see things.

Q: Okay. Thank you. And which concepts do you consider as linked to the radicalization?

A: I see some discrimination, like gender based violence, hate, polarization, violent extremism, Islamophobia, Homophobia, anti-Semitism. Uh, did I say Islamophobic? I say that. Well, let's see. It's not just Islam. It's like religion. Politic, violence and security.

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: No. Okay.

Q: And well, so the third part is about prevention practices. But like for the first one, for example, I skip it because Louis has already answered about the main activities of the center. Let's just keep it and go straight to the second one is how political and or scientific collaboration in the projects work and what are the strength and critical points?

A: I think that if the center is present here, it's because of a political vision, you know, And it's it's, I think, the main vision of Quebec to be you know, to be involved of undoing prevention in all kind of, you know, to put first prevention in all kind of issues that the Quebec can have, first of all. And the political vision to think that. So the answer is not only repressive, alternatives like peaceful ways, you know. Dialogue instead of coming with the police. And political also because…. I think 80% of the financing of the organization comes from the political. And it's interesting for us, because it's a municipal and state. Yes. The provincial government. Yes. So it's and also the federal one. But, you know, to be able to gather political, municipal, federal and provincial government to add and to put money for us to have like the prevention aspect. It's very important. And it was the first the first in North America, this kind of initiative. So the political and it's really important because it was the impression of someone saying we need to have that.

Q: Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: It's a good question because this is what I actually like have been thinking… of how I can be so, so human resources position. You know, what kind of profiles we need to do better our mission. So what I would do differently….

Where are we going? We are going to make, like I say, that we have the municipal government that is with us, but it's the Montreal one. So I think that. Do differently.

Just to make sure that in the big areas of Quebec that we could have a strategic point place to present the CPRLV. I think this is what I will have done differently. I don't know. But because we were talking about the political vision that made the center be present, be creative, though, it would have been really interesting. It's the first step. You know, Montreal has put a lot of effort to make all the big cities join the movements. And it would have been better because the problem is not only here in Montreal. It was like the vision that it's not real. It's much worse. But reality, we see that it's really around for Quebec. You can see that today. Yesterday it was not so easy to see it. Maybe it was seen but not said, not, you know, not revealed clearly because the minds, maybe the minds, the mindset were not there, you know, having a lot of situations. Pandemic. George Floyd, hate against Asian populations, things like that. But make everybody realize that, oh my God, this is the world that we are living in. So maybe that.

Q: Thank you. And what are the main capacities that you consider important to developing primary prevention activities?

A: Education for citizenship. Empathy. Inclusion, diversity. You know, those values that we are putting first today, you know, that has to be the main…. Because we are not doing the radicalization. We're doing disengagement. So, you know, to bring that kind of human values first.

Q: How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: I think we have to make it become systemic, because prevention is done with people and people are moving, aging, are changing positions. And if we come today in the places in the school, you know, today, next year, it will be different people. It becomes part of programs. It has to be part of programs… Everywhere.

Q: And how do you see the center future? Because nowadays, maybe the news speak less about radicalization and extremism. It's not that it doesn't exist anymore, but maybe like the terrorist attacks are not happening. So maybe people talk less about it. How do you see the future?

A: You know, for the future, you have to make sure that we turn around the problems and then the problems turn around us. We can be the center of prevention of radicalization and don't move. We have to enlarge the vision of, first of all, of extremism, You know, the typologies, you know, and this is something we are doing actually presently to make sure that it's not only going to add because unique religion. Because there is polarizations. It can be… As we see… So, you know, conspiracy theories…those kind of you know, we have to evolve in the same time that, you know, the issues are evolving in the community, in the actuality. And for us to make sure that we understand that it's a global… I don't know if you have to talk about extremism or polarization… You know, radicalization. But meanwhile, it's a word that's distinguished us from others because. No, you know, there's

violence, criminology, violence, gender based violence. But no, they are not addressing radicalization. So it's important to evolve and to maintain because it's like seasons. We don't know what will come after that. You know, We don't know. We don't know. We had something in Quebec a few years ago when like Quebec happened. But it can happen again. And it's like, oh, so we have to make sure that we evolve, but that we continue to maintain this main issue, which is radicalization. So for us to do that, it's really to be close, close with the political because they are the one we have to solve the issues. They're mandating us to solve the issues. So let's say radicalization and hate behaviors, but maybe tomorrow it will be violence, gun, you know, gun violence. So we have to be aware of what they're thinking, what are the needs and how they see needs to make sure that few things we can handle… the mandate.

INT. N. 16

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?
A: So I in 2015, so seven years ago graduated from an undergraduate degree in Fine Arts here in Concordia, where I did where I would do socially oriented artworks mainly in new media. Yes. So video.

And so I graduated seven years ago with a degree in arts. And I worked as an artist, as an emerging artist for five years, where I did a lot of community based arts. So working with different groups, coalitions, individuals on projects that would use art to communicate their message and their reality and their experience. I worked on a lot of.. I created a lot of collaborative work on the housing crisis in Montreal, on the rights of women, on gender violence, on a myriad of issues, but always with other people. And then after five years of being a practicing artist and applying for grants. Just trying to get funding from the Arts Council. I realized that I had enough practice. I needed to ground what I had experienced practically in some theory. So I decided to come back to grad school. And at first Concordia wasn't my choice. But I have my life here and I was like, Oh, I'll just go back to the same university, but really design my own kind of master program. And so I did. Right now I'm completing a master that's part of a program called Individualized. So instead of being part of a cohort with other master's students, part of a specific department and faculty and having one supervisor, I'm part of three different departments faculties and I have three supervisors, but I'm on my own.

Vivek is not one of my supervisors. I met Vivek through one of my supervisors who recommended me for work with Vivek because turns out what I do and what I'm interested in really works well with less than with my supervisors. But I didn't know it starting... Yes. And so right now I'm graduating with a research creation thesis that is, as we discussed a bit, I use video installation art, video art installation, and

it presents the dialogue between four strangers from different backgrounds, different cultures, different races, different religions and ages who I've paired together so that they would engage in a listening session with each other. They would interview each other about their life experience. And then I've kind of edited that into a video installation. And so that's it. It taps into what it means to listen across difference. The art, the help that art can bring in creating those dialogic spaces, open spaces where difference is not put aside but acknowledged and celebrated. How can we be together differently or not be together? But how can I listen with you to you within your difference? So that's kind of the waters I'm kind of swimming in.

A: I have a practice in oral history, obviously media art and then public pedagogy, kind of also performance art kind of.

So I have a supervisor, who is art editor, and she's the one who introduced me to Vivek for a project. And since then I've been working with him.

Q: And for how long have you been working on Project Someone?

A: Almost three years or two and a half years, Yes. And it started with the project that I'm saying that my supervisor K. kind of like pushed me towards. It was there was a bursary that was being offered to an art student, graduate, art student, and. To develop work with the City of Montreal, specifically the EDI Service that deals with racial profiling and artists from the Concordia community and graduate student artists from the Concordia community, and a more social science student from ENRS. And this was being coordinated by Vivek. And so for eight months, six months, eight months, Vivek this other student and I worked on kind of advising and exploring with the city of Montreal how they could develop policy that was more inclusive of the realities of racial profiling in Montreal.

I'm graduating. I'll be done by the end of the summer. But I keep working with the project someone as an external.

I'm looking forward to because the type of work I do with project someone, which is…. About. I guess, socially engaged art space practices I would do as an artist. But I'm really excited to work with Project someone because it's the same type of initiatives. But I have a team and I have resources. Whereas when you're single artist approaching or being approached by communities, then you have to. It's more…. it's harder. Yeah.

Q: And how did you engage in prevention and how come did you decide to engage in prevention?

A: It's funny, the word prevention. That's why I was like, "Are you sure you want to interview me?" Because I wouldn't say I've never conceived of what I do as prevention, but I can see how it taps and can become or is prevention. It's just not the lens through which I would have identified what I do. But I think especially for youth and the youth I've worked with and will continue to work with. Bringing…

giving them agency over how they can represent themselves publicly, how others might perceive them if we give them agency through the arts... Because art, at the end of the day is having a say. Having control over how and what you communicate to other people. Right? Art is like it's a mode of communication. So by working with youth in kind of developing that skill, developing that literacy, how can I represent who I am, what my community is about, What's important to us, I think falls into a bit of prevention because I feel like radicalization happens when, especially for youth, you feel like you don't have any say on how people frame you, how they perceive you, and on what kind of actions you can take to change your situation. But art is a way you can change your situation because it is a way to reframe how you're perceived. So maybe it would tap into that. I don't know if that answers.

Q: Could you tell me more about your first experiences? Let's talk about your experiences in Project Someone Yeah. So how have you learned to do what you do and with whom?

A: Well, what I do in project Someone, I've learned by working with communities, in communities, on specific social issues. So I've learned about how, when a group of individuals are being systemically discriminated against, I've learned by working with them. I've learned…. I will always have to keep learning this, but I've slowly learned how to position myself beside them as someone in solidarity rather than someone who knows everything. Right? And I've learned through working with people that everyone has knowledge and expertise. I just have a specific one and I want to put mine to the service of fighting a said discrimination. So how I've learned to do what I do at Project Someone is basically through just slowly working, practicing, being with people and together figuring out what is going on, what can we say about it, How can and how can media and art help us kind of push that forward? I would say that I learned a lot. I learned a great deal from Vivek, because what I find really important with Vivek's kind of approach, because Vivek is very much a pedagogue in the way that he organizes and facilitates and deals with projects Someone as a team, he is very much (and I think you've witnessed this too). He is for plural, plurality. He is for opinions and ideas and ideology who are different, sometimes even in opposition. And he believes or I don't want to speak for him, but what I see him putting forward is that we need to create spaces where that's it... Polarized ideas can be in the same space. It doesn't mean that we can't name what's wrong and name what's hateful, but if there's no space where things can coexist, then…. It becomes more problematic.

Q: Could you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you and with whom? How have you felt?

A: So with the work with Project someone specifically Landscape of Hope, Yeah, we went into different communities to work with youth and we really, really tried to not…. just come in one night, do some art thing, talk and create around difficult issues and then leave and then never see them again. Right? We wanted to have a more sustained relationship with this youth. The critical episode was that it's kind of impossible because we are funded, the funding is limited. We have deadlines. We have to be done by a certain time. And it's. I'm finding an impasse in academic kind of ethics where they're like, you can't parachute in. You can't extract knowledge from people. But at the same time, these people don't have they maybe don't want to work with you for three years and you can't work with them for three years. So I find a critical moment with the Landscape of Hope Project was that we really felt that tension where the community was very… untrusting of us for very valid reasons and because of the institutional obligations and setting, because of the nature of research. We couldn't really change the reasons why they were untrusting. It was, you know, so sometimes I find there's a real like ontological problem with research in and of itself. Why are you coming to see us? And our answer is like, we want to know about you so that your experience is included in results. But then… I don't know. It's really hard. It's hard to navigate because we do need to listen to people who are not exactly living the same situation that we are. Or else how can the world turn? But then the other side of the medal is why? Why are you interested in me? Do your own thing.

[Tell me if it's too abstract or what you want. Please don't hesitate.]

Q: There's no there's no, like, correct or wrong answers. The second part is about the radicalization concept. So, in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: I have a weird relationship to the concept of radicalization because I consider radical movements to have brought many wonderful things in the world. And like to quote a friend of mine, an author like Radical, like the origin of the word is roots. And so, like I call myself a radical listener.

So what your question was, what do I think of it?

[How would you define it?]

A: How would I define it? Radicalization is when…. You get alienated by the system that you are in… So much so to a degree that you cling on... to very binary ideas of the world. It's life or death. It's. If it's this, then it can't be that. And sometimes that kind of distilling that boiling down to the very essential can be really, really good because it can blossom into reminding us what is important. But on the other hand, reducing, distilling to that very, very to the essence of things can be very dangerous as well, because it doesn't leave space for nuance.

Q: So which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: I would put…. Alienation, I would put observation. I would put…. Lack of connection of recognition….

I also have good words... I have movement. I have mobilization. I have… History. Solidarity. Um…. Yeah.

Q: Thank you. And have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? And if yes, could you tell me more?

A: Definitely. Yeah. I've met youth who are very unhopeful… And that is the most alarming radicalization… I feel like when youth are alienated to a point that... they don't see the point of exploring anything that's uncertain. They are set in their ways because they've haven't been served properly by society. I've seen radical activists who do amazing work, who devote, who whose practices of for social justice are radical and important. Have I met people who have been radicalized?

I should mention I've done a lot of work with them. Now they are older, but young men in the seventies who were part of the IRA in Northern Ireland. And so that was a turn towards arms and violent radicalization and. Yeah. So I've spent some time around that.

[have you, like, interviewed them?]

A: Yeah, I've done several oral history interviews and understanding what's interesting about the conflict in the north of Ireland, especially the Republican movement, is that there was a shift from armed. Struggle to political struggle, right. Handing in the guns for the vote ballot for the so. I've seen or I've learned through interviewing these… I call them mentors, these older men and women who were at some point had to resort to violence in order to fight colonialism or the empire. The British Empire. I've noticed how they try to reconcile with that today. Right. And that's the whole thing about reconciliation is also within an individual person. How do you reconcile, having turned to extremism, extremist behavior for a social cause? And I really don't know how to talk about that too much, but it's. Yeah.

Q: The third part is about prevention practices. Could you describe the steps of one project on this topic to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: So with the steps of the project. It's again, there's this tension between wanting to do work for resilience, against radicalization, for example. And we arrive with these concepts in communities, but we also say, Oh, it's about working for the community's needs. What did the community need? And the community never says we need art to prevent radicalization within our youth. Communities are like, you know? And so at first what we did was to assess what communities needed and try to reconcile that with concepts such as these. So that's it. Community consultation, workshop development, conceptualization and developing workshops using artistic and creative outputs as a template or as an excuse to talk about more difficult subjects with youth documenting that process and then analyzing that process in

order to present it afterwards. So I would say those are the steps I've taken part in. But really, really the biggest prevention happens when you're with face to face to someone. It's embodied. It's you spending time to listen to them with true interest and listening to them in a way that you recognize that what they know is important and it is expertise. And even if some of it might be called by a leftist or someone…. Problematic. If you don't give at any point in time a space for someone to name things that are difficult, that's when prevention is canceled, right? It doesn't work. So I feel prevention is so much into spending time with someone and giving them a space. Yeah.

Q: Thank you. So you have already partially, I think, maybe answered the following question, but I'll just name it. What are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: I just... That's it. Again, I'm not like the artists on the team, so I don't I wonder if it works with youth arriving and saying, We're going to prevent you today from doing bad things. I wonder if that works, because I think in order to be able to reach youth, which is who you want to reach right before things faster. Because prevention in and of itself, it's saying we suspect that you might do something bad. That's not empowering. That's us posing a gaze and seeing that we it's not listening to how they perceive themselves. So prevention may be in and of itself as a concept is a little bit hard to navigate.

Q: You're getting to the following question… what are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities? So, if we switch our mentality and think about promoting capacities…?

A: Great, because it's shifting from positive reinforcement to negative or negative Reinforcement to positive. Yeah. Okay, so let me do the mental exercise. If I'm coming to a youth and I'm saying I want to prevent you from doing this, it means I'm assuming they could do this. So the opposite of that would be approaching a youth and focusing on the knowledge that they do have, on the expertise, the experiential knowledge that they do have. So and that's when the art, any creative input, any sport input, any. Like there's so many facets but like anything that. Helps them define who they are. That is not. Linked to violence, I guess. Yeah.

Definitely critical thinking. Digital literacy is huge. It's huge because the Internet is so vast and confusing and binary. It's you're either on this team or on that team. So finding nuance within cyberspace also. I really think. Yeah. Ways so that youth can represent what they are about so as a capacity would be like... I guess, literacy on self-representation. Like, when I do a post on Instagram about something that I am mad about. What? What is… How will that represent me? What will it do to people who see it? I guess it's developing that. Yeah. That critical… criticality. I also think that. This is a more like practical strategy. But if you work with young men and tell them this is prevention so that you don't do gun violence, you'll have very different

results if you work with these young men's and they bring their younger brothers and sisters. I think there's a problem with prevention where it isolates individuals as problematic, whereas we could enhance community awareness rather. Yeah. Instead of individualizing the problem you collectivize for solutions or. I don't know, it sounds all pretty and nice, but. Or just collectivize the problem. Even if something happens, how does it affect your siblings, your friends, your community instead of... "What will it do to you? Because it's your fault?"

Q: Thank you. Last question. How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Well, we just problematized the idea of prevention. Do we want to make it sustainable or do we want to call it something else?

I guess just to come back to the capacities, your previous question. Making people aware that the bad that they can do… They are. That bad behavior is a product of a systemic problem, really shifting individual, like criminalization of individuals onto like you, your system, your society. And the system is not supporting you in the way that it should in all different facets, which so I don't know what you call that like critical pedagogy or like, but I don't you.

It's where education comes in because then we can be like people before you have been in very similar situation and look at movements and look at how people came together and collectivized and what came out of that. And that's where they become politically active. That's where they enact their citizenship, their rights as their rights as citizens, as part of a democracy. Right. So that's why education is so interlinked, I guess, is that… there is that sentiment of alienation, even if you realize I'm not the problem the system is. But then that's where right after that education comes in. It's like, what do we do from here? Other people have done things. And that's where like memory and remembering how we got out of situations. In the past like history. That's why history is important and history has to represent marginalized and radical movements, I guess. Yeah, but I kind of didn't answer to your last question, but whatever. Oh, sustainability. I don't know. Yeah, don't tell it.

But I think yeah, the idea of prevention and in and of itself, if prevention means through data like these data keep dehumanized… that identifies high risk populations or groups, and then going to those groups and saying we want to prevent you from doing like that's the worst.

And when speaking of racial profiling at the very beginning of this, like a way to make prevention sustainable is to shift what prevention means and to shift how we identify those we want to, like, prevent. Yeah. Because how we identify those is, like, skewed and very racially informed data. So, yeah, but maybe, maybe the problem is just this idea of prevention. But what happens if there's no prevention? What happens? Because prevention has this this when I think of prevention, like I

think of like I have this notion of like someone kind of looking out, making sure nothing too bad is happening anywhere. Right. And prevent. But that's for what o prevent. I'm going super. But it's to prevent borders is to prevent concepts of nation states? What are we preventing? What are we preventing? Like, of course, violence, but. Violence is. I don't know. It's caused by other things. I don't know if.

(…)

A: But still and it's fascinating and really important because so much I think it's in your research abstract, you're like radicalization. Extremism has been like. Um, Islam has been like the we just focus on that lens but like extremism on the left or right. Yeah. People talk about like social justice warriors. Like there is the other side as well.

And I think one of the weird extreme outcomes of maybe a radical left is cancel culture. That's pretty extreme when you think of what the word extreme. That's extreme. So what are the new forms of like extremism that are arising?

Like when you say something that's not politically correct or you do something that is not politically correct or violent. I'm not saying we have to forgive, but restorative justice is I believe in restorative justice, you know, but the left. Or like my generation, it's like if you say something that's not politically correct, it's like, oh, did you know this person said that? Let's not talk to him anymore? Like, completely cancel that person from social life. Excluding. Excluding. But again, it's pretty extreme. Where's the place to learn and and different identity politics like if you're a white man more and more and this is why there's extreme reactions to this is that you can't make any mistakes because you're and I talks about…

We need those spaces because or I was given that space… when I grew up in rural Quebec, very francophone, white conservative community. And when I arrived in university at 21 years old, years old, I was my first class. I was sitting to my left, was a trans woman to my right, was a nonbinary person, and I was like, Oh, wow. And if those two people hadn't given me a chance to learn. I probably said some stuff that was icky, but they were. They gave me the benefit of the doubt and they said, We'll see if she wants to learn. And I did and I learned. But that if that doesn't happen, if it's like, Oh, you just use the wrong pronoun, bye bye, cut, then that's it. And it's I mean, I haven't I don't have no knowledge of this, but it's been shown that it snowballs.

INT. N. 17

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?
A: So, I'm a third year doctoral student and my research and study experience…. So I've studied within communications and linguistics and now within interdisciplinary education. And more specifically, I look at black and brown and

indigenous youth and in relation to their violent trajectories. But currently I'm looking at the reintegration of black incarcerated men who were incarcerated as youth and are doing life or long sentences within prison because of violent crimes and how we can better reintegrate them into society and also build capacity within the programs that help with reintegration.

Q: And do you have also working experiences?

A: Yes. So I've worked as an evaluator of many youth community organizations and programs in their projects. And I've also worked as or… right now I'm a community outreach person, so I do phone calls with people who are incarcerated. I also work closely with one of the only black reintegration programs here in Montreal. I'm also a… I've done teaching experience with university students in the US and also here in Canada.

Q: Okay, Thank you. And how did you start collaborating here?

A: So I started my master's here in Applied Linguistics, which is also still in the education program. And then I was accepted into the PhD through applied linguistics. But I eventually changed over my field or my idea.

Q: Okay. And I don't know. The following question is how did you engage in prevention?

A: So I first engaged with prevention when I switched supervisors to Vivek. And I was really interested in the prevention of violence and violent thinking. And but I was mostly interested in that on the level of black and brown and indigenous people and like the experiences that they have with this type of violence. But I did write and do some presentations for Vivek or with Vivek on the subject of far right, far right wing experiences of these individuals. And after that, I just kind of kept being redundant in the work that I did, I guess because that's Vivek's expertise and.

A: So Landscape of Hope, which for this project it was for black, brown, indigenous and racialized youth and how they, I guess, experienced resilience within their communities and their neighborhoods. And so I was the evaluator of that project and then eventually became the ground coordinator. And.

Q: You were already talking about that, but the next question would be, could you tell me more about your first experiences here? And how have you learned to do what you do and with whom?

A: It's really, I guess, difficult to say because most of what I do is not it… hasn't evolved from my experience in the university. I've kind of like gone out myself and networked and built relationships with communities.

It's mostly my personal experience just being like a black woman. And I think it's it's helped me navigate my own research. But one thing I will say with radicalization and prevention, I've had really good connections through effect as far as working with Unesco, where we look at hate speech and what's happening and how people interpret hate speech and what happens in that sense. And then also working with

Prev and how we can create dialogue around radicalization and hate within the world. But yeah, I would say it's all been really through Vivek but for my own personal research it's been just me with communities which I did get a firsthand experience working on a community project with Vivek for Landscape of Hope. And my original position was to bring in black and brown organizations that we can go into and work and do the landscape of hope work in their community. And then from there, I kind of was already making connections with my own communities and wanting to do the work within.

Q: The last question of this first part is can you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you and with whom? How have you felt

A: I guess one thing I remember as being kind of like looking through the data of former right wing extremists, I had to kind of put my identity and bias aside in a critical moment. I remember reading some of the negative perspectives that these individuals or participants had for like my community and really just me in general. And it was very difficult to kind of separate my own like thoughts but still be able to represent these people fairly despite like how they their behaviors and thoughts. So I think that was maybe a critical episode of just kind of being just a researcher in the moment in these types of settings was very difficult. But I think I've learned over time how to kind of put my personal identity aside and it's, you know, creating professional identities within the workplace, which I think also creates another barrier of people not really knowing you in academia. So you kind of have a mask throughout your entire academic career. But some people there's an extent to like how much of a mask other people wear. But yeah, I think that would be critical. And it has really defined, I think, my whole path in academia.

Q: So the second part is related more to radicalization, because the first question is in your own words and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: Probably not correctly, I guess, because there's so many.

Q: There are many ideas about that. I just I would like to know really your opinion.

A: So I would define radicalization as being deeply immersed or passionate about a specific way of thinking that has a political agenda. And I don't really see it as always being negative. I think that as of lately, radicalization has been defined with always a white face against a racialized person or against a group of people that you know, are suffering from maybe like terrorism. And it's always connected to that. But I don't define it in that way. I think it's defined through passion and for belief in this one perspective.

Q: Okay. Thank you. And which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization? So if you had like to build them, meaning map, what which concepts would you put around the radicalization concept?

A: Okay, okay. It's weird because when I think of radicalization, the first concept I think of is like empowerment, which is weird because I, I think of like, like the black power groups that would often consider themselves radical, like a group of radical individuals who have an agenda to uphold or uplift their community. So that's one concept. Could that be one empowerment or. I don't know. Usually I don't know….

[Because I hear like we are. Yeah. You said that you do, you don't consider radicalization always negative. So maybe that's why things are in dialogue…]

A: Yeah. But then there's also the negative part where I see infliction of violence or pain, but that would be violent radicalization. But I think that there's also radicalization as a word alone, I don't.. the first thing I see is not violence, but I think that's because of my own cultural experience.

I hope those are what you mean by concepts. Like, I see passion. I see immersion. I see sometimes I see like violence. Sometimes I see discrimination. And definitely I see racism. Just like one sidedness.

And also, you know what? I see trauma even in the positives, I think. Yeah. Yeah. Even with positive radicalization, I feel like it builds from trauma. And I also see isolation.

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people doing the activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: Met them personally. I don't know, because it's difficult for me to name someone as radicalized versus they had a radicalized moment or a radical episode.

[So, for example, in your research with these former prisoners. Yeah. Have you ever seen someone that you thought was or radicalized or at risk of radicalization of people?]

A: Of them being radical in the moment? No, I can't. Yeah, I can't think of because I also have worked with youth and I've seen violent behavior, but it was invoked. So I don't know. I just would not feel comfortable, you know, to say that that was a radicalized episode or person. It's so difficult, I think.

Q: The third part is about prevention. Could you describe the steps of one project on this topic? So radicalization prevention, to which you have contributed from the beginning and to the end?

A: Well, I guess if we can label speaking of police, if we can label police as sometimes being radicalized, I've worked on projects where we have worked on racial profiling that the police often does to like black, brown, indigenous.

[Q: Was it that project inside Project someone?]

A: No, no, this is a different one. Yeah. Outside of the school it's called "Montreal sains profilage". And so I was involved a bit in the beginning, but not so much where they were building like report or people's narratives about them being racially profiled and their community being, I would say… I don't know the right words,

but like them being subjected to racial profiling and also witnessing and having abusive behavior put on to them from police officers just because of them being indigenous or being black.

[Q: Yeah, sure. Could you describe me like the steps of the project? What have you done?]

A: So my role was to evaluate the experiences of the communities involved with this project and also to evaluate the researchers involved in the project and how their learning developed throughout. So I was just the evaluator, so I don't know if that truly counts.

So the project was conducted because of COVID, mostly online, but there were times of in-person interviews and like going to the library and researching more and more about the history of Montreal and profiling, racial profiling and the violence that's happened in different communities. And talking to these people and from the qualitative work that they did and also the quantitative work that they did. The next step was to put it into practice. So having like a website where people can go to and report the issues that they're experiencing and in which neighborhoods that it's happening and just contributing to building awareness of racial profiling. And the last step, I guess, would be how they can further into tackling this issue so that they can prevent these incidents from happening. And my evaluation, I guess, of that was that it's very difficult to sum all of this up in one project, and it's really difficult to pinpoint who's receiving... these radicalized acts are like these oppressive acts because it can happen at various levels. But I guess I don't know if this is a great example.

Q: What were the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Yeah, I think something positive about prevention, especially of far-right wing radical extremists, is that diving into their understandings and their perspectives of lived experiences I think is the right direction that is going in. Because if we constantly make these individuals the villain, though, they are the villain to these racialized individuals, and rightfully so. But it's also great that we're going in the direction of hearing their perspectives so that we can work inside of that community of people and see where we can prevent and include change. But I think a negative, it's that sometimes we're focused so much on the person I don't want to call them persecutors, but like the ones who have inflicted violence and pain because they are radicalized, that we're not looking so much at other violences that can be prevented. And one thing I'm really interested in is intersubjective violence is happening in black and brown communities, where they've experienced a certain trauma or like systemic issues. And so they're responding with violence. And I think that that's something that prevention should also look into, because this is an oppressed group and these are people who also are inflicting violence upon each other, but they're

receiving violence from these former extremists or these extremists. And a lot of the aid is or research is going towards the people who are inflicting the violence. So I think that that would be a negative is that we're not really paying attention to the communities that are being oppressed. We're only telling them, well, here's resilience, you know, But then the other people, they get mental health support and they get understanding of their experiences. So I think that there's a neglect for certain experiences of racialized people.

Q: Okay. Thank you. And what are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: I would say I mostly work in third level prevention like tertiary, but primary is super important. If we can get them when they're young and promote understanding of diversity, understanding of histories, understanding previous roles in these violent histories. You know, not everyone is innocent and it's important that people know what happened in the past so that they can come forward and do better, not be like their ancestors or however you want to put it. But promotion of diversity and understanding and…. teachings of history and making sure that the classrooms that these students are in are diverse enough and not just the youth for primary prevention, but these teachers that they have training and being able to work with diverse students and being able to work with diverse understandings and ideologies as well. So being strong in our teachers, but also being able to apply that to the youth in the classroom, I think is super important for primary prevention. Yeah.

Q: Maybe you somehow started answering the last question. That is, how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Yeah, by getting at the root. I think it's sustainable when we when we train and we have continual training. When the teachers are, when their biases are looked into. And I think I actually I wrote kind of a paper about this where we talk about the biases of teachers and how they instill certain things into their students that carry on to the next generation of youth. And it's oftentimes unconsciously that it's done. So I think sustainability, especially in education, starts within the teachers and not so much within policies because policies are great. But if the teachers aren't enacting it, it doesn't really matter, you know. Also, I think supervision, having people go into the schools and see what's going on. Are these teachers doing what they're supposed to do? Are they acting fairly? I worked in a school where teachers were talking negatively about a lot of the students that were lower income or racialized, and they were just saying, oh, they're not going to make it. Who cares? And so if there was someone whose job was to supervise these conversations and the treatment of these students, maybe we wouldn't have a chain of violence that's going to happen from these youth because they didn't get the care and the attention that they should have gotten from the beginning. So, yeah, teacher training,

supervisions and. Maybe more relevant education. The curriculum and the pedagogies should reflect the real life of these kids. Okay. Yeah.

Q: Thank you. Is there anything that you would like to add? Like thinking about the questions I made and your experience. Is there something like out of it?

A: I would also just say that community. Neighboring communities of the schools matter so much. There's so much that we can learn from people who are working in these nonprofit community organizations when they have the youth after school or before school or Saturday programs. It's so much that teachers can be trained from these people and guests and speakers can come in. There's so much to learn, I think, from the community. Before we before we start looking into research and articles and what they're saying about education and prevention, because the ground community workers, they've been doing this for years. So that's what I would add.

Int. n. 18

Q: So, first question, could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: I have a BA and a Phd in Psychology, and I work as a clinical psychologist and as a Professor at UQUAM University, in the Department of Clinical Psychology. I work also on cultural psychology and issues of violence. I started working with child maltreatment, family violence, violence that immigrants and refugees have experienced… and things trickled down to war and extremist violence.

I did my BA in Beirut and my PhD here in Montréal (Université de Montréal)

Q: How did you start collaborating with Unesco?

A: I met Vivek… I had met him previously, because one friend and colleague was doing her PhD with him. At that time, there were a couple of meetings, for collaboration with other partners on projects connected to extremism… but it so happened that we did not collaborate at that point in time. David I had also met because he had approached a colleague when we started the… when the Clinical Social polarization team started and he had approached us because he wanted to do a research with us, and at that point in time also we collaborate. I mean, we, we discussed some issues, but we did not collaborate together on that research project. And then suddenly, David contacted me and then he also got in touch with Vivek and this is how we started our discussions. This is how we put together – Vivek, David, myself and Samy at that time, the proposal for the Unesco Chair… I think we got it in 2018… That was 2017.. It wasn't based on the history of previous work together or previous collaboration. It was like a new collaboration, but it worked.

Q: Okay, and how did you engage in prevention? What's the path that brought you to prevention to violence prevention?

A: So, violence prevention is something I have always done… It's not new, because my specialization was when I studied in psychology, what interests me like what is family violence? And gender.. violence towards women and girls, so, so I have always been engaged in prevention of violence and then prevention of violence... When I started working in transcultural psychiatry and cultural psychology, I also focused on the issue of violence and mainly with refugee and immigrant populations that we have trauma that refugees had experienced and connected to that working with Cécile.. I started working with Cécile Rousseau …. trauma was a big part of the work she used to do. And it was also connected to inter community relation, like from a public health perspective. So, racism and impact of racism, discrimination forms of structural violence, if you want, and we used to call it inter community tensions, and then it was called radicalization. This is it… why I've always been interested in violence? I think because I'm a survivor of civil war... So that might be… there definitely is a connection there. So that's from a personal level.. from a professional level, it's always been like that.

Q: And now could you tell me more about your first experiences with the UNESCO chair? So how was it at the beginning…?

A: It was really nice.. it's pretty exciting because it's, I did not… I did not think of the fact that it would be it would have like the UNESCO seal on it would give it so much... so much leverage, so much importance and so much outreach because I mean, on my daily basis, I'm more involved with CPN-prev that I created… then the UNESCO chair and yet, people only know me as UNESCO chair

[I'm sorry, when was CPN-PREV created?]

A: So, it's the Canadian Practitioners Network for the Prevention of Radicalization and Extremist and it started in 2017. Okay, so before we got the UNESCO chair, just like Vivek was previously working on Project someone and then project Someone was integrated into your chair, but I cannot integrate CPN-prev in the UNESCO chair, it doesn't work. And so yeah, surprisingly people refer to me more as a UNESCO chair than CPN-prev. And the experience was interesting because UNESCO title provided a lot of good reputation and reach. We had little funding, but we had good coordinators – Pablo and then Sylvanna, which honestly do most of the work I mean, for me, it was it was more about planning the projects, thinking the projects to contributing, but also I contribute to the chair a lot via the work I do at CPN-prev. So I do not have, I do not feel I have as much of an active day to day role in the chair as compared to David, for example, who basically receives the chair, he receives the funds right so it's just it makes sense that he has more responsibilities regarding the chair. I have to say we get along very well – David, Vivek and myself, so we think about the projects in a common way. We all believe in the importance of the chair. So some of the projects we thought together and some other projects we separately do… Vivek with Project Someone, David and

Marie-Eve… so, we have our kind of fields where we do the work and then some of the projects we do together but when we speak about any of the others' work, we speak as a united Unesco Chair.

Q: Could you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened where were you and with whom and how have you felt?

A: So two things come to mind. The first thing that comes to mind is the challenging clients. So this is this is tougher when you have clients that are there are fragile or difficult, challenging, and then you start wondering about the what you should do, basically as a clinician, and it's not easy because sometimes you find yourself in situations where whatever decision you take, there is a risk of things turning the right way or not. So there's no one decision that can solve the situation. And that it's very hard because you find yourself torn between basically unable to make a decision. And so you feel frustrated, you feel a bit torn. I wouldn't say helpless, but it may be like anxiety inducing. I think what helps a lot in this situation is that we work as a team. So I'm part of a clinical team, with people who are senior to me as well so I can rapidly engage with the team meeting and ask them to reflect together and ask them for advice. And this way you feel really support it and you feel that you can take the risk. The team kind of helps you to detach emotionally, so not everything that happens to the client is our responsibility.

[How do these clients come to you?]

A: They come through the clinical team from many sources. They can come to us from police, they can come to us from family members. They can come to us from school personnel, other professionals referring them, they can come from family or community or from the police or for themselves. So there's different sources.

[But they can't be constrained to come to you, right?]

A: No, they're not constrained, because we are a voluntary service of mental health and social support service , so they can't be forced. Of course there are some who do not believe in the help that we provide. At these we don't see. So I'm not saying all people who are attracted by violent radicalization want help nor seek help, but at least we have those who think that we have something to offer them.

That's one situation. So maybe this is yeah, this is maybe one specific, another critical.. and I wouldn't call it episode because it's something that is ongoing. It's something that is ongoing. It's very hard to connect together. The practitioner, the researcher and the policy level since it's very difficult, and is very at times frustrating to, you know, to come to a common agreement, a common understanding of the problems at hand to have the same priorities. The policy sector or the government sector is very, very sensitive to political issues to public opinion, and this often may cause hindrance to making progress in the field. So, from a practitioner perspective, this is a very frustrating reality that we have to work with. But I still need to work with because it's really important to have those who have a

bit of the power and the money or the vision to be able to align and also to be able to understand what is at stake and see the bigger picture anyway.

Q: Thank you. So this was the first part of the interview about your working practices. The second part is about radicalization. The first question is, in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: So briefly, in my own words, I would define radicalization as simply the attachment to a goal – be it political, social, and personal, whatever economic goal. So it's the attachment to a goal with a will to that is based on an unsatisfaction with the social status quo, and the will to change that status quo. So for me, radicalization is a very healthy political and social phenomenon. Violent radicalization is a little bit more problematic at times it is necessary to induce change in society. But what I tried to prevent it as violent radicalization is not necessarily radicalization.

Q: Which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: Yeah, I mean, violence is not necessarily linked to radicalization, but yeah, it exists in the ecosystem of radicalization. I would add structural injustices, social crisis - it could be political, it could be economic, health, sanitary crisis. But definitely structural inequalities and structural violence, that's for sure. I would add, you know, other factors that are more like relational or individual risk factors that are connected to violent radicalization and need for social change. Yeah, I mean, meaning seeking meaning, identity suffering.

Q: Well, the next question for you would too obvious… it was "have you ever met radicalized people in your activities…?" Maybe you could to add something about your experience and about the outcomes?

A: So I can speak on my behalf on behalf of the network, all the other practitioners that are part of CPN-prev. So, in terms of outcomes, I can say that there is fair success in keeping them in the program. So there is a light, I think we are able to build trust alliances and to have them stay in a way in the intervention, which is already a good sign. I think that for some who are at risk of violence, there is a desistance from violence, meaning they decide not to commit a violent attack for now. Risk fluctuates. There are also more positive outcomes in terms of reintegration, for example, people reintegrate in education, in vocational training, reconnecting with family or you know, getting out of social isolation a little bit, improved mental health symptoms or issues. So there are successes there are outcomes, such as different levels that are both in terms of reducing violence, but also in terms of improving a person's general wellbeing and integration society. Some outcomes have involved "de-radicalization", meaning the person being less interested by the ideology or literally abandoning the ideology completely. They're there are there are a minority, they're less, but some do abandon the belief systems. Some outcomes are good and other not…some outcomes are losing the client, not managing to establish trust or the client feeling that we're not a good service or

worth the trust. So that's one I can think of one violent outcome or a couple of violent outcomes. So not having been able to prevent violence completely, but generally so far…. Outcomes are rather successful and there are the outcomes that are related to reintegration.

Q: Okay, thank you. So the third part is more focused on prevention practices. And the first question would be, what are the activities that characterize this center? You have already talked a bit about CPN-prev, maybe just explain better the kinds of activities because we have talked about clinical activities and what kind of prevention activities do you do? And also, what is the connection with Raps Cécile Rousseau?

A: Raps is a research and a Project Center on prevention of social polarization and its allies. It's funded by FRQSC and it allies researchers, just basically a research group. It's really a research infrastructure. But within Raps, there are prevention projects that are developed and evaluated. Raps is mainly Quebec based, and internationally as well as some practitioners… CPN- prev is a Canadian wide network and it is not a research network. It's a practitioner network. So if you have practitioners or researchers that they are a part of CPN as well, but it's not a research network. The only research we do at CPN-prev are systematic reviews. But we don't do research. We are a network by practitioners for practitioners. So what we do is systematic reviews in order to develop best practice guidelines. We do knowledge, mobilizing, mobilization, we develop tools for practitioners, we have a clinical community of practice, we meet virtually every month to share cases. So maybe I think one of the best ways to distinguish them is this this way there's research. So researchers who are part of Raps they can be members of CPN, they can be members of CPN, so they can access this systematic reviews, to access the tools because CPN has this like open public face world part, but they cannot take part in the clinical activities.

(…)

Q: Okay, well, you have already talked a bit about this, but the following question would be how political and or scientific collaboration the projects work. This we have already talked about, but what are the strengths and critical points in your opinion?

A: I think science… research and politics are more aligned than politics and practice…. and research and practices. They are becoming more aligned but because we have to keep pushing the agenda. Why I'm saying that politics and research is more aligned because politics funds research. They do fund practitioners, but not as much as they fund research and practitioners are oftentimes funded by other segments, a bit by security but also by other ministries. So I can say in Canada, there is consistent communication between researchers, government actors and practitioners. And this is thanks to the Canada center. So the Canada

Center for Community Engagement for community resilience and engagement in the ministry in the Federal Ministry of Public Safety is the center.. for extremism prevention, this is how it started, and it's thanks to them… that a lot of the connections between researchers, practitioners and politic policymakers are being done, thanks to the efforts of this kind of assumption. If there were no efforts by the Canada Center to connect those sectors, it would have been very difficult for those sectors to connect the challenges as I said, it's the different priorities, different agendas, different, different matters that we have to focus their attention. So when it's different priorities, sometimes it's become difficult to it's difficult to align and you know, work in the same direction.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Well, I think first of all, to do successful primary prevention, there has to be a form of model or strategy and to me, it's the public health or education model, that is the most important in understanding that violent radicalization is really another way of being and it's mostly caused by structural inequalities, and risk factors there. So in terms of prevention initiatives, we can implement a lot of prevention initiatives. The problem is that not many prevention initiatives have evidence that they work… they likely work just because they've been there for so long. You know, when you compare contexts where these initiatives exist, that these initiatives do not exist, this is in a way you can conclude… Maybe it's working because… so democratic resilience, I still have difficulty understanding this term because democracy itself, there's something weird about this. I don't understand. I think there could be misconceptions.

I think that primary prevention definitely needs to focus on more complexity, cognitive complexity, cultural sensitivity. I mean, a certain degree of empathy for others. Civic engagement, positive, constructive, civic engagement, vocational training, continue education like everything. In a nutshell, it should focus on like three main things. The first one is every single aspect that helps the person integrate into society and access. Fair structural conditions like access, fair economic conditions, housing, work… so that's one. Second is everything that touches on connections and belonging - so feeling that we are part of deep connections and belonging in the social support system, like we have friends, we have family, we connect to them, we belong to them. And I think civic engagement comes in here because like its connection to my community, to my society, wanting to contribute positively for the wellbeing of my community and society. But this is not enough because I can be part of an extremist group. So next to that has to come those factors that will help you know, kind of move me to something that's more positive action. So that would be you know, more complexity, cultural sensitivity, openness to others, not seeing the world in simplistic terms, so everything that kind of

complexifies and nuances one's perception of the world. Feeling of belonging and engaging and having what it takes to reduce structural inequalities. So maybe yeah critical media literacy right, like resisting the bad things that we get through internet. So this is where like primary prevention needs to keep going. Yeah, basically, anything that addresses the social determinants of suffering.

Q: Thank you, and how we think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: They need to be constructed in deep collaboration with the communities or whatever, where the prevention is happening shouldn't be top down, it should come from the bottom it should be deeply co-constructed by the community, who knows what it means. It has to be funded, has to be evaluated and what works… has to be continuously funded.

Q: And last question. What do you think is the future for the radicalization studies and radicalization prevention? There are some people who think that like there's some kind of decline of attention… what do you think is going to happen?

A: I don't think there's a decline and I don't think there will be a decline. I think there may be less use of the word radicalization and maybe more use of words like hate, extremism, and maybe social polarization and these kinds of words. I think this is definitely one of the future like hate and extremism, basically. In terms of reduction, I don't think it will decline because I think, you know, hate is always there, social polarization is there, it is increasing. But I think there will be, at least personally, I'm working towards that shift, meaning that instead of this field trickling mostly down from terrorism studies, it will become a field that trickles down maybe from other areas, from the historical, sociological or anthropological studies on radicalism or hate, social psychological studies. Education studies on prevention of hate and extremism. So I don't think it's going to decline. I think it's just going to kind of spread in different ways, and have other fields feed into it….at least in Canada I'm sure it's not going to decline.

INT. N. 19

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: So I'm currently a Horizon postdoctoral fellow at Concordia University in Montreal. I recently finished my PhD in… It's technically called curriculum studies, but it's around kind of educational philosophy. I have a master's in education as well, and I've worked in all sorts of spaces teaching, I've worked in universities, I've worked in kind of art galleries and program management and program development there in correctional institutions and prisons. I've worked with youth with a lot of addictions and kind of outreach programs in high schools and then also in high school classrooms. So junior high and high school classrooms.

Q: What did you teach in high school?

A: I taught a variety of things, mostly French, actually, as well as social studies and art classes, and then a little bit of everything doing kind of small contracts as well.

Q: And your first and your post-doc here is on...

A: So I'm doing the postdoc with a project called Landscape of Heat and Landscape of Hope. And there are two interrelated projects that try and create spaces for researchers, but also for communities and students and teachers to kind of grapple with difficult questions around kind of extremism and violence online, but also in person through creative means. So through creative expression and specifically through a lot of kind of sampling practices. So looking at what exists in the world in terms of sounds and images and visuals, and then using those to kind of create counter-narratives and other kinds of narratives in response to how people are kind of thinking about difficult, all sorts of difficult stuff in this time.

Q: And you started collaborating here at Concordia for your postdoc?

A: I Actually started collaborating with Landscape of Hate and End Project Someone in 2015. I have to double check that. Yeah, started with Project someone and I worked with my supervisor at the time, and we did a series of kind of graphic cartoons that were based on research done in a grad class. Each student created a little piece of research where they were thinking about online hate, instances of online hate. And then I took that research and I created kind of like an online a graphic that teachers could use to prompt discussion in the classroom. So I worked with Jason. He was teaching the course and created some kind of graphics that are meant to be kind of conversation starters prompts there like posters, and then started collaborating with Landscape of Hate as a video artist in the live performances before.

Q: Maybe you have already answered the next question is that how did you engage in prevention? Was it there or before?

A: Yeah. So I think this was my kind of working with Project Someone in Landscape of Hate was my probably more kind of direct exposure to kind of stuff around this kind of prevention. I worked with a lot of youth, so called youth at risk. And so there's always these questions of how to create a sense of belonging and how to link, especially kind of because I come from spaces of schooling, how to link kind of educational things with the kind of outside things outside of education. And so, yeah, my first exposure was more through project someone thinking a little bit more specifically about kind of online violence with youth.

I worked in high schools, but most of my experience was actually working with in in kind of alternative settings. So when I was studying education, I actually worked at the provincial kind of health organization, had an addictions program for youth. And so they were they were doing kind of a 12 week program, and I would work

with them every week to do different art projects. And so that was not related to any specific they're working there to kind of… there's other things happening for them. And then I also worked in what's called an outreach school in Edmonton, Alberta, where it was often students who had left school… Dropped out, some of them because they had young children or had to leave school for all sorts of reasons, and then trouble re-entering into the kind of main school system. So they would do this kind of alternative programming and more based in modules. So it was a lot more about relationships. Developing, then helping them work through their content.

I see a lot of kind of this like. Yeah, so called alternative programming, trying to work with youth who are not fitting in in the system for some.. for all sorts of reasons. That was kind of a primer I guess, for this work.

Q: You have partially answered also the next one, but we keep on adding pieces. The question is, could you tell me more about your first experiences here, and how have you learned to do what you do and with whom?

A: I think my first experience is like specifically with Project Someone was the learning to hate graphic novel kind of comic project. And I don't know if I fully learnt what I need to do or I'm still learning what I'm doing, but I think what, what brings that together with what I'm doing now is trying to think about what research leaves behind or what lies outside when we're doing research into any especially kind of complex issue. There's a lot of things we can say about it, but there's also a lot of things that are really difficult to say and not because of our cognitive limitations or because of even fears of saying it, but because you just can't say some of the more nuanced, affective bodily kind of desiring things that happen in terms of when we're thinking about something like hate or something. So one of the strategies we've turned to are these kinds of other means through kind of visuals or sound, because it still can't say everything, but there's something that working in those artistic mediums can do that's maybe a little bit different than text or then talking to someone through a kind of dialogue.

And I don't think one is better than the other. So I think I've started to see how like this, like multifaceted, like many different kinds of approaches to, to thinking through something and then collectively offers a different way to not just like intervene in an issue, but even understand what's happening. And so for that learning to hate comic book, I worked with a bunch of new researchers, grad students. Most of them are master's students. So they are also just grappling with what it means to kind of think about educational research. I worked with my supervisor at the time who is trying to think about public pedagogy a lot, and then I worked with the project someone team who had the kind of expertise more from the more specific kind of cyber violence prevention side of things. So I feel like through that project, I also got to learn how to truly collaborate where it's not just

like you do this, you do this, you do this, but where we have to use our skill sets together to make the thing happen, like none of us, you know, like necessitates a collective kind of effort to make it happen.

Q: Thank you. So last question of this first part was about your working practices and practices learning. Last question of this first part is can you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you and with whom and how have you felt? The first thing that comes to your mind?

A: Yeah, well, we've been doing, I think, of kind of just very recent things. So through Landscape of Hope, I've been working with Vivek and Owen to kind of follow up on some of the workshops they started doing last year, which is a little bit new. They've always worked kind of with communities, but often students or teachers in training. And so they've last fall went into kind of more specifically kind of communities outside of the university and with younger people and started to kind of develop some protocols on doing workshops in those spaces. And so we are working with some new communities now and mostly Owen and I, but they're in Edmonton where I'm from, and there's a lot of differences between that and the fall. So there are different things, but I think we've learned a lot. I've been able to learn from what's happened previously and then this project, it's kind of interesting because I've worked with these schools for a while, so I have some connection with the teachers and the students. And we're kind of coming in as part of a course that some of their students are doing. So again, it's a program. I've been consulting with them for a little while. It's another program through Edmonton Public Schools, which is the main school district where they are providing opportunities for students who again, are maybe not fully flourishing in school for all sorts of reasons, or who have had to leave and come back, and especially during COVID, who need to kind of like top up things because they missed a lot of school. And so they've created these courses. And instead of it being like science or math or something, it's there based on themes. And so some of the themes are like how to build anti-racist schools or how to think about decolonial kind of education. And what's cool about them is that they really want the students to be at the center. So instead of us telling you, you know, the kids, this is what we're doing. And it's like really centered on the students kind of coming up with a project developing over time. And then we help so on. Owen and I have come in to, to work with them through landscape of hope where basically we're getting together in a room with many kids and asking them we kind of helped them develop some research questions. We kind of pitch it as co we're co researchers in trying to figure out how can we work through ideas and instead of writing about it or just talking about it the way we do it is by making something.

And so we recently were there in March and then April, and we did a two day workshop most recently, and it was really impactful for me for lots of reasons. Part

of it was working with the same group of kids over two days. You can get to know them a little bit better. There's a little bit more trust in what can happen. We can. We were able to kind of actually plan something from start to finish and over the two days they work together to basically create a collaborative performance that they perform to their families. And so we weren't asking them to think about specific things, but on the first day we did, because they're already part of this course, we asked them to write down the questions they're interested in. So some students are asking questions around how do we listen differently in the world? How do we work together differently? What does it mean to do research into difficult topics? And they were able to work through those questions by making different kind of sound pieces. And they did recordings and sampling and beats and all sorts of things. So I can't remember exactly what the question.

So there were several kinds of, I guess, critical moments in that. I think one of the ones that stands out to me was in when we when we were with them last time at the end of the workshop, after we did a bunch of sound stuff and cool things, one of the students asked, "What does this have to do with anti racism?" And it was a really good question and I think it exposed kind of how we're approaching things pedagogically. And that is to say we're not saying hello everybody here, five ways to be anti-racist or like or provide some sort of formula. And in the moment, I had lots of ideas, of course, how what we were doing related. But I left it open and I asked the group, I said, "Well, this is a really good question, like, what does this have to do?" Because we spent all day together and I was just really impressed and not surprised maybe by because they are such a great smart group of kids, but they kind of said all sorts of stuff. They said they answered the question to the other students and some of them said, you know, by expression or like having this space where you can express yourself or different people can express themselves, creates a different culture where other kinds of prejudice and that sort of thing, or kind of like separations might not you might be able to work through it in a different way. Some people talked about kind of showcasing the talent and excellence that already exists in communities like that. There's already a lot of stuff going on in these kinds of activities, maybe expose how everyone is already kind of has all this power in this talent behind them. Some students talked more practically about how they had to make decisions throughout the day, and they couldn't just rely. They had to actually kind of compromise and listen to each other differently. And they couldn't.. they had to kind of slow down a little bit and make decisions together as opposed to just going with what they wanted. So there is a kind of like move away from the individual towards a more collective thing. So they made these really incredible connections to this question of how does like we did like sound mapping and things, how does it and, and for us we knew that we weren't again there to kind of give them content per se, but to create a space where they could work through different

kinds of content that actually does come from them instead of us kind of like imposing it on them, right?

Q: Well, great. Yeah. Thank you. So the second part regards radicalization - in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: When I think of radicalization, I always think about kind of what constitutes a norm and then an extreme and how that is always maybe something that is not kind of static, but it's in motion. So I think it's relative. Radicalization is always relative to something. Which makes it tricky.

I mean, in the case of kind of violent extremism, I would say radicalization often involves a certain kind of process of alienation and then maybe reclaiming a sense of belonging. I think there's a really interesting play between that, like between kind of feeling on the outside of something and like separate from something, but then kind of finding something to hook on to that can kind of create a sense of belonging or identity. And so I don't think radicalization just about like kind of like lone, singular kind of experiences, but how it links up to some something that kind of creates the movement of radicalization. Like, I feel like there's always it's always in relation to something that wouldn't be a good description.

Q: And which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: Yeah. I think that question of extremism extremity, like the extreme, like what counts as extreme versus mainstream or in the middle, I think of radicalization in terms of community and belonging. I think I also think about it in terms of politics. I mean like my at the top of my head is, is a kind of like white supremacist the, the kind of. Yeah. Especially thinking about like online communities and stuff that kind of more outright white supremacist, like far right.. Those are the first, I guess, things that come to mind with radicalization. I also think about kind of really masculinist communities. And again, maybe I'm thinking just online.

I think less I mean, like, I feel like when I first joined the project, there is part of me, part of my bias, I guess, is is thinking about extremism in the way that it was often narrated in terms of kind of religious extremism, like globally, you know, like that's like one of the main narratives. And then since… And now it's so different because I've gone to several workshops and maybe it's influencing what I'm the kind of question of the alt right kind of white supremacist stuff, because that seems to be one of the more dominant forces now in a fashion. I mean, fascism is something that I guess where I maybe why I was brought in, I write more about kind of fascism more generally. And so think about like this kind of fascist line as well with radicalization.

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: I've met students, many students in less in high schools, probably more in university classrooms. I wouldn't say they're radicalized, but they you can I could I guess I would start to hear certain ways in which they talked about things that for me signaled a certain kind of allegiance to community. And often it is around kind of yeah more far right ideology… And then the strange kind of I guess way in which it's been unfolded in the Canadian context as well in relation to pseudo scholars like Jordan Peterson. Have you heard of this person? He's a public intellectual, I guess you could call him. But a lot of I think especially young men, young white men. Kind of a YouTube phenomenon, you know, that everyone and has some really kind of terrible rhetoric around kind of what it means to be a man, what it means to be a smart man and what it means to be.

I wouldn't even want you to listen to it because it's just like toxic. But what I find difficult about it is that people who you wouldn't maybe think normally… like he hits something that that's right on the edge that that I think people young people again it's usually young men young white men that I would consider kind of like smart and kind of with it in my class. And then just some of the way I just saw them kind of being pulled because of their identity, maybe. But I think it's really this difficult thing, which probably happens a lot in these spaces where people feel alienated or separate or not good enough or insecure, and then there becomes there's a way to kind of build oneself up through these channels, Youtube channels…. But that makes them feel like a sense of belonging and affirmation. So I haven't and then I've met people through the project who are former like former kind of. So that's always interesting. But I haven't. It's been more of those students who are kind of I wouldn't say they're radicalized, but they're definitely on the edge.

Q: The last part is related to preventative activities. Could you describe the steps of one project on this topic to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: I could talk about I think I'll talk about, like, Landscape of Hope probably, because it's kind of fresh. I think we're in the middle of it, but we have been trying to think about it in a very different way. I think maybe to think about prevention again in the sense that the content that that we're introducing or it's kind of generic or empty, there is no content yet. It's like, it's kind of like a vessel… to hold something that will happen based on what is brought to it, based on what the students bring to it or the artists. And so I think that that model, it does something different. Or for us, it's provocative. I think as a as a piece of research, as a part of research in this question about prevention, because one of the difficulties I have and I'm somewhat a little bit outside of the field proper, but I think it's like a pedagogical question to a question of teaching is like, how do you of course, there might be some sort of goal or some sort of aim, these bigger things that we want in the world, you know, less violence, more belonging people to feel a certain way. But there's

it's so dynamic how people come to something or how people learn or what a context is. And so there's this difficult thing that I struggle with of being able to kind of lead to something, but also being open enough to know, like, what is this something that we're working through and not to predetermine what's happening? And so for prevention, I think there are very big goals. Of course, the prevention of violence is like a big goal, but there's so many other little things within it that are much more difficult to articulate. And then it often again is like how does it how does it get articulated by the community itself or by the people itself that are.

[Could you try to be a bit more specific? Because I've heard about it also, obviously, but like if you had to tell someone that doesn't know anything about it, how, how, how it was like thought at the beginning and at what point you are and what do you do more specifically?]

A: Totally, yes. Yeah, I'm speaking in quite abstract... So Landscape of Hope kind of came out of the art project band, landscape of hate, and Vivek could speak about this better. But from, from my involvement in it as an artist, it was an opportunity to again, kind of grapple with the stuff that's happening online and the content. All of the proliferation of like not just hate speech, but just like weird stuff online and to work through that material, but ah, and also create our own material to kind of create these counter narratives because instead of ignoring what's happening online or just kind of adding more and more and more, how do we restart recontextualizing and then what do we learn from that? And so the project Landscape of Hope, I think came about for a few different reasons, partly also because of different funding requirements. But one of the goals and it had been there in Landscape of Hate at the beginning, is kind of working with people around you to collect samples of what's happening. And so we thought, I think they thought when it kind of switched to this, this kind of more community oriented thing is like there's a definite need to kind of address questions around radicalization or extremism or kind of cyber violence. There's lots of ways in which it's done, But what would it mean to kind of come into a space and make something together using audio and video where you also kind of learn skills, digital literacies, how to use the actual… how students can actually use the materials in front of them to say something.

Part of it is just empowering them to be able to say things, whether that might mean through a mic or through audio or through visuals. And then the other part is like giving them space to say things that might not be easy to say in other formats. And so my role as a video artist at the beginning was to kind of … I would I would talk to the people in the project, we'd think about themes and ideas, and I would create a bunch of video assets and then perform them live in response. And now my role as a postdoc in kind of a workshop leader is to again, really work with the spaces that we're in, because it all depends so much on what the context is to think about. Yeah, to create a space where we can teach both the technical digital literacy kind

of hands on skills, but then also turn format it so that we can give the reins, give the leadership to the students so that they can make something happen.

[So during last year you have done these workshops in schools?]

A: We… just started in with the group that we're working with that Owen and I are working with now. We started just after Christmas. I've been working with their teams since September and we're thinking about kind of questions around research. They do a lot of prototype programs, so they're always trying to figure out how to document them. And I'm helping with that. But this this group we just started working within like after Christmas, like in January started.

So it is. It's the one that's in Edmonton, but basically it's across a whole school district. So there's the district that has many schools in it, many high schools. And then the team I work with, they work with students from all different schools and then they come together to a community.

[and they volunteer to join the group, or are they chosen?...]

A: They get credit for it. It's a course. Yeah, it's a special course. So they have to opt in. They often get suggested by people like by counselors or people in their school and they get to go and they have to go to these courses during school time. But like, if they go to a different place and they do these different programs and then for it, they have to instead of it being like a curriculum, what they have to do is get together with other kids and decide on a project, carry out the project. It might fail and might succeed, and then they have to reflect on it and write about it. So it's like a research course.

[And how often do you meet them?]

A: So they meet every two weeks or so and then meet in person once a month. Now that COVID is done. I we met with them online a couple of times in January and February, and then we met with them for we had two days of workshops between different groups in April and then we went back in March and worked with a smaller group. So at first we were working with lots and just showing them a little bit. And then after that, the ones who really like connected with it came to the more kind of concerted two days.

[And are you closing now with this group or is it going to continue next year?]

A: I think it's going to continue. And I think our goal, like it's in the works right now, we're confirming. But they're going to come to Montreal in October for a residency and work with a bunch of art people here to continue to make these different things.

[How many?]

A: So when we were there, there was the first time there was like hundreds, and it was like an intense workshop where we worked with small groups and they and then last time we were there, there was about 20 of them.. the ones that kind of

really got into it. And then from and then from there, we hope that that many can come, but it might be closer to like ten or 15. We'll see.

I don't know if that clears it up. And so there's so many parts, so it's hard to. I'll send you the video, though, too, just for your interest if you want, because they did this performance. It was really interesting.

Q: Thank you. What are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Like both positive and critical? Are you kind of asking for both? Yes. Well, I feel like this is probably what your work is about, but I think a lot of stuff around some of the most difficult issues of our time… It involves a very fundamental shift in the way that we learn to be people in the world. And I think schools teach us how to be people in the world in a lot of ways. And so when I think about prevention, I think there's really specific things. And this is where I look to research that people do specifically on this that can be done in terms of, again, empowering people and sense of belonging and that sort of thing. But I, I just think so often about how school structures are already created in a way to make you feel, to make many kids feel alienated and… not good enough. And you know, there's all sorts of things in Canada and especially in my context in Edmonton, Alberta, we work with a lot of indigenous students in these courses and it's so hard at first to even get them to trust that what we're doing is not just another extractive or like weird thing for us as opposed like it to it's taking time for them to even buy into the to what we're doing and then let themselves... And I think there's a big mistrust of and distrust of, of educational structures. And so when I work in schools and think about prevention, I think a challenge or a critical kind of aspect is how do you create new ways of relating in a structure that already limits ways of relating. And how do you experiment differently within an institution that kind of structures relations? I think it's it's difficult to try things differently. And then you're also it's kind of a difficult uphill battle to kind of switch a culture of something. Right. That already exists. But at the same time, I think that that's what's maybe like a positive aspect about especially doing these kind of creative, this creative work is that even if you try and structure things or you're within a structure, the nature of the work is it goes everywhere and it's it can't be contained always and it gets really messy and something different happens that I think I don't think we're preventing explicitly like these kids from being like, I don't think that you can draw a direct line like, Oh, now this kid won't, you know… But we've seen how having a voice and also feeling a sense of accomplishment and ownership over something that wasn't really not about us. It's about them. And like school, like we always say like school is not for us, it's for you. But that to them was like such flip, like no schools for teachers and for no school. Who school for like, who is it for?

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: I think one is a humility or a sense that you can be wrong, and that's okay, which I think is key because I think so much everywhere is like about including in the university, like having an idea, being firm with it and defending it and like it being right. And it's like, sure. But also sometimes we're wrong and we have to let go. So the capacity for some sort of like.. it's okay to take a risk for it to be wrong, to be okay with being wrong, and that it doesn't mean you're valued, you're less valuable. And I think that's so hard in schools where everything is about being right. So, yeah, kind of being able to be wrong, being that kind of sense of humility or letting go of of how we might be able to change your mind and that being okay, being able to kind of be not just flexible because there's this like interesting balance that we want students to be able to say, to be confident enough to say something, to be empowered, but also to put it out there knowing that it might change.

That you can take a risk and try something, but that you can also let it go if it. I think that in related involves a kind of a capacity around being able to be part of a collective. And this is a hard thing I think, and something I think about a lot to let go of a certain kind of like individual sense of, I don't know… I mean, yeah, the in schools, again, I think we're trying to always think about how to make students feel not special, but like supported and held and like that. They matter. But without just saying, like, you're the most important thing, you know, like that you matter. But your matter as part of a collective, like none of us matter that much - like We all matter, but equally not that much.

And I think that's really hard because so much of our social structure, including schools, is built around the individual right. And so a capacity for being part of a collective, for a capacity for care. We talk a lot about care the with the teachers that I work with at this school system around. What does it mean to care in this time for each other? They talk a lot about caring for the land and for ourselves as well because we're doing a lot of decolonial work. And so I think for me, care is not just being nice or something or being kind. It's like to care for something as a kind of speculative sensitivity where you have to actually kind of like make yourself vulnerable and not just empathetic. I don't think either. I think it's about kind of practicing something so that it's you can no longer not care about it, practicing things differently. Yeah. And I think experimentation, I think a lot of these things, whether it's like humility or collective kind of things or kind of caring differently, it just doesn't happen. Like I'm going to be collective now. It takes like ongoing experimentation. So another capacity is like being able to, to put yourself out there, to experiment, to fail, to learn from it, to reflect on it without becoming like it becoming like a neurotic thing or like something that's linked to some sort of

insufficiency. But yeah, to be able to truly experiment and also with not maybe an end in sight, to experiment to see what might happen.

Q: do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Funding. Yeah, that'll be a theme...   I think a lot about my work, A lot of my work is around ecological issues. So when I hear sustainable, it's an interesting kind of concept for me. I think the challenge is because to make prevention activities sustainable or there's maybe something, it's like, how do we abolish the need for prevention activities? Do you know what I mean? Like, we don't want to sustain prevention activities in a way, or we want we want them to not be needed anymore, you know? But in the meantime, the sustaining those, I suppose for those building those capacities, which I think is like very practical. On one hand it's about money, it's about people, it's about expertise, which I think is different than experts. I think it's about collective kind of thinking, resource sharing, skill sharing, like actually kind of listening to and learning from each other instead of reproducing the same problems over and over. There's so much stuff that's been done. I can like. So it's like a practical thing on the one hand. And then and then on the other side. I don't know, it's that you're always I feel like a lot of these activities are often kind of situated in, in other milieus that you have more or less control over, whether it's like society or schools or like a community. And so I think there's like a kind of tactical thing that maybe has to happen and probably does happen with prevention, where it's I think at the same time it's nice to develop models and that sort of thing. There's probably also something that has to happen where it always has to kind of be responding to what the what's the changes are. And so it has to be kind of agile and be able to meet the challenge, the current challenges, which sometimes requires letting go of how we thought things once were or something. Just thinking recently about some of these things around all of the kind of yeah, like they can't even call it out right anymore because it's so messy and weird. Like salad bar terrorism or is one word I heard to describe it where you have like anticapitalist Bolshevik kind of like rhetoric mixed with like a very white supremacist kind of fascist, like the categories used to describe, like factions are so messed up now that it's…. It links also to conspiracy…And all of that stuff. And weird ecological, a lot of ecological, like a lot of people kind of claiming a like a desire to kind of solve climate change and global warming and everything. But the way to do it is through the white ethno state, right? Like get rid of immigrants in this.

(…) Exactly. Power. It's about power, I think. And so those are the other kinds of. Yeah. Things around sustaining is like a bigger question around how we think or how people feel within these systems of power to and that becomes much bigger than your project. That's where you lead out. Yeah.

INT. N. 20

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: I started a PhD here in 2009 and graduated in 2018. My PhD was related to musical self regulation. So it's looking at how musicians practice their instruments and how they discipline themselves in order to practice better and to achieve their goals. And specifically, I was interested in differences between age groups. So before that, I worked in Japan for about 16 years as an English teacher, and I did my Master's in applied linguistics there. And then most of my life I'd say I've been a teacher. And my original degree was in music.

I was born in London and I've lived in France, Japan and now Canada. So I did… I did some studying as well in France in my twenties, and I stopped. But yeah, so I've lived in different places.

Here is since coming to Montreal, I guess I diversified because apart from changing from my initial plan to do linguistics to music education, I also got involved in anti radicalization research because, well, there's, there's, there are different possible answers to that. One of them was because I needed some work, because I was an international student. And it's not you don't get you know, it's kind of difficult as an international student to have access to grants and funds and so on. But my PhD involved systematic review. So because I have experience in systematic reviews, which actually I learned as part of the CSLP because my professor used to be the director of the CSLP before Vivek, I had connections with UQUAM, some friend of mine was working with UQUAM and they said they were looking for people with experience in systematic reviews. And so I got involved that way. Yeah. So I've been like working as a research assistant with them, but also as the editor because like a lot of the people in the team, English isn't their first language. And so I get involved to code studies for the systematic reviews and to edit things like policy briefs, the actual reviews, any knowledge mobilization that they do. So I've been involved in. It's always funny when people say like, Oh, what are you doing? And I mentioned the anti radicalization thing because that's the thing that most people find interesting, that they don't care about my, you know, my music past or the teachings, but I'm not actually, I wouldn't say that, of course, that I'm in any way, shape or form an expert in that area. It's just something that I have seemed to have got involved in.

Q: Okay. Thank you. And how did you start collaborating here at, let's say, at CSLP in general?

A: So as I said, my previous PhD professor used to be the director.

So he got me involved pretty early on, just as like a student member of the like a student representative of the committee for a while. And also Vivek was my, was on my committee so he, and was my professor like he did research methodologies.

And so I took a couple of classes with him, including statistics and research methodology and. And then I was looking for a job. This particular job, I was looking for work, I guess, like last year or the year before, because, yeah, I was in need of work because where it's kind of complicated, I forgot to say, also I worked as an e-learning instructional designer slash research assistant with a company that's closely associated both with the CSLP and with the university. So they create they create the online courses for the university. (…) It was just before, it was before COVID. Like I worked there for a couple of years, so before COVID, but also I worked there during COVID. But the company ran into difficulties.. it's incredible…. It's really strange. It's it shouldn't have because most educational companies thrived.

Q: Could you tell me more about your first experiences here? So how have you learned? You have partially answered. How have you learned to do what you do and with whom?

A: Through my professor and through the systematic review specifically through honestly, it wasn't I mean my professor was more into meta analysis. I took, I was invited to a couple of meetings about the meta analyses which were conducted here because that used to be I'm not sure if it's still the case, but it used to be like the thing that this place was famous for. And I think it's changed a lot since Vivek has taken the reins.

I Guess because of that, mostly because of my experience.

[Have you used your expertise in music in CSLP projects?

A: Never, Never. But that's okay. I mean…. I actually don't consider myself a musician, which is strange. It's something that I've studied but I don't like. I'm not somebody, for example, that I practice, but it's for myself. And I definitely wouldn't feel comfortable in some sort of music, musical…Role…

And I have too much respect for music therapists to ever be involved in anything like that. But it's an interesting question because not so much with the CSLP, but for example, as I said, I'm involved in the systematic reviews and we look at different types of like programs like prevention programs or interventions, and we never come across like studies that that involve music. I've seen studies that … where they look at theater, the effects of theater on, I say adolescents that go and watch a play that involves themes of radicalization or so on….

But not music… But I think but it does surprise me that there's not more stuff related to music. I mean. Also. So I don't. I guess I don't really understand…. I would need to find out more about it…

That's why it surprises me that, like the studies that we've looked at haven't really brought up very much art and specifically music. But what I was trying to say was, I guess I don't really understand landscape of hope and what they do. I've watched a couple of the videos.

Q: Can you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you and with whom? And how have you felt? Even if you don't work with prevention directly, maybe in one of these projects where you collaborate?

A: I think the first thing that comes to mind and related to prevention or like that particular work would be the event that I was trying to invite you to because that was organized, I think, by Vivek and Ghayda. And that I found really interesting because it involved kind of practitioners, like police officers. Not I don't think they were very high up in the police and lecturers and social workers. And I was just a student at the time, but it was I was involved in like just getting the groups to discuss together. And I found that fascinating, even though it wasn't my area, really fascinating because I realized just that diversity of people involved, the fact that it's a big effort to kind of, you know, prevention is a big effort involving lots of different people. And yeah, I think that that really opened my that that was one of the reasons why I thought, okay, this isn't my area, but I'm like, it's a real privilege to be involved in, in, in such a big operation. I like that. I thought that was really cool.

Q: In your own words and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: I mean, I guess the one word that springs to mind is it's a trajectory that's not necessarily linear, that it's multifactorial.

This is a little bit biased because of my experiences, but so exposure to extremist content online. And then that's one. But like others, would be personal factors, such as feeling disconnected from society. Feeling… I would say disengagement is is one of those. I hesitate to. I know that there are lots of contested factors.

I mean, it's interesting, like watching on the news, like when you see things like mental instability brought up as a reason.

Q: And which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: Probably.. As a sense of being denied somehow, like your or being excluded, silenced, marginalization, oppression… probably as well. I mean, this is again not something that I do directly, but I often imagine that like if somebody had done something to somebody in my family or in my country, like my parents country or something that I'm sure that I would feel. I would be vulnerable to. To strong voices, shall we say.

And also, you know, like this. This idea of, like being, you know. So one of the studies this is coming to the literature, it's about music. Like one of the studies I read recently was about people who are refugees. And when they go to a new country, they lose. You know, there's been this cut with the past. And so music and for example, being part of an orchestra can be such a good way to kind of let other people know what you're what you can do as a musician who you are, and but also of integrating with the, you know, the host country.

(…). There are studies on like even karaoke as an, as a is like a really good way of like singing, bringing people together, especially my experience in Japan of having done that, having done that really, really is proof to me of what music can do, even though sometimes people like some people look down and karaoke and nonsense like an activity. I don't know. I don't see it like that all.

Q: Next question. I don't know if you can answer. Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: You know that meeting it's possible that that meeting that I was telling you about, that there were previously radicalized people, but I don't recall. No.

Q: So then the third part, again, maybe it's not directly linked to what you do, but let's see if you can answer to some of them. It's okay if you can't... No problem. First one would be. Could you describe the steps of one project on this topic to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: So the ones that I that I've contributed towards would be the systematic reviews. So in this from beginning to end, I've been.

A: Yeah. So my, I had a friend in the Education Department that also has worked closely with Vivek... So we both did the PhD together. And she did meta analyses. So she was very involved in the CSLP and she was the one who had the contacted and, and through Vivek as well. Now she later helped to conceptualize one of the systematic reviews. And so I was involved in editing her conceptualization and her making of the model to, to like, to looking at the ways that... I can't remember honestly very much about that. But like I, I was involved in that and then I was involved in the discussions relating to how we were going to find the articles. Then I was involved in like when there were writing grants, proposals, I helped with the editing of that. Then I was involved in the coding of the studies that went into those reviews. I was also involved in pamphlets that were used as knowledge mobilization tools, so correcting the English and sometimes translating French versions to English. I was involved in that. I was involved in the final edits of the actual reviews and then the submissions to the journals.

But it's weird, you know. That's why I kind of felt nervous talking to you about this, because when you are involved in, like, editing jobs or.

Especially, and coding, especially when it comes to things like systematic reviews, it's like you only see one small part of the elephant. So it's, it's, it's kind of complicated to remember everything. (…)

Q: Are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently even in this case? Maybe you don't do directly, but. From what you see, also from your reviews?

A: I mean, the one thing that springs to mind from the reviews is and I saw this in several articles, was like, So I guess two things that sprung to mind to me personally. One of them was that we would sometimes read reviews that were written by the government, and so it was like it just seemed so biased. Of course, everything works because they just say, We do this, we do this, we do it. And then the actual in terms of like identifying its success, it was really not very convincing to me. So they basically asked the practitioners how successful they thought it was. So I think that that would something to change would be to ask the individuals. One of the things is that there's an assumption these days that. That… People feel comfortable talking and wanting to share. And I think that... I sometimes question like to what extent that's true. Like because to develop relationships with and trust with people, it takes time. And also this idea of like wanting to help, I find a little bit problematic because it suggests that I'm in need of help and I need you to help me. Yeah, I find that too. I would like to see more of what goes on, but just the way it's talked about troubles me a little bit.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to developing primary prevention activities?

A: I guess coming back to the elephant thing, I think it's true that this it's generally good for us to think about it, for everybody to think about having a broader view and not just one's own. Yeah. And also developing empathy towards different positions. (…)

Q: Thank you very much. Last question is, how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over?

A: It's the same as in education generally. I think that you need to…. Make the people be able to the people that you are helping be able to then help themselves and help others. Because if you one of the problems I see generally with a lot of research is that it's you know, it's funded for one or two years and then the researchers sometimes go in and do great things, but then it comes to an end, right? So there's never even, for example, in this project, I don't understand what's happening. I haven't heard a conversation about what's going to happen long term beyond the three years of the project. So I, I think that it's important for there to be conversations about that from the start and that those conversations do not just include the brain trust. (…)
Think to bring people from the communities in. Yeah. So that's, that's one thing. Yeah. But I think that in terms of like what happens after. So it's one thing to invite them in that's important. But then eventually what's the end game? Other than we've

done, you know, United Nations sustainable Goals. I mean, that sounds really cynical, but I think I can be cynical because I'm not…. I am…, but I'm not part of this world.

INT. N. 21

Q : Est-ce que tu peux me décrire brièvement tes études et tes expériences professionnelles?

R : Oui.. À la base, je détiens un mastère spécialisé en génie informatique et multimédia. Alors c'est, c'est de l'ingénierie du son et de l'image. J'ai pratiqué plusieurs années dans le domaine. Je continue à prendre des contrats, des contrats comme en informatique et autres. Et j'ai un doctorat en études du religieux contemporain de l'Université de Sherbrooke. J'ai travaillé sur la question des loyautés dans les discours de la guerre au Liban.

Alors, mon mastère d'ingénierie, je l'ai fait à l'école d'ingénieur au Liban. Puis, par la suite, je suis venu faire mon doctorat ici. Ça, c'est pour mes études. Au niveau de mes expériences professionnelles… Quand j'étais au Liban, j'ai travaillé beaucoup. En plus, comme dans le domaine du multimédia, j'ai eu une expérience aussi en politique, comme responsable médiatique d'une campagne électorale pour la Chambre. Et depuis mon arrivée ici, pendant les premières années de ma thèse, j'ai eu plusieurs contrats à l'université comme assistante à la techno pédagogie pour la transformation d'un programme de maîtrise en études du religieux contemporain, d'un programme en classe à un programme à distance. Alors je faisais l'éponge. Former les professeurs aussi à l'utilisation de cette nouvelle technologie et tout.

[Pardon, à l'Université de Sherbrooke toujours ?]

R : Oui, oui, oui, toujours à l'Université de Sherbrooke. Sinon, j'ai eu des contrats d'assistante de recherche de 2014 à peu près ou 2015. Je ne me souviens plus là. J'ai été nommée coordonnatrice du Centre de recherches « Société, droits et religions » pour trois ans, alors j'ai coordonné les activités de ce centre qui a à peu près 20 ans d'existence. Ici, à l'Université de Sherbrooke. C'est un centre multidisciplinaire aussi. Puis, par la suite, j'ai été une année et demie travaillé au fédéral, au Département d'enquête et de sécurité de Postes Canada, comme agente senior de développement de programmes de prévention en matière de sécurité. Après depuis novembre 2019…. Depuis novembre 2019, j'ai eu le poste de coordonnatrice générale de la Chaire UNESCO en prévention de la radicalisation violente. Alors, depuis, je suis à la chaire. Je suis aussi chargée de cours au Département de politique appliquée à l'Université de Sherbrooke et chargé de cours à l'école à l'École supérieure d'études internationales de l'Université Laval. J'enseigne principalement des cours sur le cyberterrorisme et la cybersécurité, la transformation numérique et ses impacts sur la société.

Q: Et est-ce que tu peux me raconter un peu plus de ton début avec l'Unesco Prev? Bref, comment tout a commencé avec l'Unesco?

R : Oui, c'est ça. Il y avait un concours qui a été lancé par l'université. En fait, pour recruter une personne pour ce poste-là, alors j'ai appliqué au concours, il demandait une lettre de recommandation, un cv, de l'expérience professionnelle et tout. Alors eux autres, ils ont passé, je pense plusieurs semaines à passer des entrevues. Puis j'ai eu à un certain moment un envoi courriel pour me dire que j'ai été retenu pour l'entrevue. J'ai passé l'entrevue avec Vivek et David qui étaient là. C'était vraiment tous les deux qui me passaient en entrevue. Puis, une semaine plus tard, on m'a écrit pour me dire que j'ai été retenu pour le poste. J'ai commencé à temps partiel parce qu'à l'époque aussi, je terminais ma thèse de doctorat. Alors j'ai eu quelques mois vraiment à temps partiel pour, après, commencer à temps plein avec la chaire. Puis. Et je suis avec eux depuis presque trois ans.

(…)

Q : Merci. Donc la prochaine question est.. est-ce que tu peux me parler des tes premières expériences? Comment tu as appris à faire ce que tu fais et avec qui?

R : Euh, bonne question... En fait, il y a beaucoup, beaucoup de gestion. Il y a beaucoup de leadership dans le poste de coordination. En fait, le fait d'avoir eu à coordonner un centre de recherche qui est aussi interdisciplinaire pour trois années. Alors, de 2014 à 2016, à peu près même de 2014 à 2017, je dirais, ça m'a donné une très grande expérience au niveau de la recherche, au niveau des contacts avec les profs, les auxiliaires et tout. Alors le travail en tant que tel n'était pas nouveau. La deuxième chose quand j'ai été à Postes Canada, alors au département Sécurité d'enquête, j'ai eu une excellente gestionnaire avec qui j'ai travaillé, qui, elle m'a formée beaucoup sur les habiletés et les compétences en matière de gestion de ressources humaines, parce qu'elle, c'est sa spécialité. Et comme je travaillais vraiment dans son équipe et que j'étais directement rattachée à elle, alors je me rapporter juste à elle. Elle m'a beaucoup formé, ce qui était quand même très de valeur pour moi, parce que j'ai acquis des compétences que je n'ai pas acquis ou qu'on n'a pas nécessairement dans le domaine de la recherche… à la chaire, quand je suis arrivée... Je peux dire que le travail a commencé au fur et à mesure. Pablo avait plusieurs de mes tâches, alors Pablo m'a fait une passation des dossiers. Il m'a initié à certains dossiers. Mais c'est vraiment au jour le jour, là quand même, que j'ai appris à connaître les instances, les partenaires et tout. David a été très, très présent dans ma formation... Énormément, je peux dire. C'est celui qui a été le plus présent, c'est celui avec qui je travaille le plus aussi de proximité… du fait que Vivek a sa équipe chez Concordia… cela va bien et tout.

Mais ce qui est bien à la chair, c'est que, aux trois semaines, on a nos rencontres de suivi avec tout le comité de direction. Alors les co-titulaires sont là et comme ça,

moi je peux faire des suivis avec tout le monde, je peux leur mettre à jour sur l'ensemble des dossiers. Eux aussi, ils peuvent me mettre à jour sur ce qu'ils font chacun de son côté. Parce que ces petits, comme chaque titulaire, a déjà une équipe à lui. Et puis c'est quand même assez large ce qu'on couvre. Je peux dire que c'est ça. Il y a aussi une grande partie d'autonomie dans le travail, alors je prends des décisions. Puis j'avance du fait que je connais les dossiers, du fait que si je vais attendre tout le monde, on n'arrive pas toujours à faire le travail à temps. Alors ça, c'était une entente qu'on a pris dès le départ… que « Sylvana, tu as cette marge d'autonomie quand tu es capable de prendre des décisions sans nous revenir, tu y vas… aux trois semaines, on fait nos rencontres, alors c'est là qu'on va préciser ». Comme si j'ai besoin de consentement ou de confirmation. Les deux autres, c'est là qu'ils vont me le donner. S'il y a une urgence, je vais prendre ce téléphone, puis appeler la personne. Puis elle va, on va faire le suivi. Sinon, j'ai des suivis réguliers à toutes les semaines avec David, juste David. Alors on prend une demi-heure, disons lundi matin ou mardi matin. On se parle, on fait un suivi rapide. S'il y a des urgences, c'est là qu'on va les statuer et on va dire bon, voilà, il faut faire tel ou tel autre suivi.

Sinon, c'est ça. Avec l'équipe de Vivek, on a essayé vraiment au fur et à mesure d'établir cette relation-là. Qu'on communique si on fait quelque chose à un événement, aux autres, il nous communique parce qu'il a une période. C'est comme il y a eu, comme je pense, un malentendu... On ne communique pas assez. Alors on n'était peut être pas tout le temps au fait de ce qu'ils font, surtout qu'ils sont très productifs. C'est une équipe très dynamique. Alors ça là, avec Catherine, avec leur webmaster aussi, on a réussi à faire ça. C'est comme du mamans, ils ont quelque chose, ils vont nous écrire pour nous informer. On va essayer de coordonner ensemble les sorties sur les réseaux sociaux, sur le site et tout, et ont trouvé que c'était la meilleure façon pour ne pas échapper quelque chose ou comme juste perdre de l'information juste dans notre circuit à nous. Alors ça, c'était vraiment bon là de le faire là, puis c'est ça. Sinon, oui, c'est un peu ça. C'est de l'apprentissage à tous les jours. On a beaucoup, beaucoup de projets, ça change, alors c'est. Je ne peux pas dire que je connais tout, c'est vraiment de l'apprentissage. Nos projets aussi couvrent des domaines très différents qui ne font pas partie nécessairement de mes champs d'expertise. Alors, au fur et à mesure et à mesure que je fais entendre les titulaires, au fur et à mesure que je vais lire les productions qu'on fait, j'apprends. Alors j'ai beaucoup évolué aussi avec eux. C'est bien, c'est ça.

(…)

Q : Ok, merci. Donc la deuxième partie de l'entretien est à propos de la radicalisation. La première question dans tes propres mots et très brièvement comment tu définis la radicalisation?

R : Euh. La radicalisation est cet état d'une personne qui, qui va sortir de ce qui va, disons, c'est ça prendre une direction qui n'est pas commune et qui n'est pas acceptée par la majorité dans une communauté. Alors il va adopter un comportement et des idées qui vont être en marge et très en marge des autres personnes qui constituent la majorité dans laquelle il vit.

Q : Ok, merci. Et quels sont les conseils que tu considères comme liés à la radicalisation ?

R : Quels sont les concepts? Bon, c'est sûr que toute radicalisation n'est pas violente au départ, alors je pense que le terme violence, je ne peux pas dire que c'est un concept, mais le terme violence est important parce qu'il faut l'expliquer, surtout dans notre cas à nous. On s'intéresse vraiment à la radicalisation violente parce que toute radicalisation en soi n'est pas mauvaise. Alors je considère que le terme violent ou violence doit être précisé quand on fait le type de travail que nous nous faisons à la chaire Unesco-Prev. C'est la première chose. Le terme extrémisme est intéressant du fait qu'il couvre un peu, un peu plus, plus large que... Même que le terme radicalisation. Alors ça aussi, c'est un concept qui est à définir et à préciser. Sinon, c'est sûr que nous, on est une chaire qui traite de la prévention, alors on ne fait pas nécessairement le travail de recherche. C'est simplement d'étudier le phénomène de radicalisation ou d'extrémisme violent. Mais on fait un travail de prévention, on fait un travail d'évaluation. Alors c'est important que ces concepts soient clarifiés, puis soient mis de l'avant pour pouvoir expliquer ce qu'on est en train de faire. Et qu'est ce qui nous différencie aussi des autres? Parce qu'il y a beaucoup de chaires de recherche au niveau international, de centres qui s'occupent de définir la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent, de les étudier en tant que phénomène, mais pas la prévention en tant que telle. Alors c'est un concept qui est important, sinon l'évaluation, alors l'évaluation de programmes de prévention. Pourquoi? C'est important d'évaluer pourquoi nous on s'intéresse à ça et comment l'aborder. Alors comment présenter cet aspect-là aux autres? Parce qu'il y a beaucoup de réticences aussi au niveau de l'acceptation de l'évaluation.

Q : Est-ce que tu as rencontré des personnes radicalisées au cours des activités? Et si oui, est-ce que tu peux m'en dire plus?

R : Euh. Bon, je sais que par exemple Vivek, il a travaillé avec des extrémistes, alors il a travaillé avec ce type de personnes là ou ce type de public. Moi, personnellement, j'ai eu à faire avec quelques étudiants qui étaient radicalisés. J'ai eu à faire avec des étudiants aussi, qui font partie de groupes conspirationnistes, mais pas plus... Je ne peux pas prétendre avoir l'expérience, par exemple, de Vivek et de son équipe qui eux autres ont travaillé avec ces gens-là ou Ghayda qui elle, elle fait de l'intervention auprès de ces gens-là. C'est juste une expérience vraiment en marge des expériences des autres.

Q : Ok, merci. Et quels sont les aspects positives et critiques des activités de prévention? Est ce qu'il y a quelque chose que tu souhaiterais faire différemment?

R : Euh. C'est sûr qu'on fait beaucoup de recherche et on essaye de mettre cela en pratique alors qu'on essaye vraiment d'avoir un lien avec les milieux de pratique, avec les intervenants, les gens qui sont sur le terrain. Je pense que ce qui est important à faire, c'est de pouvoir… faire comprendre davantage le travail qu'on est en train de faire. Pourquoi? C'est important de faire ce travail de prévention et pouvoir l'expliquer davantage. Que ce soit au niveau de l'éducation, des milieux éducatifs, mais aussi au milieu de l'intervenant, mais aussi au niveau politique. Je sais qu'on est, on fait beaucoup d'interventions ou on collabore énormément avec plusieurs ministères au sein du gouvernement provincial, fédéral, avec des instances internationales et tout. Mais il reste que des fois, il n'y a pas la même compréhension pour tout le monde par rapport à ce qu'on fait. Alors c'est ça, on est quand même une chaire et des experts qui arrivent à vulgariser beaucoup notre recherche. Ça, je trouve que c'est un point très très positif parce que nos recherches ne restent pas seulement on essaie vraiment de les mettre au profit des gens qui en ont besoin et tout. Et je trouve que c'est un travail qui est bien pour la société. En tant que tel, on a une très grande présence médiatique. C'est parce qu'on est capable d'expliquer les choses et de les rendre accessibles, que ce soit aux médias ou aux gens. Mais c'est ça, il faut qu'on soit, je pense, plus proche encore du milieu de la pratique, puis de rendre plus accessible encore notre recherche, nos recherches.

Q : Et quelles sont les principales capacités que tu considères comme importantes à développer dans les activités de prévention primaire?

R : Peut-être peut être avoir plus de présence dans les écoles, faire plus de travail avec les jeunes pour renforcer l'esprit critique. Je pense que le renforcement de l'esprit critique est à la base de la radicalisation et de la prévention primaire. Et ça s'adresse à tout le monde-là. Alors si on est capable de travailler dans les écoles, puis d'avoir une présence pour communiquer notre expérience, on est capable de renforcer cette capacité là et de pouvoir avoir des personnes plus responsables et plus compréhensives de ce phénomène-là, et moins à risque, par exemple, de se radicaliser à un certain moment ou de rejoindre des groupes aussi… par rapport à une échelle comme plus large. Je pense qu'il faut aussi renforcer cette même capacité d'esprit critique chez la population en général. Alors il faut, il faut arriver par exemple à discuter ou à débattre des phénomènes sociétaux ou des enjeux qui sont problématiques pour les gens, sans toutefois les étiqueter. Alors je, je ne dois pas m'adresser à Marina et lui dire Marina, tu es raciste juste parce que Marina n'accepte pas mon point de vue ou mon idée. Alors je trouve qu'on est beaucoup aujourd'hui dans une société polarisée. Et du moment où on ne partage pas le même point de vue, alors c'est comme si l'un et l'autre là sont de l'autre côté de la bordure et je trouve ça un peu problématique. Alors ce serait bien de renforcer cette capacité,

de discuter, de discussion, de débattre dans une société, parce que c'est quand même la base de tout État démocratique.

(…) La résilience démocratique? C'est sûr que c'est un concept qui est très intéressant. On vise vraiment développer des projets autour de cela. Le phénomène de résistance ou le concept, en fait, c'est n'est plus un concept. Le concept de résistance est à la base philosophique, alors il incarne beaucoup de valeurs. Et c'est sûr, parler de résilience démocratique, c'est parler de beaucoup de choses aussi. Alors il faut, il faut bien définir le concept si on arrive à le définir. Mais il faut au moins pouvoir délimiter ses contours. Comment on le présente? Qu'est ce qu'on entend par ce concept-là? Mais c'est sûr que ce serait bien, parce que la résilience est au-delà de la compréhension. La résilience, c'est être capable de continuer et d'assurer un vivre ensemble malgré tout ce qui nous sépare, malgré tous les enjeux qu'on est en train de vivre. Alors comment on est capable de toujours trouver un consensus à un commun qui va, qui va nous relier ou comment même on gère la diversité qu'on a, malgré tous les enjeux, alors c'est comme ça que je la comprends et je trouve que c'est un. C'est un concept intéressant. Il faut juste voir son acceptation. Comment? Qu'est ce qu'on entend par ce concept-là? Comment les autres l'acceptent? Parce que bon, nous, en tant que chercheur peut être, on se comprend entre nous quand on l'utilise. Mais est ce que les autres le comprennent ? Est ce qu'ils nous comprennent autant? C'est cela qu'il faut qu'il faut voir.

Q : Merci. Dernière question est ce que comment tu penses que les activités de prévention peuvent être rendues durables et efficaces dans le temps ?

R : Bon, c'est sûr que la prévention est et par nature dynamique. Alors on fait de la prévention parce qu'il y a un problème et qu'on essaie de redresser ou de traiter et de prévenir à l'avance. C'est en amont, c'est un travail en amont. Je pense que c'est un travail continu. Il faut, il faut toujours le faire. C'est ça, mais il faut qu'on s'adapte aussi à l'évolution, alors. Depuis, on voit que les nouvelles technologies sont problématiques parce qu'il y a de la radicalisation qui se fait sur les réseaux sociaux ou qui se fait en ligne. Il y a des discours haineux qui sont véhiculés ou autres. Il faut qu'on s'adapte, nous, pour pouvoir suivre cette évolution là et pouvoir aller faire de la prévention là où il faut. Il y a des fois, on n'a pas nécessairement toutes les capacités, que ce soit au niveau des ressources humaines, des ressources financières, des compétences et tout pour pouvoir faire ce type de travail. Mais c'est important de suivre l'évolution là des phénomènes qu'on est en train d'étudier pour pouvoir évoluer en tant que travail de prévention. C'est ça que je trouvais important à faire.

Int. n. 22

Q: Could you describe briefly your working and studying experiences?

A: Basically my background for my master that I did in Quebec at the university level, I studied jihadist groups of North Africa. Basically the evolution of al Qaeda and Islamic Maghreb. So it's really a political sociology of the jihadist group, basically. And, and, of course, I was like studying this group and not another one, because I felt that I wanted to understand what happened to Algeria during the 90s and 2000 - why all this violence... And so, I think it's like the starting point. It was international studies, but basically what I did was like being supervised by a professor in political science, which was from a very French tradition. So at the end of the day, we were doing political sociology with another one who was in criminology but doing the same thing. So it was super compatible. After that, I decided to do a PhD in political science. But before that, I was working in a small research center more or less a think tank here in Montreal. And I was studying also Jihadist groups and their evolution. We can say there's a continuum between the two. And after that my PhD I just I tried to see if I was going in to do a PhD with this perspective. I did a pre-field in Nigeria 15 days, trying to meet different actors, like more security experts from foreign first and from intelligence and all these kinds of agencies. But I was quite disappointed by the quality of the data or what I was going to have. So counter-terrorism sounds like really superficial in terms of topic for a dissertation, PhD, and studying jihadist groups with like secondary sources… or something like that... At some point, there's a limit. And so I didn't want to do something like that. And I discovered what happened to Mali in the Sahel basically in 2012, when I finished my master, with the Tuareg rebellion, and I was discovering their rebellion at the same time as discovering the jihadist groups are now more in the Sahel. So I read extensively anthropological work on these communities and because of my weird relation with the topic, being like, at the same time a foreigner but somehow close to them because it's like still Berber tribes, um, like half and half I can play a little bit being like too far away cousin (I have relatives in Algeria, some are like from the east and some of them are calling themselves Berber or from the west of Algeria and calling themselves Arab). But I played this asset, let's say, in the field, and I was curious because it was the periphery. It was like an important topic for Algeria too so many reasons were like, and I liked the idea that they were rebels at some point. I think it's like also a personal feeling going into that topic. And why they decided to start violence against the state to how nomads are like fighting against state why and to not go with essentialist reasons or factors or like vision because everyone's talking about the Tuareg question, the Tuareg, but beyond that, what's happening? So what I was not like looking necessarily for prevention of radicalization of anything I didn't… I was not even using this kind of notion at that moment, but we can clearly see links. And when I was doing my fieldwork in 2016 / 2017 in Mali and Niger, more and

259

more Tuareg were like talking about… my research brokers, my some of the leads that I was interviewing, talking about prevention of radicalization, and they wanted me to help them to obtain funds from the international agencies to do prevention of radicalization, not because they were like super concerned about it, but more because it was a way to attract funds. So I think it's important to be aware of these things happening in the global south too, their abilities to understand where are the funds, some of them are, like more honest than others. Another one having an NGO in Mali and another one in Niger.. So, were they like really trying to do things?... [maybe it's applied to every field?...]

Probably, probably, because it's the same guys who were doing international development before. Then they like just switching depending of the funds so and …. basically that and after that I did my postdoc at the University of Florida's research group and still doing same things, like working a little bit on Jihadist groups, at the same time working on like nomadic communities. So my… more or less expertise. And at some point la Chair Unesco-Prev contacted me for like, contract as a consultant. I was not hired at that moment at University of Sherbrooke when I accepted the contract. I wasn't even interviewed for the process. So it was two different processes. And, and I said yes, at some point, I hesitated because I was kind of disappointed by consulting works for the non-impact of these kind of things. But he convinced me that we were going to be able to, at some point, influence decision makers in the Francophonie. And the goal was like to write different reports on different case studies. In North Africa, West Africa and in West and to do a comparative study and on the strategies of prevention of radicalization in the Francophone world. And basically, what's working? What are like our recommendations at the end

We finished the report in January 2022. And we presented it in front of Conseille politique de la Francophonie in March 7. I met multiple times after that people who were like part of this "adventure", more like the people who asked us the document. And it seemed that it was like a thing, like people in the political in the decision makers sphere, they were reading it…. And they were interested by this document… I'm not sure if in academia, you have like the same kind of social capital but in the practical world, they were clearly reading the document and it's spreading online. It's online on the website of a Chair Unesco. You'll have lots of case studies. This one is like the transversal one that we wrote the critical mind… and one key thing in the construction of this, I can talk about it if you want, or we can stop here it depends on what you want. Okay. The key struggle that we had is that we were not going to the fieldwork and I was just coordinating with Lydie…. And the thing was that we had like local research teams, research centers, doing the field work and writing the Country report. Some of them were like super critical against the State. Some of them were clearly let's say being very cautious or very

positive about the State and all the things implemented. And that was like the struggle for us because we needed to put some reflexive analysis on this data. We're not to like very homogeneous, and, and that was our challenge. So a lot of iterations with the actors trying to challenge them, trying to double check. Fortunately, we had like some external expertise me for North Africa, but it's a bit west Africa for Niger for example. I was able to see what's going on. Lydie was an expert on Cameroon, so for one case that I was not mastering that all, she was able to see everything in details. So with that, we were able to write the final report but when you reading the country reports, and the final reports you can say that you have a new layer in the writing process with like a more distant look and some data that we couldn't use because of the process. So that's my frustration in the process, but at the end of the day, I think our recommendations are very good. And what we did was kind of very challenging with during COVID to have all these teams together, but yeah, how can we talk about what's happening in all these Countries? If even if you're implementing as a guide… like with interviews with the same kind of patients, with the same kind of protocol for writing and all that you still have different materials, how can you compare that? And I think we'll still, we still have a lot to do for that

Q: So let me see if I got it right - you were called to collaborate with UNESCO chair in 2021?..

A: Yeah, I was the scientific coordinator of this project

Q: And then.. nowadays you're still working with the Unesco Chair?

A: I think they elect collaborators perhaps, but not anymore for that project, there was like an actual contract for that project

Q: And then you started collaborating with the University?

A: I was hired by University of Sherbrooke when I was doing like the contract at the same time, I was hired, officially first April 2021 at the University of Sherbrooke. I'm assistant professor. I'm teaching basically political systems in Africa, political systems in Middle East, political risk analysis, the course on methodology for master students, methods and concepts. And depending of like the years, a very practitioner class, which is like basically doing consulting work for like, an international actor.

[So you collaborate with David?]

A: Yeah. And basically, I have already like a new collaboration with him. We, I was in the last meeting with David and I told them that it was interested to implement some projects with the Chair Unesco on the prevention of radicalization in the Sahel, the factors of radicalization, the prevention of radicalization and how to do, to explore this information in the Sahel… that's the thing and basically with my course, which is like consulting course, sometimes the actors that we are like going to have.. They are like collaborators of David for example, one is like an

international networkon security, and it's like a close partner of Chair Unesco.. Basically, we are doing the contract for that.

Q: The following question would be, could you tell me more about your first experiences at Chair Unesco, let's say, and how have you learned to do what to do and with whom?

A: I was very skeptical about the agenda of prevention of radicalization when I was doing my fieldwork, because I saw like the instrumentalization of factors. And I was very annoyed by this reframing of international institutions, doing more prevention of radicalization and international development and having like this kind of informal talks with people on the ground in Niger. So I was looking it in a very skeptical way, particularly that can't be the only party to understand how to stop the trajectory of violence. For example, in Niger, you have like some people who are like already radicalized, like being Salafist, but they are Salafist (kitties?...). The act of violence in their like, ideological system is not there. But it's really, really close. So they already radicalized in that sense. So I was like, they already have this project or it's not something happening in their trajectory. So that's why I was like, struggling with few things happening in the ground and not very sure about how we can work. And after that, he proposed me to work with him. Because of my expertise for North Africa, West Africa, he was convinced that I was a good resource. So I was like, Okay, let's try it.

[How did David know about and how did he get in contact with you?]

A: Because of my works. Because I published extensively in journals on terrorism, or on West Africa, or North Africa, but also on how to solve conflicts... So policy. I did my fieldwork in Mali and Niger, people around they knew that it was like one of the cool fieldwork in the last years. And yeah, I'm publishing extensively in French, English quite visible in Quebec. So he knew that I was eventually resource, even if I was not directly explicitly working on this, on prevention of radicalization. I told him we had like many discussions that I was like, sometimes telling him "Yeah, I can see things going on". They're doing field work… It's going to be interesting to know like the three levels of prevention and to see what's going on in the different countries. But you know, the three levels of prevention in Morocco, they're not even thinking about that. So we like artificially going to present that in our research. And we were saying like, okay, don't worry, we're going to tell them that they're going to use this frame, but it's not… it doesn't mean that the actors are doing that. So we explicitly wrote it in the report, and one of my recommendation was, it's a frame, we can use it. But don't think actors are going to just implement things for this frame. It's just a way for us to understand a little bit what's going on. But even some actors are understanding primary prevention as a tertiary prevention, or secondary prevention... It's like when you're looking at them, the guys who were writing the report, and also the guys, the practitioners in the field, that they can't

disagree on these kind of things. So I was like, so that was the first thing. Second one was sometimes I was being too pessimistic and saying, that's just, that's just the new fashion. That's just a new paradigm… in few years, we're going to say "climate change" and security… and next it's going to be another thing… and so and he was like, telling me, "keep this critical mind", basically, and because we need that, and in the writing, I want you to not be to not defend prevention of radicalization, but say what's happening exactly. If you were saying good, if you're able to see good things… Target them and explain them but when you're like, not sure about what they doing, do it too. So basically, that was like our like, contract more or less because he knew that I was more sensitive to critical security studies, to different things happening in the scientific literature, so that's the so I kept this tension. And when I wrote the report, I was struggling… because I was "Am I an agent of the insecurity of the world, of the securitization of the world, or am I able to implement things that can help the actors?" and when I was writing the report, I was struggling with these two ideas all the time with me and trying to write as cautious as I could. (…)

Q: Can you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you and with whom and how have you felt?

A: The three levels of prevention, primary, secondary, tertiary prevention, like I was like… for me, prevention is everything. Basically, everything… is it like even prevention of radicalization? And that's that was like, and he was like telling me you have like another one, targeted primary prevention. So, I was struggling with these categories and saying that, why we're like trying to have like research teams working with these things, and we know that except in Belgium and Canada, the other ones don't know this frame, and they don't master it the researchers and on the field they don't have any idea of it. So that was like, I was trying and it was in the terms of reference …so trying to see things through this frame… With actors who don't master that, or who are not thinking through that, and writing preliminary case studies report with that, and that are transversal, to say at the end…it's just a frame, we can use it to understand a little bit more what's happening on the ground, but the frame is has like way too many problems. That was one of my key problems. Other than the categories inside the primary, secondary, tertiary prevention, and international aid, international development for developing micro projects. So that was my thing. And I think it's partly caused by all the compromises happening in the term de reference, in which I was not involved, and this part of the story is more David and Lydie… I arrived with a frame and I needed to work with it, and to coordinate scientifically to be sure that it's scientifically viable. With this kind of notions… And knowing that we were like, trying to understand local realities with our frame.. and that was like for someone who pretend to be post-colonial or something like that… a struggle all the time.

Q: Okay, thank you. So the second part of the interview is more specific about radicalization. And the first question is, in your own words, and very briefly, maybe with only words and expressions, how would you define radicalization?

A: Trajectoire, complexe, (tortures ?), polymorphe, paradigm, limited notion

Q: Which concepts do you consider as linked radicalization?

A: Normally it's not with that, but it's terrorism but because it's like linked in the frame of people, of literature…counterterrorism... psychology, biographies, cognitive, development, discourses, trajectories, Security (…)

Q: So the third part of the interview is about prevention practices – you have already talked about the projects that you worked on… are you going to continue you collaboration with Unesco-Prev?

R: The tool, the small agenda that I started to develop… I'm perhaps more interested by like all this information and all these radicalized narratives happening in the Sahel right now with like, pro Russia, for example, against… anti French and all that and what's happening since I left… What are like the key story tellers, what are like the key notion they're using… focusing on narratives, basically, in the Sahel, which is initially my perspective for studying Tuareg. So it's reconciling, let's say more my ethnographic lens with this type of topics.

Q: The following question you have already partially maybe entirely answered but I will ask you anyway. What are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: There's one thing perhaps, the operational one. Selecting the people who are doing like the research on the ground, being able to interview them and to check really cautiously, their background and who are in the team because it's clearly not the boss going to do the fieldwork. And if methodologically speaking, they're good enough. Methodology behind it and the ability to do a cautious reflexive and scientific research that's probably one of my… Yeah, in the process that was like the thing

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention? activities? So you already said that you were skeptical about primary prevention. But still, if you think about primary prevention activities, so universal prevention, what do you think it's important to develop?

A: Cultural flexibility, tolerance, at least de-centring our view – this is something I'm trying to do all the time with my students…. not trying to understand others with our cultural backgrounds. I know it's like easy to say… but I think it's the thing I'm trying to use all the narrative tools to develop a form of empathy for like the other way around. And it needs to be like… embodied. Yeah, without that. It's like, abstracted things that you're saying to them and everyone is going to say yes, I'm not a racist or anything but it means nothing. You need to see like the other and to

see components that you can relate. The other person should be able to see you in the experience. And I think it's the only way around to do things. And I know that the one thing is like interesting and I agree with it, it's particularly with the young people, to avoid to say don't do that. It's not a bad example or something. The best strategy is more like to say, "Look at what happened" and he was disappointed that the end about the excitement happening with his involvement in in the Islamic State. That's more interesting to see the whole trajectory and okay, the epic stuff and after that, nothing… and the true reality with his complexity than just saying don't do it. Yeah, the forbidden things are not the way…

Q: Thank you. And last question is, how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: I don't think it's going to last. I think another one would be… perhaps it's going to be one of these notions that we're using in the big frame, but another one is like the key, the buzzword at that moment, and I think we're going to fall like climate security next of climate violence next... We're going there and perhaps they're going to find a link so to continue to frame things with prevention of radicalization inside that. But yeah, perhaps it's going to be connected to this new notion.

Int. n. 23

Q: The first question is, could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: I'm doing my PhD at the University of Montreal and I'm working on the reintegration of people who are associated with Boko Haram in Africa. And regarding my work experience, I've mainly worked as a researcher with some, some of my supervisors at University of Montreal and UNESCO chair… So I had to plan meetings and also send emails to organize events and stuff like that and later I worked with A. on that project with the report de francophonie… so I had a position as also a researcher for that.

I'm studying law and criminology.

Q: Okay, thank you. And how did you start collaborating with the UNESCO-prev? Can you tell me a bit more about it?

A: They advertised the position like one year and half ago in 2019. They were looking for someone as I said at the at the coordination position. So it wasn't really directly with the research. And since I had some experience, doing coordination work, and stuff like that, I applied for that position and also I was hired because I was also working on the field of violent extremism. So it was interesting for them. And yeah, later I during the pandemic, I have decided to step away from my position because I had to also prepare my exam…. I stepped down for almost six months and after that they reached me. When the project with the Francophonie started then

they knew that I had some experience. So I started working on that and then later they hired A. in order to work with me on that.

Q: At the moment are you still you collaborating with them?

A: No, I stopped That project with this year was just too much.

Q: How did you engage in prevention?

A: Ever since I'm working with violent extremism like…. It's like, yeah, is obviously you're working on prevention is ordinary progression, that level of prevention.

Q: Can you tell me more about the beginning of your career, about your first experiences with violent extremism and how have you learned to do what you do when with whom?

A: It's hard to see because for me, it's mainly for my research and I'm thinking my PhD on that, so I had that interest about the topic and I knew that in Africa, it can be good to study that kind of, to have that kind of research not only in Europe and North America. I wanted to have a little perspective. I don't know what to say, I'm still learning… (…)

Q: Can you tell me more a bit more about your fieldwork? Was it qualitative, quantitative data?

A: Yes, I'm doing qualitative research. And since I'm interested in the reintegration of people, I had to meet people there, people working on that kind of program, to be able to understand how they manage the reintegration of people and I also had the chance to speak with former (…) I was in this case, so I had to go in that phase. You're working there and helping to reintegrate people...it's mainly qualitive and also documentary so I have a lot of grey literature. Yeah, that I had access when I was there that I was going to bring back here and that I'm still exploring.

Q: Thank you. Could you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you when with whom and how have you felt?

A: Working with the UNESCO chair for example, when we had that big collaboration in Africa and in different countries in Africa, and we also had some things in Europe. So at some point, it wasn't easy to be able to have the kind of work that you were hoping to have, but at the same time, we had to have a diplomatic approach not to say to people that their work wasn't very good. So it was hard because for me, I was thinking like, if we want people to be able to make better jobs, we have to tell them what needs to be done better and not just tell them thank you. You're doing amazing because of diplomatic stuff. But at the end of the day, I wasn't in the position where I have to decide so… And the UNESCO chair was coordinating that when you're in positions to coordinate you have to manage. Yeah, so for me, it was kind of hard but at the end of the day, we're able to pull out something good from the work and yeah, I learned from that too.

Q: Okay, thank you. The second part of the interview is about radicalization more specifically. The first question is in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: A process which will lead someone to fall… and into be violent and he will mentally accept the idea of violence and also he will act in a violent way to be able to share this ideology or this view of work. It's a process.

Q: Thank you. And now which concepts to consider as links to radicalization?

A: Extremism, violence, ideology, process and… violent action

Q: And have you ever met radicalized people during their activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: I met people who joined an extremist group but I can't say that they were radical, violent threat… because the people that I had the chance to meet… from what I heard their story is like they didn't join the group because they wanted to be in a terrorist group… is just a way of looking for a way out, to have a better life.

Q: Okay, thank you. So the third and last part is about prevention. And the first question is, could you describe the steps of one project on this topic to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end? Maybe it could be this project on which do you work with Adib for the UNESCO chair, for example?

A: Yeah… that was the main project I was thinking about, because I'm also involved in an Association in Cameroon which is called prevention of violent extremism and radicalization in Africa and we had the kind of different events but this was mainly like conferences and stuff like that, but like it started from zero. Yeah, so with the Chair, we had that project about mapping, different kinds of program of prevention around the seven countries … and we had to at the beginning, we have just tried the idea and had many meetings to see what were the countries that we were going to target, because we had to be strategic, since we didn't have a big budget. And then we were able to have some criteria to be able to choose those countries. And then… We had so many meetings online to see what kind of partnerships we wanted to have because one of the wish of the organization of Francophonie was to have involved someone from the south, the local researcher from the global south too, because if you want to produce good research, we have to have many different kinds of partnerships around the table. But the thing is… it was a very big challenge to choose, because most of these stakeholders working on the field either they will be too much linked with the civil society so they tend to have like, just a critic speech or they are working with the government. So they tend to have like a diplomatic language to cover stuff. So it was difficult to find the right stakeholders. And also one of the challenge for me is coming from the fact that we are institution from the north we have a way to think, to think research… And we will have to reflect, to work with stakeholders who already know how to write a report, what kind of approach and stuff like that. So the thing is, we are working usually with the same

people because we know them and that we don't open the opportunity to have different stakeholders so I don't know if I answered the question. But yes, that's something that I noticed the fact that the same people working with that, in that kind of especially in the prevention of extremism of radicalization, they will get some expertise or they will usually go only to them because of that expertise. But the thing is it closes the door to other stakeholders, who are also very interesting, can be just less structured or with people with less experience. So I think that's the problem.

Q: Okay, thank you. What are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Yeah, so as I was saying, trying to be more creative in the way, how we build partnership to be able to include like, different kinds of stakeholders, also is hard because if an institution is funding research, that institution will come with its own agenda. And I will recommend to more flexible because if you are, too much, let's say you want a specific direction for the research, one specific outcome, then it leaves very small places to be able to, to anticipate and also the, how we frame things, is not always the same how people on the field will frame things. And it's, it's required a lot of time to be able to understand and to translate those realities. So, for me one of one of the big issues also how we can translate the knowledge from the field to be able to understand as a stakeholder from the North, and what can I say? Yeah, the good thing is collaboration, because since it's the kind of issue that many countries are facing recently, I was also in France - I lived there for six months and I noticed that there are a lot of talks, of meetings to be able to understand… But the thing is, since we are missing the even the definition of what is radicalization debate… I mean following the countries you can have different approaches. So I think it's good that we have that kind of intersection like your research is going to come across to see what is being done, but at the same time to keep our own identity because we don't face the thing. The drivers are not always the same, the dynamics aren't always the same. So to be able to contextualize…

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Well, trying to make sensibilization, raising awareness for the public, I think it's one of the key thing is how to treat information because nowadays we have that big challenge with… fake news and how the fact that you can easily have access to different platform can affect so I think the digital literacy or education is really important to help people not only to build resilience, but to understand how to look for information and how they can be so critical thinking differently. And also, I think value like tolerance, because we are living in a world now where people are traveling (…) People are getting married each other like, there are lots of mix. And I can understand that that makes can raise a sense of like people can be like what is

happening but that's the reality. So we need to teach people how to live with differences, so much culturalism education about difference.

Q: Okay, thank you. And then the last question is, how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: It's if it is incorporated in academic curriculum, for example, like for me, I see a world given away in kindergarten can have kind of conversation if it becomes a lifestyle, not just a moment, like just to… the same way as we learn different kinds of subjects, like civic education, religion, or big things about the world. At the school, we need to learn how we can promote living together and how we can promote… the prevention of violence in any form. Because in school, you also have that issue of intimidation and stuff like that. So you have different kinds of so…. The earlier you start to aim to have that in curriculum to teach students, people… How to Yeah, how to navigate that, the better it will be.

Int. n. 24

Q: So, first question, could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: My undergraduate degree is in Political Science, my graduate degree is in International Development – I come from the US, so I first studied at the University of Florida, and my master's degree is in the University of Geneva in Switzerland. And after I was finishing my master's, I started working for the UN. Then I worked for the UN in New York City. And I worked a lot in my professional life of immigrants. And I've been an immigrant in many Countries, including here. Here I started working with the refugees, UNHCR in a Country that was in war, so a hardship duty station and then worked in the headquarters far from the beneficiary, which I didn't like very much like administrative audit working for the US... And then I started working with refugees, Jewish refugees coming from the former Soviet Union in New York. Then I moved back to Switzerland for six years. And then we came from there here 18 years ago, and since I've moved here, I've worked in the private sector, I've worked in the educational sector for our English university... I've worked in politics for the federal government, and now with the nonprofit organization. And my desire really was to come and work in the field of immigration in the sense that a lot of people struggle to find their place in their new country. Like I've had a really great experience here and in other countries, but for a lot of people it's much harder to start their new chapter of life, you know, in the optimal conditions. So… I wanted to try and make a difference. So I've been here as the regional director of operations in Quebec for the past two, almost two years.

Q: Could you tell me a bit more about your organization here?

A: So Action Interculturelle has been working for 32 years to build a more inclusive society. And we do so by really trying to make people aware of how cultural diversity is a strength and how immigrants contribute greatly to society, to the arts and culture, to science and innovation to the economy. And so we work really hard to try and set up projects that will educate people and fight ignorance, and so do a lot of opportunities like last night for people that come together from all spheres of society to get to know each other because not everybody has the lucky chance that to live next to an immigrant or to work with an immigrant, so sometimes people just need to have the opportunity to talk… to so there are a lot of opportunities, a lot of events that we create like that which bring people together to create bonds and bridges and then we do other projects that are like la gestion de la diversité… so it's more like helping immigrants with you know, finding their path professionally, finding jobs, staying in jobs, realizing their potential professionally, and also accompany and helping businesses employers of all types, not just businesses, also municipalities, nonprofits, who want to and who have hired immigrants. So they put in place measures, policies, practices that are going to make those people feel welcome and also use their, you know, their skills and their talents to their full potential. So that everybody, everybody ends up. So that's like another division and we have another section which is really working with agricultural workers, because they have been, they are among some of the most vulnerable immigrants. They're very dependent, totally cut off because of the language barrier. They don't have the same access to government services as other immigrants you know, so we do a lot. And we have also I would say, a whole line of projects that deal with fighting racism and discrimination.

Q: And how do you collaborate with a UNESCO-prev?

A: Well, our projects together… was first with David, before even the chair came through. And so there was just a natural transition once the chair was approved. And then I'm lucky because before I worked here, I worked for the Minister of International Development, and she's in the area and so when David and the university, we're trying to get the money from the federal government for the chair, where I was involved in my past life. And so I knew David already like that, but he was the honorary president, co president, and also one of the instigators of a project that Action Interculturelle put in place called "Dialogue plus" with youth. And that whole project came into being after the attack on Charlie Hebdo in Paris. So it was in 2015 that happened in 2016 or early 2016. I forget now, if it was the end of 2015 at the very beginning of 2016. But from that point, one of our talent counselors said, we've got to do something here, to be sure that this doesn't happen here… that can't happen here. And we have started to have already a little issue with some students from our universities and others... So there was like this whole undercurrent of we got to do something and she contacted David, because he was often in the news,

you know, on the on the radio and in the news because of his opinions on this and he's a very good educator, very good in communication… the best. And so he reached at the end, and they reached out together too the executive director of Action Interculturelle, the founder, Mohammed Sulami, who's Muslim… and together they worked on project ideas into them for funding and that was what that's how "dialogue plus" came into being. And so that was a project which really brought youth together from whatever background, of course many more immigrants, but it was not limited to immigrants to create this "espace de dialogue". And it was done here in Sherbrooke and Edmonton, in then it was done in Quebec City and it was done in Hamilton and… Ottawa…so in five different cities. And they also did some research. So not only did they bring youth together, they put a huge forum on, which was to basically kind of identify the different issues to start talking about what can we do… actions that we can take. They did research to try and understand better what the reality was… have you been a victim of racism, radicalization as well as extremists. It was really identified as being one of the goals, to fight that was one of the goals of the project. So they did some really good data collection. And they also organized an awareness campaign, which had the theme "On se ressemble plus qu'on pense". So then they managed to really mobilize the community here, the big institutions, the health system, the universities, the city of Sherbrooke, the companies and do this really wonderful add campaign. Maybe you didn't know that we have the brochure recently in the really, really effective. So that's how with David, they developed a strong link between Action Interculturelle and as well and then the UNESCO chair was approved and funded and he continued in his role as a professor, started working more and more with Concordia and UQUAM, and that's it. And then the project Dialogue plus was funded for a couple of years. Funding stopped for a year, that new request getting more funding for a year, then off for a year…now we're back on, so it's always it's always tricky with the funding, that's one of the things I was going to tell you too.. what we would do differently… being able to plan on a longer period of time, definitely allows you to have a bigger impact.

Q: Thank you. We have already been through some of the questions. Can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you and how have you felt?

A: I think what I wrote down and what I think is still worth mentioning is many times you can talk yourself into believing that extremism and radicalization is not going to happen here. You know, places like Paris or Marseille, you know, places with some tension… that's where those things happen, but when we had the son of someone I know leave to go fight in Daesh, because of the Syrian war. That I think, for me was really extremely, I don't know, an eye opener, and I felt so badly and I still feel so badly for them, because he never came back. And there have been a

couple documentaries produced about three boys who did that… and this boy was one of them and, you know, just you see how it can happen right here in our little town…. Sherbrooke.. Which is, for me kind of a haven, and yet... And also, I would say, well, we have a young woman here who was kidnapped while she was traveling in Africa, and she was kidnapped by some extremist… it was in Mali. And that too, is there's just no way, no place anymore where you don't have to think about these things and take them seriously and get prepared.

Q: Thank you. So the first the second part of the interview has as you have seen is about radicalization. So in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: Well, I think it's when you get to a point where you have such categorical views, that you're so convinced of them and so self-righteous about them... That dialogue is no longer… dialogue with people different from you is no longer not possible… I don't want to give up but it's really, really unlikely and I don't think you know, radicalization is always violent. I know radicalized people who, Geez, how do they, but they're not bad people necessarily. They just have such rigid views.

Q: Thank you. Which concepts we consider as linked radicalization.

A: Well, for sure, when I started at first to better understand and grasp the notion, it was more in terms of fundamentalism. Okay? Islamic fundamentalism… because it was about these young men who were going to fight for ISIS. But definitely, what I feel is more prevalent and it's more dangerous is white supremacy and white supremacy, sometimes I think is too… too strong of a word, because I think a lot of people who have that kind of viewpoint, they would resemble white supremacy, right? But they have this worldview… Of being superior and looking down on others and not respecting them and sometimes being really having this idea that there's this conspiracy going on and they're the only ones still left there defending before… you know, that kind of extremism just so close minded... To people who are different and you see them as a menace or an irritant either way, you know, for me, this is a real issue

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: Yeah. So in our activities, honestly, I am not aware of having somebody who was radicalized. But you know, I'm from the States. So thee I know people, even in my own family, who I would say, I would consider pretty radical, even if not violent… or haven't become violent yet, but it was like.. okay when that happened, but very, very close minded.

Q: How do you see the difference among the States and Canada?

A: Well, I would say the difference between Quebec and the US, because I know Quebec much more than I know the rest of English Canada. I think there are big differences between Quebec and the rest of Canada. There is far less polarization.

But I think we're on a slippery slope here. It's just the beginning… we're close to being… heading to isolated extremism as in the United States. I think the cultural background, the religious, the influence of religion, also in the States that the history of gun rights and slavery in the United States is so so different from here. So I don't see it, you know, following the exact game plan, but what happens in the States, some elements of that were resuscitated, by certain political parties, and made become normalized and in that way it becomes it becomes more and more natural to stigmatize certain parts of the society… that worries me.

Q: Thank you. So about the center we have already spoken, and how political and scientific collaboration and projects work and what are the strengths and critical points? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Now we have two new projects that are just on it. And, again, both are with youth. So it's really important for you to work with youth. And one of our projects is in high schools. And it's to create these intercultural committees, student committees, and then what we want to do is educate them so that they understand and they really can like, unpack the idea of what's racism, what's discrimination. They have to be able to perceive, you know, that conceptualization of it in order to perceive it. So that's education… then we want to make sure that they have opportunities to exchange, right and get to know and have interactions to they're not isolated in their little bubbles. We really, I think with youth have to fight ignorance because a lot of youth might say I was one like that. You get so much information from your parents and on so we need to also be able to see different points of view. And then in a lot of our regions here we have very, very few immigrants. And so we have some high schoolers, one, three, you know, so it's a question of also trying to… demystify people who are different. And then what you really want to do is make them understand, you know, help them see and identify themselves, what are the different issues that are involved with…problematic issues that our society is facing, and then work on an action plan and that's it, equip them for action. So really trying to start with the youth. This is the one project so that they become autonomous… And then it's a way of creating these little, almost like little laboratories where they're all going to be sort of us organizing centrally an activity every month or inviting them all... now we're going to have 11 committees, organizing their own activities, and doing their own interventions in the in the media, and creating opportunities for people to get to know each other to the "rapprochement interculturelle". So I really like this approach. So and we're just getting started and we have 11 schools and absolutely want to come on board which is an amazing accomplishment because they're always so busy. And we have to do it outside of the educational curriculum. So, we have that and then the other projects that we have that I think are a critical point. So the critical point of that first project that I explained is that we're empowering the youth you know.., equipping them,

empowering them to get out and be actors themselves. And it will be training at public speaking, running a project and then the different things like what'ssystemic racism, for example. Taking the other project, is outside of the schools, it can be students, it can be older students, younger students, it doesn't matter they cannot be students, but expect from 15 to 25 and we are going to set up a kind of what we call on French "gemellage", so we're going to put them in groups of two or three. One immigrant, one non immigrant, maybe First Nations, you know, they're gonna work together on issues. So what do they think, again, is similar to them or what are some of the problematic issues that we're confronted with right now and it could be conspiracy theory, new replacement theory, all kinds of things. And they will then work with a mentor, who will help them develop a kind of action plan… what we may do then to prevent or make the situation better. So I think in this section in that project, I really think the intercultural pairing is very effective. And mentorship… mentoring makes a huge difference.

Q: Thank you. So, next question is what are the main capacities which are important to developing primary prevention activities?

A: So what I said before like… understanding, unpacking the concepts, so there has to be kind of already an understanding so you get beyond your unconscious biases… You realize you have them and then you can better understand the reality and then the concepts that we're talking about, so there's, there's that and then I think another thing that's really important is you have to find a way there's no secrets secret recipe, but you have to find a way to create this situation of relationship of trust and confidence. And, you know, it's stress, it's complex, but you want to get them to buy into it, because if they're not if they're not enthusiastic about it, we can't do this kind of stuff. If it's just mechanical. It's not a school assignment. You gotta want and you got it feel that you're making a difference and you're contributing. So I think that's pretty important. Okay,

Q: Thank you. And how do you think prevention activities can remain sustainable and effective?

A: Yeah, well, I think it's really important... there must be a kind of a continuum, in the sense that you've got to project first of all, like I said, it needs to take place over more than just one year, one year, three years minimum. And so, let's say you start with your core group, you equip them if you train them and you get the longer haul, you want to have a kind of process where they come back the next year, and they help the younger ones. And they start mentoring, so that you create this kind of in French we say "pépinière", you know, so that they after a while, become autonomous. It's the older ones giving back to the younger ones, giving them… regenerating like that. I think that's really important. Having a sustainable product, you've got to also get partners to buy in. You can't just be a nonprofit or one group behind, you need to have the community that says this is what we want to do. So it

can be the school board, it can be the municipality. It can be a private company in the area and you know, get everybody around the table, so that it's not just our point of view how we do this, but the other one so that they know that when our funding ends, you guys are gonna have to keep like being The Guardian Angels of this. We're of course going to try and help the youth become more and more autonomous, but they'll always need a hand. So you've got to start from the beginning, already thinking that.. okay, we're not going to be there forever.

Q: Okay, thank you. Is there anything that you would like to add?

A: Yeah. Only thing I would say is that you just have to… You can't… You can't give up it's important to realize that you have to just keep repeating maybe you'll say "I've already told community this once…" but you just keep coming back. Coming back with those messages… "on se rassemble plus qu'on pense"… "la diversité est une force" you know… you just have to keep pounding it.

Int. n. 25

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: I did my undergraduate in, in History, then the major degree in International Relations and Development in Denmark and did a graduate certificate in Refugee Studies at York University. I worked.. I started my career as humanitarian aid worker working in Sub Saharan Africa, and also in the Palestinian territories, and then joined the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, so I worked with refugees for almost six years in Africa, Geneva and Tbilisi – and there I worked with Chechen refugees, so I was first exposed to kind of the foreign fighter extremist groupings that would go through there to fight to fight against Russians and Chechnya. And then I've been working at the Montreal Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies since 2008, became executive director in 2016. And have launched several projects looking at different forms of extremism. A lot of our work is focused more on the ISIS, Boko Haram, the Sunni jihadist group because they were the ones that were committing kind of mass atrocity crimes and genocide against minorities or civilians. So that was tied into our work on genocide prevention. Did some work, also with parliament as a global action where we brought together 120 members of Parliaments to Milan, Italy… different law enforcement on preventing extremism, where we released a handbook did with some different practitioners to inform MPs and what they could do to combat kind of more of the Sunni militant Islamist groups, but since then, have done a bit more work looking at online extremism. So we've worked with Global Affairs Canada did a study on how artificial intelligence can be used.. or misused to deal with online radicalization. And that's dealt with in chars Buddhist radicalization in Myanmar gets wrong and minorities looking at Nazi groups and in the last couple of years

have got several projects. Funding from the Canadian government, particularly heritage Canada to look at kind of online extremism, so did a bit of anti refugee extremist narratives rise in the far right in Quebec, and I've done some stuff looking at online hate targeting female journalists. So the cupboard kind of more some of the more I would say, extremist groups more closely tied to the far right or conspiracy theories and online misogyny.. so, that's kind of an overall you look a lot of stuff but a lot of stuff we tend to do is looking at groups that commit mass atrocity crimes. So those that actually are organized and are fighting in countries like this, or in areas like in the Sahel, or the Congo, Mozambique. So yeah, so let's say most of its been on focus on more non state actors rather than kind of the modern phenomenon that people have now everyone extremism studies is moved away from radical jihadist groups, they're are still there. They're still dangerous. They killed 100 People last week in in Mali, but not as much on the Q-anon and on that seems to be drawing attention now by scholars.

Q: And how did you engage in prevention? If you if you consider yourself engaged in prevention

A: Well, I mean… there's a whole I mean, we work with a lot of UN agencies, we work with the UN prevention of genocide, so looking at what measures can be put in place to prevent political violence. So looking at warning signs, looking, you know, spotting patterns in societies, looking in which groups are engaging in hate speech or dehumanizing language and trying to map that out and try to provide policy recommendations to the UN and others on what can be done. And then yeah, so then different other projects we've looked at different groups on what can be done to prevent extremism. One was we.. I did a lot of work on the failure of the Kenyan government and other governments to prosecute foreign fighters who went to Iraq and Syria.. to genocide against Christian minorities and others… So prevention is by prosecuting those who engage in violence, a signal that this behavior will be you know, will be a response from the State to hold you to account. So that's some of the work we've done both in advocacy and as well as briefings on members of parliament and the Kenyan government.

Q: And now could you tell me more about your first experiences here at Concordia? How was it the beginning?

A: I don't know how that relevance, because I started off with a study on looking at how the US and Canada became government responded to genocide, or didn't respond to genocide in Rwanda did respond to violence in the Balkans in Kosovo. So my study that's how I started working as a Concordia researcher at the Institute. So we started working on that, and it's probably two, three years later that we began to see the rise of non-state actors, streaming, using social media to recruit people that that myself and my colleagues began to look more onto the side of radicalization, preventing violent extremism. And we got small projects… we got

a project through Facebook, and the US State Department to kind of engage students to come up with counter narratives to online extremism, had been presented UNESCO conference in Quebec, I think was 2015. Now I mean, it's time flies but yeah, so I started off that way. So I don't know if I can…

Q: Okay, this first part of the interview is not specific about radicalization prevention, it's about your working experiences. So it's okay, thank you. And the last question of this first part is, can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you when with whom how have you felt?

A: No, what I what I would say to that, is that as we began to look more at extremism and as a think tank at Concordia, we hold a lot of public events, we invite speakers, academics, former practitioners, UN officials, when we began to look at do a little bit more work on religious extremism of the Islamic…, we began to get a lot more we got a lot of kind of angry commentary by some academics at Concordia. But you shouldn't be looking at this. And we'd send emails to try to get our events canceled. So that was a bit shocking. We had an expert from Germany, who was an expert on antisemitism. And he reached out to me saying pass through Canada. We'd like to do a talk about my book, I surveyed something like 300 Muslim refugees in Berlin to find out what scale of.. is there any antisemitism among the refugees… so we did this event. We had a lot of professors, and some student groups get angry at us for hosting this. So I don't know if that's so strange, because you're at a university and you're supposed to be allowed to talk in question about all sorts of issues, but some of them people will get angry at us.

[And how did you respond to that?]

A: Wow, I responded simply saying that we had the right to do this. And we had one professor that kept on harassing us. I had to go talk to the University Office of rights and responsibilities to try to get him to stop harassing us. We're allowed to talk about you know, we were I worked in political violence. I've had events canceled or pressure put on us. We're talking about the Uighur Muslim persecution of Chinese… the Chinese government put pressure on us and university to stop those events. But I've also had academic sometimes get active and they think that we shouldn't talk about this at all.. so, you have to fight back and push for yourself and say this and this is an important public policy issue. It's a human rights issue. And it's of importance to talk about this and, and having worked a lot of humanitarian operations where you have non state groups that are carrying out violent acts and actually displacing millions. I don't understand why some people don't want to talk about that or at least examine it. In a in an rational and an academic setting. But that's unfortunately some of the things I found that have been challenging about this.

Q: So the second part of the interview is a bit more specific about radicalization. And the first question is in our own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: I would define radicalization as someone becomes obsessed with an ideology that is violent and they… they start to act on those violent impulses. So you know, there's many forms of radicalization. To be, you know, could be the Incel movement, can be the far right. It could be the far left, it could be Islamist, it could be it could be even a nationalist rhetoric we live in, in Quebec. Where we have had, you know, terrorism in the 70s, where the military was called in because people were attacking, bombing up stuff in the city, attacking diplomats killing a cabinet minister. So inside, it's when you get obsessed with some kind of ideological ideas. And you want to use violence and you can't snap out of it. You just cannot, you know, you lose all critical thinking skills. So, so to me, it's that pathway. Okay, that's how I describe it. I'm sure there's 1000s of different opinions…

Q: Yeah, and there are many different answers for this question. Which concepts they consider as linked radicalization?

A: Around radicalization? That's a good question. I haven't thought of it that way. You know, I guess, I guess one thing that I guess there's a difference of radicalization of those who become radicalized on disinformation or on events happening abroad. And their ideology sees it through a very narrow lens and label so I guess it's, I guess, it's like kind of the importance of grievances. You know, having real or perceived grievances does lead to activation, we've seen that in Canada, we have, you know, a high number of people from Montreal that went at the start that the Syrian war, we saw a lot of young Montrealers that disappeared and traveled to join ISIS and, and it's always, I think, in trying to understand, you know, it's just the ideology is it the internet, or there were people around them that were pushing them to do that. And what did they have grievances or perceived grievances? In some cases, there were… other times there was just a sense of developing an identity that was so than identity opposed to everything else in society. If you develop extremely religious identity, then everything around you from women, you know, being present in positions becomes a radicalizing factor. So, so I think it's complex, but I guess that that grievance issue is I think is important.

[Ok thank you. Something else?]

A: I guess, I guess it depends on which groups you're talking about. I would say more of what I what I see through my work because a lot of these extremists are educators or social workers. So they look at certain aspects of radicalization, but many of them don't look at global affairs. They don't see how a conflict in one country for example, civil war in Syria could lead people here to identify that conflict. So a lot of the a lot of the cases we were seeing radicalization in Canada

and people moving, going abroad to fight are usually tied to civil conflicts or civil wars. So the in the 1990s the Bosnian war, the Serbian war, we're seeing the Christians were fighting the Bosnian Muslims. And you had groups that went over to fight you have that in Afeghanistan with the Taliban. With ISIS, we still have it with certain groups of Al Qaeda, the Islamic Maghreb in Mali or West Africa where people trapped Canadians have gone there to convert.. to Islam Sunni Muslims, but people of Korean descent of Christian Orthodox Christian descent that have gone to fight in these conflicts far away, that have nothing to do with them. But they they've gotten an ideology that this conflict is black and white. This group is committing, fighting their religious brethren and therefore we must go to defend that so I think these global for me, I think the global conflicts do have an impact. You see that a bit right now, you can you know, you see in Ukraine, the complex reason their passions and we have two large Ukrainian population Canada there are people that are going to fight with the Ukrainian government. Is that a form of randomization? One could argue perhaps it is, but I do think I do think events and conflicts abroad are sometimes just as important as factors related to social factors or socio economic issues. Okay, thank you. And I just point out one last comment for so many people out there saying that extremism is caused by poverty. There's not much to say that that's true. If it was you would have vast swaths of India being radicalized, but it's not a lot of extremists we've seen from Canada at least going to fight in conflicts have come from, you know, middle class backgrounds or they be university educated. So the poverty theory to me to me, is that this is not a very serious argument.

Q: Okay, thank you. And the third part is about prevention practices. So, the first question would be what are the activities that characterize your center? But you have already answered…

A: Yeah, well, I think for us is that we do a lot of we work with a lot of partners to kind of educate.. do a lot of public events, to bring together groups, okay, in government to brief NGOs. So, so we have talked about warning signs, we've, you know, we've done some work on anti-semitism and looking at how different forms of anti-semitism appear online or disinformation, through veiled hate speech. So recognizing that is a form of prevention, trying to get the government to impose better regulations on social media companies in order to take down extremist content, so it doesn't, it doesn't radicalize others. That's a part of our work. We've done presentations and research and presented that at top European forums like the global media forum, on online extremism, and we've done a lot more work on the online space. So yeah, in prevention… I mentioned we did some stuff with Facebook, training students… Like we bring a lot of like policy pieces on some of these issues that are getting published. That's kind of what we do it's mentioned is if you're a university based think tank you engage the media to raise awareness

about this, you write policy articles, so that decision makers because people in the government don't read academic articles, I use it... To communicate with decision makers try to try to help policymakers think outside the box. We do briefings, write these shorter papers and, and organize events. You know, with just to kind of raise awareness.

Q: Yeah, we you kind of so next question would be how political and and or scientific collaboration in the projects work at what are the strength and political points.. and if you can tell me more also about your collaboration with the UNESCO-Prev?

A: Yeah, well, UNESCO, when Vivek applied, I gave him a reference letter. Because we were… Vivek and when Project Someone came about we helped. We helped organize some events at our Institute but yeah, when that when the prevention when it was formed, you know, we've done certain events where we actually hosted different members of the of UNESCO so there's some events Vivek, but also with David Morin, collaborative events, university panels, sometimes public events, we've done online chats, we've collaborated with some of the members with the Montreal Center of Prevention of radicalization. Yeah, so it's really more I'd say public, mostly public events, but we did on some of our projects for the government. We did have we did interview some of the members to get their expertise or their views on certain things. So we wrote a white paper. We worked with an artificial intelligence company to monitor Twitter to see what was happening at the start of COVID. Anti-Asian sentiment to the rise of extremist groups of far-right in Quebec, against the refugee crossing on the New York border. So we used AI to monitor that but then we had some of our staff members or from our fellows who are journalist interview, some of the members of the UNESCO group to get their expertise and knowledge on this that we have put into, like a white paper for the Canadian government.

Q: Okay, thank you. And is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: That I would like to do differently? No, I can't really think of any..

Q: Okay, thank you. And what are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities, even if I don't think you organized primary prevention activities directly if I get it right, but if you don't, what is your idea? So what are the capacities that you consider important in order to prevent radicalization?

A: Well, you know, I guess as the world moves more and more into the digital space that we need to have the capacities to monitor, monitor the online spaces, you know, in real time, you know, because that's where you're seeing or you see ideas or spread, false narratives are promoted. You have extremists going online recruiting vulnerable people. So I think that's one area I think, you know, I can't speak for what the government is doing because they have some capacity. But I think I think

that's a key area. How can we monitor online spaces and look for early warning signals that might warrant an intervention right by social workers, by mental health experts or by police or national security? Yeah. So I think that's a key point. And also, I guess, you know, I also one thing that I think is not really looked at, but it's like what are the roles of families? Families are usually the first ones to see behavior change, how do they report that? And so that's a key question. I mean, I after the Charlie Hebdo attacks in Paris, I was asked by the mayor of Montreal to be part of this "Vivre ensemble" living together network of Mayors. They asked for advice, but it was very like they could never come to a concrete idea about what can be done. They set up the Montreal center for Prevention of radicalization. There's a telephone hotline that they set up to allow family members are concerned about someone that might be radicalized and violence, I think more can get help. So that's a key initiative, but I'm not sure how well known… people do know about the services and whether available in other parts of the country or global.

Q: Thank you. And last question is how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable when effective over time?

A: Well, there has to be more investment in it. And frankly, frankly, either or there seems to be a lot of money going to studying aspects of radicalization, but there doesn't seem to be a lot of money going to the prevention side. You know, there's, you know, talking about digital building, digital literacy, sorry, critical thinking skills, digital skills. So, is that prevention, is that response? But I think if you look at public safety, Canada has a responsibility for preventing radicalization, a lot of it a lot of the work that they've done, it's mostly about academic studies, classifying extremist groups, but there's very little they've done that that is to do with prevention and particularly looking at like what interventions could be done. And I know there's very few people doing this. And we're very close with, with a former extremist who traveled Afghanistan, he's now one of the top persons that's doing interventions himself as a as a Canadian Muslim, with other Muslims, for example, he doesn't do that with the far right or other groups, but so he has done these interventions, but he complains and told me that no one else is doing this and, and it has to be someone that's not from government, because then there's no trust. So I think that has to be dealt further in the Canadian context. Not sure but globally. You know, what, really, what really works. So there seems to be little knowledge about what interventions actually work.

Q: What do you think is the future of this field about radicalization studies

A: I think it's only going to I think the issue is not going away. I think, I guess I think there's been a shift where one of my fellows is a former Canadian Security Intelligence Officer, one of the top experts on counter terrorism, and he says, now everybody is only talking about the far right in Canada. And so I think it's shifting I think, I think what we're seeing is that different at least in academia, and also in

the NGO field, there's a focus that the focus will change rapidly based on something you know, in the US. But if you look at the global statistics, the extremist problem has diminished a little bit, but the overwhelming acts of violence and people killed are not coming from the far right. That counts for like not even 1% of global death tolls. It still represents predominantly for very extremist groups in Middle East and Africa, so to me it to me I'm kind of perplexed at how some of the community working on this can shift and look and say this is a real problem now and ignore the other one when, when the data doesn't always like the data on like, who's being killed by these extremists. Doesn't always show, I don't know if there's a there's an ideological perspective of why this switch and that's where the money is. I don't know... I think it's also become a bit political. I think if you're gonna pay in government, for example. You know, now they don't talk about, you know, violent religious extremists. They're only talking about the far right. But there's been some frustration saying like, listen, let's keep a global perspective. And if the stats begin to sway dramatically, then we understand that you have to put a lot of more resources into one particular threat. But there seems to be there seems to be politics in the context where our political parties will pick one extremist group over another and perhaps not precise another. So I think that's, that's dangerous for public policy. And I've heard people complain about that. So I think we have to we said that remain honest. But I don't think it's going away. I think just with the rise of the youthful population in the world, you know, rise up certain regimes that are very famous in nature that are promoting and brainwashing children. I think I don't think it's gonna go away. I think it's gonna get worse might be in a low right now.

INT. N. 26

Q : Est-ce que tu peux décrire brièvement tout et tout dans tes expériences professionnelles ?
R : Oui, euh. Bien dans le fond. Moi ça fait 22 ans cette année que je suis à l'Université de Sherbrooke. Ce que j'ai fait dans le fond, j'ai fait un. J'ai eu mon diplôme d'études secondaires et ensuite j'ai fait des études en secrétariat pendant un an et demi. Ensuite, j'ai eu beaucoup de formations dans le parcours de vie de mon travail. Tu sais, je souhaite être toujours à jour dans le fond, dans tout ce qui est technologie pour pouvoir suivre le fait que rester toujours au goût du jour, le pas pour pas être déphasé, Génial. Donc fait que oui quand même. Beaucoup de formations.
Q : Et maintenant quelles sont tes fonctions à l'Université de Sherbrooke?
R: Euh. Je suis secrétaire de direction ici à la faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines. Puis le département, c'est école de politique appliquée. Oui, ça fait deux.

Ça fait deux ans. Ça va faire deux ans au mois d'octobre que je suis ici, officiellement là, à ce poste-là.

Q : Et dans la chaire UNESCO... Est-ce que tu peux me décrire un peu comment tu as commencé à collaborer avec la chaire et ce que tu fais ?

R : Bien avant d'être à ce poste, ici dans le fond moi j'étais... Je travaillais à la direction des Lettres et Sciences humaines. Dans le fond, je travaillais pour deux vice doyen dans le fond, dans le fond, je travaillais pour la vice doyenne à la recherche, puis le vice doyen aux études. Et puis David Morin a été à un moment donné le vice doyen à l'enseignement et à l'international…. En tout cas, il y avait un titre très long… et puis c'est moi qui gérait son agenda. Et puis avec la Chaire, bien, on comprenait que c'est beaucoup de travail, beaucoup de demandes. Tu sais, autant au niveau des partenaires, au niveau d'entrevues, au niveau de fait, que là, quand David est parti, j'ai dit Ben écoute, je pourrais, tu sais, je pourrais t'offrir d'être la secrétaire dans le fond de direction, mais de la chaire. Et tu sais, il m'a dit Oh! Oui, il dit Ça serait une bonne idée, parce que je ne sais pas comment je vais faire pour m'en sortir dans quelque chose que j'ai commencé comme ça, tranquillement, tu sais, à gérer un peu son agenda. Puis finalement ça a pris de l'ampleur parce que là je travaille maintenant aussi pour Marie-Ève Carignan, qui est aussi maintenant dans la chaire. Et puis ça fait que, dans le fond, je gère leur agenda, je planifie, tu sais, tout ce qui est entrevue, tout ça fait que oui, quand même, ils ont des agendas de premier ministre, donc c'est assez. C'est assez, beaucoup de travail quand même, oui.

Q : Est-ce que tu peux me parler un peu plus de tes premières expériences avec la chaire ? Comment tu as appris à faire ce que tu fais et avec qui?

R : Oui, c'est ça. Au départ, je travaillais vraiment beaucoup plus avec David Morin. Dans le fond, j'ai commencé à connaître tranquillement les partenaires. Ç'a été quand même assez graduel, je dirais. Là, au début, c'était des petits rendez-vous le vendredi, hop là, ça s'est mis à rentrer un peu plus beaucoup, beaucoup de demandes à ce niveau d'entrevue, au niveau de beaucoup de réunions organisées, là, parce que ça, c'est vraiment le plus gros de mon travail. C'est ça, essayer de trouver des moments. C'est sûr que je dirais, la pandémie a facilité un peu le tout avec le team, le Zoom, parce qu'avant tout était en présentiel, donc c'était... Je dirais que la charge était encore plus lourde. Mais maintenant je pense que ça, ça a facilité un peu le fait qu'on puisse la faire à distance, prendre et c'est ça, c'est apprendre à bloquer des moments où ils doivent se concentrer sur l'écriture ou des choses comme ça, parce que sinon ça fonctionnerai pas. Repos au niveau de leur travail.

Q : Est-ce que tu peux me décrire un épisode critique de ton travail? Ce qui s'est passé ? Où étais-tu et avec qui?...

R : Bien un peu loufoque même, non? On peut dire là que c'était déjà passé. C'est que on a beaucoup de partenaires extérieurs qui ont un décalage avec 6 h de

décalage, puis à un moment donné. On avait fixé une rencontre, mais en se fiant pas au décalage. Donc les gens pensaient que ça commençait dans un moment de la nuit… Et là nous… c'était à ce copain que ça n'avait juste pas de bon ça le fait que tout le monde, à un moment donné, on s'en est rendu compte en disant oh mon Dieu, je pense qu'on n'est pas à la bonne heure parce que là, il a fallu que tu aies beaucoup de monde, je m'en rappelle encore et qu'il fallait tout refaire. Mais. Mais je pense que c'est une de mes forces de…. D'avoir un plan B. Moi je dis toujours que je suis là. Je suis la femme au plan B, donc qui sait, il faut toujours que y a une solution.

Q : Et comment ça se passe avec les partenaires canadiens ? Comment ça se passe ? Est-ce que tu as des contacts avec eux ?

R : Ben moi c'est surtout par courriels tu sais, parce que je ne fournis pas mon numéro de téléphone, donc on se parle beaucoup par courriel. Je vous dirais que ça répond assez rapidement. Là, c'est… c'est très rapide. Puis si c'est des gens, je pense qu'ils ont des gros agendas, donc souvent faut que ça aille vite. Donc ça fait que souvent, si j'ai à fixer une date, j'ai petit, je donne souvent une date de butoir. De toute façon, là tu sais, j'attends pas qu'on me revienne une semaine ou deux semaines après, je leur dis bon bah s'il vous plaît, veuillez me répondre avant telle date parce que je sais que les agendas bougent ben trop vite, là je ne ferais que ça… sinon, oui.

Q : Donc la deuxième partie de l'intrigue de l'entretien est à propos de la radicalisation. Donc à la première question, et dans tes propres mots et très brièvement, comment tu définis la radicalisation, qu'est-ce que c'est la radicalisation pour toi?

R : Et oui, c'est une grosse question… c'est pas mon domaine à moi. Alors si je résume rapidement, je dirais que c'est des gens d'après moi qui ont souvent des opinions ou des façons de faire différentes, dit de, on va dire des règlements. Et puis c'est ce qui fait souvent que ça fait des…. Malheureusement, des guerres, des chicanes, des…Des gens qui touent…. Tu sais que selon moi c'est un peu ça la radicalisation…

Q : Merci. Euh. Quels sont les conseils que tu considères comme liés à la radicalisation par exemple… Dans la chaire, on parle de radicalisation et d'extrémisme violente, non?

R : Je ne sais pas...

Q :. Et est-ce que tu as déjà rencontré des personnes radicalisées? Et si oui, est ce que tu peux m'en dire plus?

R : Dans la vie oui… il y a des gens qui ont des opinions…très fermé. Je peux dire ça comme ça. Ben oui, là tu sais, je dirais qu'avec la pandémie, on a eu des gens qui sont un peu extrémiste là. Exemple tu sais qu'il fallait pas suivre nécessairement les règles qui étaient un peu plus on j'appelle ça des fois plus de droite, c'est ceux qui suivaient vraiment leur groupe, qui croyaient pas en rien, qui passaient, qui faisaient

un peu comment on dirait ça…Tu sais, ils se faisaient berner. Exemple par le gouvernement… Moi je te dirais que c'est un peu ça que j'ai connu. Sinon, tu sais, outre ceux qu'on a vu dans les nouvelles. Mais ouais.

Q : Ok, merci. Et quels sont les aspects positifs et critiques des activités de prévention? Est-ce qu'il y a quelque chose que tu aimerais faire différemment? Bon, dans ce cas là, peut être, c'est pas toi qui fais les activités directement, mais dans ton opinion, les points positifs et critiques des activités, des programmes ?..

R : Et bien c'est drôle que tu en parles parce que dans une réunion, à un moment donné on en a parlé de ça, que la base partirait de l'école, c'est des plus jeunes. Donc tu sais, au primaire, secondaire - bien primaire, peut-être un peu moins, mais tu sais, je dirais peut-être secondaire, tu sais, Cégeps, ça, parce que tu sais ça par deux, dans le fond, c'est la nouvelle génération, parce que, tu sais, c'est selon leur perspective à eux, puis de comment ils vont décider d'agir face à ça, justement, l'extrémisme violent, la radicalisation, puis tout ça, là. Donc, moi, je pense qu'il faut, il faut qu'il y ait une formation ou en tout cas quelque chose qui soit lié à eux pour que c'est pour que le reste fonctionne bien, parce que ça part de nos jeunes, Donc je veux pas, là, vous autres, moi je dis toujours nous autres, les avec ceux qui sont plus adultes, on a déjà notre façon de penser, fait que tu sais la changer, c'est plus rare. Mais tu sais les jeunes, tu sais, moi je pense que tu sais quand je trouve qu'ils sont beaucoup plus rassembleurs aujourd'hui. Tu sais que peut être que certains l'ont été aussi fait, que puis ils ont une belle opinion les jeunes comme moi. Je pense que c'est ça qui peut faire que ça va changer et que justement les leur façon de penser et de dire les choses va apporter une belle, un bel avenir.

Q : Merci. Quelles sont les principales capacités que tu considères comme importantes à développer dans les activités de prévention primaire ?

R : Je sais pas... J'ai pas trop. J'ai pas trop d'opinion sur ça…

Q : La dernière question est comment penses-tu que les activités de prévention peuvent être rendues durables et efficaces dans le temps? Je sais pas, situant quelque idée de ce que tu écoutes parce que le problème on parle beaucoup de le problème et que on fait beaucoup des activités qui ont onze. C'est difficile savoir s'ils sont efficaces et c'est ce sont durables, donc.

R : Oui, c'est ça… En tout cas, moi je souhaite que ce qui va être fait en tout cas. Puis plus je pense que la Chair …ils font beacoup là et que je suis certaine que les activités et ce qui va rapporter justement au niveau des ministères, au niveau et je souhaite que ça change, c'est leur façon de voir, et puis, puis qu'ensuite on voit les résultats, là, tu sais que ça soit positif…puis que ça réussisse à changer ta façon de voir et de penser déjà un peu le oui.

Q : Donc.. pour la Chaire maintenant vous avez d'autre quatre ans, c'est vrai ?

R : Oui.

Q : Et qu'est-ce que sera différent ?

R: Oui, bien, bien, un peu moins de ce qu'elle faisait, je pense là? Mais oui, c'est ça. Bien moi je vais l'épauler en plus dans là dans les prochaines années. Parce que justement essayer d'y enlever un peu de poids là, sur tout ce qu'elle gère là, parce qu'elle c'est la coordonnatrice. Donc disons qu'elle en a beaucoup dans sa cour, là. Donc moi je vais peut-être plus m'occuper des parties conférences et tout ça… Donc, je vais essayer de la dégager un peu.

INT. 27

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

A: I studied History first Quebec City, my bachelor, and in History studying West African history with religious organizations in Burkina Faso. Then my PhD in Sociology. Here in Montreal, still studying about... Just activism in Burkina Faso, not extremist. I was always trying to get away from the most extreme stuff to get back to connect to normal religious life in a country where religion is very important. And the post-doc in History at the Center for African Studies in the US.. So pretty much the same thematic. And then. So... So I worked in research and teaching, teaching in Sociology after.. At university level. It was Bishop's University, a small anglophone university here in Quebec, teaching General Sociology classes. And meanwhile, I got a job at Cefir (Centre d'expertise et de formation sur les intégrismes religieux, les ideologies politiques et la radicalisation). It's on the south shore, in a Cegep. So... I was hired as a postdoc, first by the researcher there who wanted someone to help him with the research part. Because I applied for coordinator of the centre, they picked someone else, but he found my profile interesting... So he hired me as a postdoc and then the coordinator left, which so they've merged the postdoc in the coordinator position for a full time job. As the assistant director, stayed there for three years before joining the Cprlv.

Q: Thank you. And how did you start collaborating here at CPRLV?

A: I knew the Cprlv since its creation. Of course I followed what they did. It's the former scientific director here who told me that they had this job, which was his job, his previous job. This was open. I wasn't looking actually for a job, I had just started a new project at Cefir…. I was supposed to be the principal investigator about religion in Cegeps…

Q: And how did you engage in prevention more broadly?

A: I come from a very purely academic scientific background, so I wasn't. I was never involved as a practitioner before. That I still love my job here. So really came from a scientific point of view, from reading about radicalization. And as I mentioned, that was not my primary area of study. I was mostly concerned about

normal social movements that were not radical, and not extremist, but... In Burkina Faso, extremism came into my field and nowadays as a full blown civil war in Burkina. But at the time it seemed like a far away, that phenomenon that could not really happen there. Even though there were…. such stark inequalities... Social tension and so forth. Extremism was not that attractive to people in Burkina. And so the tipping point of understanding why at some point people will join a really extreme or very violent movement. This is still something that. Which strikes me… to understand.. and to prevent. So there was no lack of reason to be upset and to want to blow everything and Burkina before 2014/15. But people didn't do it. Or did it with other means, but. So that's part of that questioning.

Q: Would you tell me more about your first experiences here, and how have you learned to do what you do and with whom?

A: It was a bit strange because it was during the pandemic, and it's an organization that is respected, but also as controversial. There was a lot of tension about the creation of the center and the very heavy political involvement in the creation of the center, which was resented by academics. I wasn't like at the time… then the. Some governance issues… I didn't follow that at some point. So I didn't know really what to expect. And I was.. I knew that I knew B. was nice and really competent researcher. So that's that he stayed there here for long was a reason why I found that there was something to be done and that it was a valuable organization. Could be. And... That's what I discovered after I was here. But I was had a bit of apprehensions and also how I could do… could transfer my background or research background into an organization that is not dedicated to research. And for research is peripheral - not peripheral, but it's really harnessed to the prevention needs, training, mobilization, community support and so forth. So, I was a bit apprehensive.

Q: So this was before. But then when you got here, how you managed to, to bring things together and to give your contribution.

A: So, so it was through Teams meetings basically... So it was really awkward meeting people online only, but... It's sort of naturally came together. The fact that they had a period where they didn't have anybody at their research, they struggled with dropping the research area. Then when I came back, I came here. So it's like reopening the scientific department here or whatever they called it. So I felt like people were really appreciative of what I… could bring and were waiting for me and they were eager to to learn things and to be able to learn from a new person to different backgrounds. So that was very helpful to get him involved. Teaming up with the needs of people. To be able to contribute. So that was the key.

Q: Could you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you when? With whom? How have you felt?

A: Well, the first thing that comes to my mind... we had news recently that.. when key people in the organization leave… We've had that a few times lately… the former training director, now Ana Maria is not coming back.. Mm hmm. That these moments are a bit of crisis for the organization, because I realize how much organizations rely on specific people. So we have the organigram and all on paper…but really it's people who make the organization happen. And when they leave, they leave with so much knowledge and that it's a bit frightening.

Anne-Marie was in maternity leave and she was supposed to come back, but she found another job in the meantime. So she came back last week to wrap up her things.

Every time it comes with more, more job to do, because there's… everybody is very young in their position. (…)

So, so it's probably an occasion to look forward and to reinvent the organization, but it's still a bit frightening. So, so that there's that and. As it turned into pandemic…. I didn't feel like I really knew the center physically. So I was in my daughter's room, at my computer doing Teams meetings and trying to do independent stuff. That's not really how the organization works in the normal setting.

Q: So the second part of the interview is about radicalization. Okay. So first question is in your own words. And very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: We have our definition. So, so that that contaminates my.

Q: Even without like constructing real sentences, but even like flashes of concepts that you think that for you define radicalization.

A: So I work in a center that has radicalization and it's its name. Still not sure about the notion of radicalization because...It's really contextual. It was created as we know it now... So it's sort of the individual process of getting involved into extremist, like Political or religious involvement. So that sort of framework is very recent. But we called that other things before. So maybe tomorrow… And I'm feeling like it's getting a bit out of fashion. It was very connected to this jihadist moment that maybe we're we're getting out of or that maybe it's not gone, but. So that's it. It's sort of a. The individual process of getting involved into to extremism. That's very simply I'd define it like that. The way to make it relevant past that very short period of jihadist and then Western jihadist involvement…

Q: Thank you. And which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: Extremism, for sure. That's the main one. I mean, that's the ideological. Polarization. Well, broadly speaking, politics and… Ideologies. Social movements. Violence… To some extent.

Q: Thank you. Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities? And if yes, could you tell me more about it If you maybe direct?

A: Here I don't work directly with people radicalization process here. I've met some in my life, but not in professional setting.

Q: Thank you. So, the third and last part is about prevention practices. Very briefly, because I know a big part of the answer, but what are like, let's say, the main activities that characterize this center?

A: The central part, I would say is the community support… So the helpline and the team that works with radicalized people and their environment, family, friends, schools and so forth to help them, and find other ways to express themselves. That's. Uh, one big element here. Training also is very important. We do a lot of training. It's been very defining for, for the organization in Quebec over the years, training in all sorts of professionals, environments. To what is radicalization. And then for more specific issues… There's also community mobilization. So we have or we try to have… it's difficult to find people to work. Nowadays people to be involved, be part of the community, be in consultation tables all around. So that we can... be known to community organization that might need help to prevent radicalization or hate based behavior. And it's less obvious now than it was in the past. But Cprlv also tries to have a very high public profile. So being present in the media, Media expertise, Public campaigns… to be known to the public, because one of the issues is so that people know that resources exist, to contact them.

Q: Thank you. And how political and or scientific collaboration in the projects work what are the strength and critical points?

A: The center is... Political collaborations are important. We try to be apolitical, to be neutral, but we are directly funded by the City of Montreal and the Government of Quebec. So maintaining good relations with government is very important without having them dictate what we do. So that's very… that's one of the big issues there. And we feel that at some point the change in the government at the municipal and provincial level would lead to the closing of the centre, basically. But the center has succeeded in convincing the governments of its relevance in the past... Beyond the specific political context in which it was created. But there's really this sense of being seen as a public service that can be useful for any type of political level.

So, Cprlv is a private center. It's a nonprofit, independent, nonprofit. But since most of our budget is derived from the governments to, we have a board… I think they are named by two founders, but they are independent people. So, we have our independence… But it's sometime difficult because the public eye... We were created at the initiative of the mayor, former mayor of Montreal, and we were seen as a creation of the city of Montreal. And at some point there were motions at the municipal council.. So mandating us to do this and that report on this and that. But we cannot do that. So, part of the public eye is still an issue. It's also an issue because

very few organizations that have direct public funding for their day-to-day work, most of our partners in the field of radicalization are on project based funding produced for years or something for a specific project. So it's much more precarious. So we're seen as having a lot of money and very, very privileged… Which is probably the case at some point, but still… we have other limitations.

Q: Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Differently? I'd like to have more time to do things. I feel like.. we're a lot in reaction to events to. Stuff to demand from the public, from partners. I don't think it's possible because it's probably… Just like that. And it's part of our mandate. But having more time to… To define what projects we'll do… to build them, that that would be a luxury to have.

Q: Okay. Thank you. What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Preventing polarization is probably impossible, because there are issues that are debated that are very emotional and it's normal. And there need to be ways to express radical views. It's very important for society to evolve to realize that its own limitations… But. The thing that doesn't work well as when people are stigmatized or labeled or personally demeaned by public debates. That's where… It's very. That's where the cut happens, because over history, we had polarized debate, very strong views. And in Quebec, we debated independence movement for example... People were upset about it. But in most cases there were places where we could shake hands after debates where we could say, okay, we're still equal, we're still respecting the institutions. The institutions mean something, recreating some sense of belonging towards our institutions or having meaningful places where you can belong. ..I know I'm very vague. I'm trying to think… Sense of belonging..

The thing we saw, like with the truckers convoy and all were... People stopping. They don't have any… Respect or faith in the institutions, in the democratic process and counter powers and all this stuff is really meaningless. They want their point to be they will be happy to have a government that fulfills their desires, but they will not respect that process. And so the broad.. it doesn't work a civic education... Having ways where people feel that the whole process, that whole democratic process is worth something. It's worth more than having your point past or not at that moment. That's where. I think one of the. The issue is… Can you repeat the question?

Q: What are the main what are the main capacities important to developing primary prevention.

A: I'm not trying to do self-promotion... but if you get the "What if I was the wrong?" campaign.. The goal of that campaign was to address that type of capacity. And one that is often overlooked is the.. Apathy... ça ne me regarde pas".. And in many cases, counter extremism or prevention of radicalization is often framed as…

You don't do this… This is wrong. This is the limit. You don't go there and go there. We need to find ways to say to people, yes, you go this is meaningful, This is important. You need to get involved. You're upset. You're right to be upset. Go ahead. There's this, way, this way, this way where you can like you're afraid that French-Canadian identity will disappear. And we don't care about heritage. And you're right. You go, go there. Teach French. Go protect the landscape. There are many ways to get involved. To to so. So this is often lacking in prevention because w say prevention. So stop, stop, stop. Don't do that.

A:. Dialogue. Understanding….tolerance, but in the sense of understanding that other people are different and think differently and that... It's okay. You can go back to sleep. Even when you realize that. These are key.. and respect. Okay. Basic form of respect. Not to demean other people, to dehumanize people who don't think like you... So this would be key. Attitudes.. based on that, you can go forward.

Q: Thank you. Last question. How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: You know… you need to build activities with a long-term perspective. Seems to me too many projects are just launched on three, four-year basis. And over here in Canada, at the federal level they fund a lot of things but… Yeah… In a very short time frame. And they expect evaluation during the three-year project and say, how will we know that our public awareness campaign has prevented radicalization within three years? That's impossible. And it's sometime and it's also pretty much impossible to really evaluate the effect. We can evaluate satisfaction of participant. People are always happy to participate in that and stuff. But. So that's... We have to live with the part of uncertainty and having consistent programs that aim at long term objectives based on general ideas like discussed, fostering respect and dialogue. These issues will have some sort of continuity and effectiveness. We need to reframe from getting on board in that.. in crisis mode. That's something that we have seen a lot in that prevention... Programs being set up in a hurry because there were terrorist attacks or something

Q: And how do you see the center's future?

A: That's a good question because. Discuss before constantly need to remind the governance of our relevance, because now that.. Syrian conflict is less… There's less consequence here and the jihadist movement is less strong here, it's less obvious. The reason why we work great and are less obvious to the policy makers. So… But I think the pandemic, on the other hand, has shown to most of the public that radicalization goes really beyond small Muslim communities in Montréal.. and it's happening, then type of ideologies and ideological spectrums that most people didn't know existed before… Conspiracy stuff and so forth. So I think this is an occasion to remind the public and decision maker that extremism will not disappear. This will always be with us. And. That we need to have infrastructures, permanent

infrastructures, to be able to prevent extremism to be harmful to the core society. So. So that's where I see the Cprlv in the future as a. I think it's necessary that it stays. Some sort of infrastructure like that to prevent polarization from blowing into violence.

Int. n. 28

Q: Could you describe briefly your working and studying experiences?
A: Okay, so in terms of studies, I have a bachelor's degree in Psychology and a master's degree and a PhD in criminology. Okay. My master's and PhD we're not on the subject of preventing violent radicalization, it was on the subject of preventing sexual violence and how to assess the risk of recidivism for those that have committed sexual offences. However, I also developed a pretty strong background and research and methods so at the end of my PhD, I did a postdoc on the same topic. But after that, I was recommended for scientific coordinator job at CPN- prev, which is where I work. And since the start of 2018, I would say I've been working with CPN-prev as the scientific coordinator since then, so I kind of developed along that, that work experience my expertise, I would say in violent radicalization, but I I've been in the field for maybe four or five years I would say maximum. In So, as part of the scientific coordinator of CPN prev, the main thing that I have done is the is to coordinate systematic reviews of the literature on different topics on violent medicalization. So, we've done one on the link between exposure to extremist online content and violent radicalization, attitudes, or behaviors that IRL or online we've done one on primary and secondary prevention programs for violent radicalization and then one other on TV programs. We've done systematic reviews on.. still ongoing …different trajectories leading to provide like isolation. And right now we are conducting one on risk assessment tools for Violent radicalization. So it kind of melts my fields of expertise together.
I work for CPN-prev, but my official employer is UQUAM because the CPN-prev team is located at Uquam. So we do the offices, but since COVID, we didn't go much in there I would say we've mainly worked from home… and even before COVID We were I would say mostly working from home, but we would be having Team meetings each week or each two weeks to you know, keep in touch and…
I teach but at the University of Montreal where I did my masters and PhD, I teach some classes for bachelor students, so I teach classes in "psycho-criminology", I guess so how to use the main psychological paradigms and theories to explain the criminal phenomenon. So most of my time is spend at CPN-prev... So I'm hired there four days per week. And then I have one other day where I can pursue other things like, like my classes, and links with other colleagues from my earlier field.
Q: Thank you. And more generally, how did you engage in prevention was

A: Well, obviously because of my kind of job description. I do not do personal intervention with individuals on a radicalization pathway. This is more my contribution is at the research level and not the, the clinical level. So the two main ways we've been I would say for the scientific aspect of CPN we've been contributing to prevention is that first of all, we have been doing systematic reviews on kind of what works and what does not work as well, in terms of prevention efforts, either for primary, secondary or tertiary prevention. So when you're doing these systematic reviews, at the end you obtain a list of, let's say, recommendations, so things that emerge from the literature's stuff that worked… Usually pretty well or that did not work or stuff that worked well with a with a subgroup but not with another. So we've been contributing to prevention in identifying what we would call as best practices. So we know that the state of the literature is kind of it's kind of new, so that there's no clear there's no clear cut best practice guidelines that emerges from the literature but what we still have some insights on stuff that seemed to be working well and seemed to be working less well. And in and in relation to that we also have been conducting Delphi processes which are consensus building processes.

[With the practitioners of CPN-prev or also outsiders?]

A: Actually both… so that's another thing at the end of 2018, we've built to consensus committees, one at the Canadian level and one at the international level. And then we organized in at the start of 2019, a consensus conference, in which we submitted the preliminary results of our systematic review on online radicalization, primary/ secondary prevention and their recommendation that emerged from these systematic reviews were submitted to experts, so experts could be researchers but also practitioners from all around the world we try to represent as many sectors and countries as possible. There was an slight over representation of Europe and North America as it usually is, but we tried our best to make sure that like every country in the continent was represented and sector also and yeah, so we've tried to bring practitioners, researchers, but yeah… so to really bring both in relatively equal proportion because we didn't want to give too much the mic to researchers at the expense of practitioners. And then the, during the conference, have people brainstorm together to reflect on our recommendations and either suggest modification, agree or disagree, but also think of all these recommendations could be concretely applied to practice and if there were any important observations to do to these recommendations. Once we had that feedback from the conference, we launched an online Delphi process in which every member of the committee, the two committees that I mentioned earlier, most of them or maybe half of them, I would say were at the conference, but not also all of the experts that wanted to participate in the in the process that were in the committees were invited, and then it was like an anonymous online review of the recommendations updated by the

conference. So for each recommendation, the practitioner or researcher could say whether you're agrees or disagrees with it, like total agreement, slight agreements and modifications are needed. Slight disagreements. And modifications are needed or flat out reject. And then the there were open ended questions to suggest modifications to the recommendations or why is it good or not good. And there was also room to suggest new best practice guidelines. And then we kind of did that iteratively. So after the wave one, we collected feedback, modify the recommendations that had to be modified and did another wave, so at the end of three waves, I would say that maybe 80%, or the other recommendations were accepted and the other 20% We did not reach consensus. And so there's a report that should be coming in the next month or so about, about that. So that's one of the way and that's another way that is really important for CPN-prev, which is we want to build bridges between practitioners. So there are some projects in CPN-prev in which I have been involved but maybe not, not led this project like for, like reviews and Delphi, so we have virtual communities of practice that we build so that practitioners can exchange and discuss their challenges, practices, etc. And in terms of the Delphi process, it is really important to, as I say, build bridges between on the ground practice and research so that we don't have this kind of a group of researchers in ivory towers that suggest recommendations that would be too vague to be applicable or just not adapted to, to the day-to-day practice. And then we kind of tried to have that feedback loop to really make sure that we, as I said, build bridges between practitioners and researchers.

Q: Thank you. And can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you and with whom? How have you felt?

A: That's a good question. Since I'm working with mostly researchers and research assistants, it is maybe less conflictual that we're with persons that are on radicalization directly…So, it's not necessarily something that I personally experienced, but it has been discussed a lot at CPN-prev... And it's all the security field and the psychosocial field…. kind of are not on the same wavelength. Really, the there was, I talked about the Community of Practice that we that we built two weeks or three weeks ago, it was the first in person meeting of that community of practice. And one of the things that kind of researcher / practitioner mentioned was that as of now, you have kind of often what happens is that there's a first screening by the security level. So for example, somebody gets flagged because somebody calls the police because that person may be dangerous in the future. So what usually happens is that, first of all, the Security determines if the risk level is kind of assumable or not, and if it's not, then the psychosocial field is just left out and it's all about security. And then if they feel that the level of risk is not high enough to do any immediate security related actions, then they may be referred that case to psychosocial services. So that is, well, the problem here is that the high risk cases

actually do not get psychosocial services offered to them… but according to the criminological literature, those that benefit the most from interventions are those that usually are at the higher risk of committing recidivism. And it may be that the same thing doesn't apply to people on violent Radicalization trajectories, but I think it will be most likely than not to apply, but we don't know for sure. But what emerged from that was that essentially the really high risk cases only gets visits from the police, not from psychosocial experts. So that may be that the for this person may be that we prevent an acting out at some point because of the security services, but maybe also that the risk of that person is still high because there's no intervention given to lower risk factors or boost productive factors. So even if for now that person doesn't act out, maybe then the person will act out in the future because the risk has not changed. So one thing that was really mentioned as a problem with the kind of division between security services and psychosocial services, and it's not only like the bad policeman's fault and the good practitioners, we also had a training at CPN that was built up by the training team. And it was a it was a train the trainer's formation so it was just related to violent radicalization, but there was also notions of pedagogy and stuff like that and the training was really focused on anti-oppressive techniques, which was ultimately really good. But funnily enough… criminology.. (I kind of get both sides of the coin, I get the psychosocial practitioner side, but also get the police side in there)... And at some points in the training, there was some, let's say, maybe misinformed advice about police and how police do their stuff. And I remember raising my hand a couple of times saying, even though I agree with most of what you say you may be painting a darker picture of bullies, that it actually needs to be questioned.

But at the time, the let's say the nuances that I made were really well received by the by the trainers, and… because when you're doing anti oppressive practices, it's really about reflecting on your biases and your biases can be against some communities, but it also can be against the police.

Q: Okay, thank you. So this was the first part of the interview about your like working practices. The second part is about radicalization. And the first question is, in your own words, very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: Um, so I'm not sure I'm going to provide a definition, but still… I'll say something. And that was in that that's particularly interesting and sad at some point, because during the COVID phase, I think that everybody has known that a near, a distant relative, friend, family or whatever that got kind of pigeon holed into either eventually to a kind of conspiracy theory... And I've seen some my, let's say, more distant… I've seen some distant relatives that I thought were really pretty wise and rational guys that kind of got lost in that and some of them were just lost friendship as of now and some of them kind of came out progressively. As COVID restriction went out. But when I started working for CPN, my boss told me that to her, at least

in the North American context, violent radicalization is often when personal suffering gets grafted into a social stuff and so you have a person that and here the risk factors are really kind of similar to those that can lead a person to join a violent gang or are deep into crime. And it's really, and as I said, I've seen that with like my own eyes in some ways, which is you have people that either feel extremely isolated, alone, that maybe have left their jobs and multiple jobs because various reasons, and then they start to kind of build an anger against either their friends for not being closer to them or against society for not being adapted enough to their needs, and, and let's say cognitive and personality style, and then you have that anger that builds up and then the anger against society can graft into a group that also is like anti society. So so either far right or even far left in some cases, I have seen it and in my relatives. And but to me, it really starts with a personal suffering that leads the person to join the social cause to feel important, to feel empowered. And I've heard I don't want I don't want my death to be useless, you know. And so… you read the personal suffering gets grafted into a social cause and obviously not in the best ways possible.

Q: Which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

A: So obviously, we have all of the personal suffering variables which could be having trouble paying your debt, paying the rent, having trouble finding a job, keeping a job... feeling like you don't fit in being rejected by either your job peers or school peers, or just feeling less connected to your peers than other peers in your social group are connected together. So like there's the suffering sort of the personal level, either with your with your friends and family, but also with in relation to society and your job and your schooling or whatever. There's, and now these are kind of unfulfilled needs and then there's what the being part of a radical group can fulfill. So then, you have it's a obviously the and I mentioned it earlier, the kind of Quest for Significance, so to make your life worthy again, because you feel that right now it is not worthy. There's all the, you know, being accepted by a group like we all long for being in a group that likes us, and that validates us and that resonates with us. And then if it happens, if it so happens, that is a radical group that gives that to the person well, it's going to be enticing. In any case, it's kind of the same thing for violent gangs and same, the same idea what else

There's also the all that stems from two groups being in the position, so it's gonna it's kind of in the sports team or, or whatever, like and it's kind of what social psychology has put forward in, in, in its early days, but again, if you took the Stanford Prison Experiment of Zimbardo, you could put perfectly psychologically normal group of people and then you oppose them and… Yeah so…, if you put two groups in opposition, whether it be let's say in 2012, there was the student representatives against the the Liberal government. Then if you put two groups in a position, obviously thing are going to polarize and may lead to some individuals

wanting to do violent radical acts to further their cause. Yeah, as you alluded, too there's all so there are the hate components like the othering components, So you build your identity as a member of a group and then you hide your group as the best thing and then you oppose that to another group. That you dehumanize. So so based on ethnicity, based on religious affiliation, community affiliation, etc. So there's the fear of others, there's the fear of others or not understanding others. That can lead to these, let's say violent, radical attitudes. And one thing that's really interesting that I heard from social psychology, again, is that if you're in a new social situation with individuals that are members of a community in which you don't.. that you don't know and don't belong in that can create a feeling of social awkwardness, and then that feeling of social awkwardness may make you actually feel that the experience was bad with this person and then instead of the person saying, well, that experience was not ideal. The conclusion that you reached is that the people of these groups are actually not nice and you don't meet me... They don't make me feel included or whatever when it spiked when in fact, new social situation with communities that you have not engaged with previously may be awkward at the start, but, you know, as it goes along, everything actually is in place, but if people never get to that, you never get to that and they can't….

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people during the activities and if yes, could you tell me more?

A: Well, not in I have never met radicalized people as part of my professional practice, No, I've never met those people…. as part the people from my extended friends group that I've seen, so yeah, I would say that, yes, I've heard things that would definitely fit in the violent radical spectrum.

Q: And the third and last part is about prevention. Could you describe the steps of one project on this topic, so radicalization prevention to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

A: Yeah, well, as I said, the two main projects that I have lead, I would say with my boss, obviously, would be the systematic review of preventing violent radicalization and also the Delphi process…

So in terms of recruitment for those that participated to the process... So first of all, when we open CPN prev, we kind of made their way was an option to kind of register for the mailing list of CPN prev and be a member of it.. because it's a network and there are those that are, let's say, hired by Uquam to build up the network, but there's also members of the network which are not obviously funded by Uquam but still which can be part of the network and then that can receive the newsletters… we build platforms, as I said, for example, the virtual community of practice so that practitioners can exchange on their work and their challenges and also good, good calls. So for the recruitment, there was a part where we looked at those that registered as members of CPN prev that had a substantial or pretty good

expertise, either in research or practice with people in violent radicalization trajectories. We also directly reached out to those known by members of our team as experts. So… when we started that it was in 2018. Obviously, I couldn't provide a set of names that would have been relevant because I didn't know the field yet, but my boss did and other members of CPN also did. So we reached out directly to experts at the Canadian or international level. And I think by snowballing… We also asked those that we reached out to to if they had a new suggestion to for inclusion. And so that led to around if my memory serves me right around 110 or 120 members. And then we invited like 60 of those to the 2019 consensus conference… I had to prepare a lot of things, such as booklets with the results of systematic reviews, but also each recommendation that emerges from these.. and also a place to comment on these recommendations… we did English and French booklets and at the end of the consensus conference we collected all the booklets and we synthetized the recommendations from the practitioners and the researchers, which lead to the first wave of Delphi process. We had a list of recommendations, then we submitted to all the 120 community members… not all of them accepted obviously…

CPN had the funding to organize this conference, it was quite costly. When you take into account the plane tickets, the hotel.. Yeah. So, when CPN-prev was launched at the end of 2017... We received a pretty big funding by the Community Resilience Fund of Public Safety Canada to do our… the various aspects of our mission and there was obviously the scientific side that I know more deeply, but there was also the training, the knowledge mobilization, the mapping. These were the four main aspects of CPN and I would say the 2019 conference was kind of at the nexus of multiple things. It used the data from the mapping to identify experts. And then we put these experts together to do some scientific work. And then once this is done, we also give them back the results of their contribution. So there has been knowledge mobilization aspects. So, two days of conference, but they could come in the day before. So I would say it's a two nights and hotel plus accommodations, plus plain tickets so so yeah, so yeah... There was funding that like was per project so we had funding specifically to do in person conference in order to you know, train persons but also mobilize knowledge between these the researchers, practitioners. And people that work in the field. So, so yeah, that's obviously super costly. And also, the, the administrative team had so much work to do to get this done. Because I didn't want to think about it only.

Q: Thank you. What are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently? In this case, maybe you don't do my directly but from what you see, what are like the positive and the critical aspects?

A: It's harder to answer personally because I'm not doing intervention... I can relate with has been reported in the literature as being maybe…I would say that one of the things that really came out is the important difference between a program that targets the community and whether it's tailored for community and that is kind of discussed mainly with the substantial problems of the Prevent strategy in UK which kind of stigmatize the whole Muslim community, when actually it's fine to have programs for people that are religiously radicalized and you don't intervene the same way with person that are religious radicalized with Islam versus Christianism or whatever else. That is obvious. So tailoring good, but then just targeting a community and assuming that practicing Islam equals risk factors that is not only untrue, but a stigmatization for these for these communities. In terms of stuff that works in terms of tertiary prevention, especially, one of the main things that came out is that we can nearly use criminal prevention intervention as it is and it's good. So we usually define two types of in a tertiary prevention efforts or intervention efforts, which is the de-radicalization aspect and then the more social insertion aspect and what was found by those that and these are on the field practitioners that gave their feedback to researchers that then publish these papers. So even if it's comes from researchers, if it ultimately comes from practitioners, and practitioners said that they really felt ill equipped and Ill trained to conduct de-radicalization intervention. You really need to you really have to use figures that are critical to the participants of the program, and that are really well trained or in the field. So one of the good success on that was, for example, using ex-radicalized people that were involved with far right movements and then they can share their knowledge of the dynamics can be used to, to help people that are struggling with those or using Imams for religious themes related to violent radicalization in Islam... And so maybe that's for these very specific cases, de radicalization was found to be worthwhile, but most of the time practitioners said that they did not feel like you had the expertise to conduct these interventions. And that the participants usually did not respond very well to those because kind of, you know, if you're doing a if you're in prison, and then you have the Correctional Service of Canada that tells you this or this is not a good way to think here's a better way to think.. that's not going to go super well... So what they found is that actually really practical interventions that are classics from the field of criminology, so help in finding housing, in help in finding a job, etc. was really what actually worked well for participants… And to me that is not surprising, that is really a good example… of that in our own meta analyses of risk factors and radicalization, not having a job is not associated with radicalized attitudes but is associated with acting out. So that's… it's it may be hard to target the attitudes… and if we go back to what I said at the start of the interview concerning my definition of radicalization to me that

goes to that if the person feel disconnected from society, has trouble finding a job and just has free time to get angry at every social structure…

But if somehow by doing the intervention, we can latch back that person to society, then the anger goes down, and, and probably the violent radical behaviors are also going to go down. And, as you said, it's also important to do the sometimes and yes, and the challenge that you mentioned earlier, yeah. Sometimes you do your best as practitioners. And then you have your government that does something that is let's say, I don't know transphobic or whatever and or community "X" phobic and then you know, like, like everything that I just did was just flattened out by a big dumb decision by the government or in order to get organization, so there's also that that so we have to work at the personal level but also at the societal level and some governments will be receptive to what we have to say and some will not.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to developing primary prevention activities?

A: In terms of prime prevention, open to anybody... I would say that openness towards other is a really big one. In terms of openness to so there was a thing that is named integrative complexity, which is kind of a concept to accept that things are not black and white, there are shades of grey and then a view different from yours might actually be right and you may be right, then both, right and so kind of the ability to see and accept and integrate multiple viewpoints was reported as a really good thing to intervene on and that kind of fits with the openness towards others as I was mentioning that I think that that that can be like thought literally in schools and that will be offered better. So yeah, at the primary level, it's more complicated... What else? I mean, did yeah. Digital Literacy would be another big one. That could help people to and you know, differentiate something that is sketchy in terms of certifiability from something that is pretty clear-cut as true…. So, so differentiating the good for the less from the less good sources. So and I would say critical thinking in general could take on the digital literacy section. You know, when you're at high school, we could spend a little less time on learning complicated mathematics that you're never going to use in your life unless you go deep in physics or engineering or whatever. And maybe a little more time on logic, digital literacy and stuff like that, that I think it'd be really worthwhile.

Q: Thank you. And last question is how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Well, first of all, funding… funding because if initiatives are to be maintained over time, they need to be funded over time. And for example, at CPN-prev we did this year where we are at the end of our first grant and we've applied for another one. But it's obvious that if we don't get it, then everything we've built will just crumble and fade out… It was for four years, then we've had a one year extension. And I think we're applying for another three to four years I'm not sure. So so yeah.

Funding is really important, the government and the funding institutions, as they have to realize that what we're doing is worthwhile and can help. So, yeah, actually, I would say that's the main thing I could go to see other things but it's really the elephant in the room…

I would say that and that's out of my head and anything like that, whatever. But if you hear something at school, and then you come home and the parents say, oh, that's bullshit. Don't listen to that. Well, the other that sticking with the person and kind of not… so I would say that it has to, like there's need there needs to be a whole society effort for it to take place in people's minds. And that, as I say, so maybe you can have the parents but maybe that the school can give the same message at a sports team and the same message. The news that can be the same message, whatever, your teachers so, so I would say that, like.. the way like this is like this is really like Not field related stuff. But to me, real change happens when you want to do something and that the social circle around you, enables you and gives you the ground to go in the direction that you want to go. And that's kind of the same thing. The person hears something at school and says, Oh, that's pretty wise and then maybe hear the same thing elsewhere and elsewhere… that maybe true change can take foot… and also I would say in building bridges between communities. One of the really wasting that I've heard that the 2019 conference was that it is really easy to hit a group, but really hard to a specific person in a group. So just expose people to other communities. So that they actually realize that all of their preconceived ideas that were these communities are actually that really founded.

INT. N. 29 AND 30

Q : Est-ce que tu peux décrire brièvement tes études et tes expériences professionnelles ?

R29: Oui. Donc mes études… J'ai fait à l'Institut d'études politiques de Toulouse entre 1996 et 1999. Donc sciences politiques. Ensuite, j'ai fait un diplôme d'études approfondies en sécurité et de défense jusqu'en 2000. En 2001, je suis parti à l'armée. J'ai fait mon service militaire en France comme officier de réserve. À la fin du service militaire, je fais tout rapidement. J'ai été déployé comme conseiller politique au Kosovo. Donc. Euh, après la guerre, donc deux ans. Ensuite, je suis arrivé au Québec pour commencer mon doctorat en science politique à l'Université du Québec à Montréal UQAM, en cotutelle avec l'Université des sciences sociales de Toulouse. Et là, pendant mon doctorat, j'ai fait plein de choses différentes. J'ai été assistant de recherche, j'ai été directeur adjoint d'un centre de recherche. J'ai travaillé dans le secteur privé comme conseiller stratégique. Je suis allé au Brésil

pour une grosse compagnie minière. Ensuite, j'ai travaillé aussi pour une ONG para gouvernementale qui faisait de la formation pour les missions de paix. Donc je suis allé beaucoup, beaucoup, beaucoup en Afrique. Je suis revenu, j'ai été le directeur adjoint du Réseau de recherche sur les opérations de paix. Et finalement, j'ai eu mon doctorat en 2007. Et là, j'ai été tout de suite engagé à l'Université de Sherbrooke ou je suis depuis quatorze ans. Ok, voilà ma vie. Résumé.

[Est-ce que quand tu t'étais à l'Uquam tu as connus Ghayda ?]

R29 : Non, en fait, j'ai connu Ghayda beaucoup plus tard, il y a cinq ans. On s'est croisés sur les enjeux de radicalisation, un peu dans les médias, un peu dans une activité ou deux. De la même manière que j'ai croisé Vivek puis c'est comme ça que l'Unesco. Oui. Si, au moment de la création de la chaire Unesco. En fait, on se connaissait pas beaucoup avant. Mais au moment où on m'a approché pour la création de la chaire UNESCO de création de la chaire Unesco, c'était dans la foulée de la Conférence internationale Québec UNESCO sur les jeunes et les discours radicaux et la radicalisation en ligne qui avait eu lieu à Québec et le gouvernement du Québec voulait annoncer des retombées concrètes à la suite de cette conférence de l'Unesco. Donc, on m'a dit est ce qu'il y aurait un intérêt à créer une chaire Unesco? J'ai dit Ah bah ouais, ça serait intéressant parce qu'il n'y en avait pas vraiment dans le portrait québécois. On ne va pas sur ce sujet-là. Il y avait d'autres chaire Unesco, mais pas celui-là, et donc je ne voulais pas. Je trouvais que ce n'était pas pertinent de le faire seul. Je trouvais que c'était pertinent d'avoir des expertises disciplinaires différentes, d'avoir aussi une forme de diversité homme/femme avec des gens issus de Bref. Et donc que j'ai approché Vivek et Ghayda au même temps. Et puis….

Q : Est-ce que tu peux me raconter un peu plus de comment ça a commencé? Parce que c'est intéressant et... Pourquoi Québec?

R29 : Mais pourquoi Québec s'intéressé à ce sujet-là? Unesco… Oui, alors, le Québec est un État, un État non souverain comme vous le savez, mais c'est une province qui est aussi associée à l'Unesco. Alors ils ont un siège, c'est pas comme dans la francophonie. Donc à la Francophonie. Vous savez, il y a trois sièges, il y a Canada Québec Unesco et Québec Nouveau-Brunswick. Donc là, le Québec a un genre de siège avec le Canada à l'Unesco. Donc, il y a une communauté Québec Unesco importante. Notamment pourquoi? Parce qu'il y a beaucoup des domaines de compétence de l'Unesco qui tombent dans le champ de compétence du Québec. Et donc, le Québec avait organisé cette conférence à l'Unesco sur la radicalisation. C'était à un moment donné ou au Québec, on avait des gros enjeux sur la radicalisation. On avait eu deux attentats qui n'avaient pas fait beaucoup de morts, mais qui avaient tué une personne à chaque fois, une à Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, puis une à Ottawa. Alors c'est pas le Québec, mais c'était proche. Et on avait surtout beaucoup de jeunes, notamment de Montréal, qui partaient en Syrie, et cetera. Donc,

le gouvernement du Québec, à ce moment-là, va mettre sur pied un plan de prévention de la radicalisation, un gros plan stratégique sur trois ans interministériel.

Et il va organiser cette conférence-là. On peut dans le même temps, je te dirais et là le Québec va dire bon, parmi les retombées, est ce qu'on pourrait créer une chaire Unesco? Donc le Québec a poussé en disant est ce qu'une chaire vous intéresserait? Comme moi j'étais, je travaillais un peu déjà sur la question et ils sont venus me voir et tout. Donc voilà. Et puis alors le protocole? Il y a déjà plusieurs chaire Unesco au Québec, mais pas sur ce sujet-là. Et donc c'est là où j'ai monté le projet. Et donc là, il fallait faire deux choses monter le projet de chaire Unesco. Mais ça, pour créer une chaire Unesco, ça passe par le gouvernement du Canada, donc par en fait la Commission canadienne auprès de l'Unesco qui valide ton dossier avec une évaluation par les pairs et après seulement. La Commission canadienne auprès de l'Unesco recommande à l'Unesco la création de la chaire et l'Unesco décide. Donc ça fait une, deux ou trois étapes. Donc ça, il y avait l'étape de création de la chaire. Je ne savais pas si l'Unesco accepterait. Là, on montait le dossier.

Q: Comment le processus est commencé ?

R29 : J'ai commencé vraiment à rédiger ce que pourrait faire la chaire… J'ai échangé avec Ghayda et Vivek, qui étaient les deux autres titulaires, et là, on a monté le dossier ensemble. Donc d'un côté, on a monté le dossier vers le Canada pour que le Canada recommande, puis envoie à l'Unesco. Et de l'autre, on a monté le dossier pour le gouvernement du Québec parce que ce qui était important, c'est d'avoir le financement. Quand t'as une chaire Unesco, ça ne vient pas avec de l'argent de l'Unesco, donc il faut vraiment que ce soit le gouvernement, il faut aller chercher de l'argent ailleurs. Donc on a fait les deux en même temps. Et le gouvernement du Québec, rapidement, a dit Si vous obtenez la création de la Chaire Unesco, nous, on acceptera de la financer en partie. Ça c'est.

Q : Mais je pense à combien de temps il a voulu ?

R29: En fait, on a commencé le travail en 2018. Donc on a eu l'obtention, je pense, la création de la chaire mi 2017 ou fin 2017.

Q : Donc, c'était pas trop long?

R29 : Non, ça a été, je te dirais, peut-être... 4 à 6 mois. Non, il y a eu un fast track, ok, mais en fait, quand t'as un appui politique déjà. Et puis il voulait annoncer rapidement à la conférence de l'Unesco ce qu'ils ont annoncé. Ils ont dit si on crée une chaire, le gouvernement du Québec le financera donc. Après, quand tu arrives à l'Unesco en disant moi, j'ai déjà 400 ou 500.000 $ pour partir la chaire… Bon et j'en passe. Ok, d'accord..

Q: Comment ou pourquoi aussi tu as décidé de t'engager dans la prévention?

R29 : Ça, c'est une bonne question. Moi, mon background à moi, c'est vraiment plus la sécurité, la sécurité nationale et internationale. Mais. Je pense que rapidement... J'ai pris conscience avec d'autres, avec plein de chercheurs, que la réponse sécuritaire, elle, était insuffisante. Qu'elle n'arriverait pas à endiguer le phénomène qu'il fallait… Elle est nécessaire, la réponse sécuritaire. Évidemment, si quelqu'un veut poser des bombes, il faut l'arrêter. Mais ou quelqu'un qui diffuse des discours haineux en ligne, il faut faire quelque chose. Mais en même temps, à côté de ça, on voyait quand même un élan d'un certain nombre de jeunes intéressés par ça. Nous, on se disait ouf, il n'y a pas juste les djihadistes. On voyait aussi l'extrême droite qui montait notamment en Amérique du Nord, mais en Europe aussi avec les attentats, faire l'attentat d'Utoeya, Andreas Breivik, et cetera Donc on s'est dit il faut travailler vraiment sur la dimension préventive. Il y a beaucoup moins de choses qui se faisaient aussi sur la prévention. On travaille beaucoup sur les causes de la violence politique, sur les causes de la radicalisation. On travaille beaucoup sur la réponse sécuritaire, le réflexe police, renseignement militaire, et cetera Et on travaille beaucoup moins sur la prévention. On dit qu'on le fait, mais on le fait pas. Donc nous, on a dit on va le faire. Puis Vivek travaillait déjà sur la prévention avec le projet Someone, notamment sur les discours haineux en ligne. Ghayda elle est psychologue, donc elle bon, elle sait que le sécuritaire est nécessaire quand il y a quelqu'un... Mais, mais en même temps, elle, fondamentalement, elle pense que c'est la prévention. Donc je dirais que le feat était bon par rapport à la nécessité de travailler là-dessus. Et puis, pour nous, c'était important d'occuper aussi l'espace public. Des médias pour ramener rapidement ce message-là. Pour dire attention. Évidemment, on n'aime pas les djihadistes, on n'aime pas les extrémistes, et cetera Mais une fois qu'on a dit ça, on n'a rien expliqué. Donc il faut essayer de comprendre les causes de la colère, comprendre les causes de la violence et puis de travailler là-dessus. C'est vraiment ça qu'on s'est dit assez rapidement.

Q : Au début, il y avait un quatrième co-chaire qui n'était pas Marie-Eve ?...

R29 : En fait, c'était Sami Aoun qui, lui, n'était pas un co-chaire, c'était le directeur scientifique. Sami, lui, c'était, c'est un spécialiste. Maintenant, il a pris sa retraite. Mais c'est un spécialiste du monde arabe, arabo musulman, vraiment un très grand spécialiste de ça. Donc pour nous, au moment de la création de la chaire, c'était important d'avoir Sami à bord parce qu'il avait ce regard là sur la question du phénomène djihadiste qui était quand même une priorité de l'heure. Et puis, c'est quand même un intellectuel, un grand intellectuel. Donc on se disait Bon, ma Sami, on va, on va le prendre comme directeur scientifique parce que c'est une figure importante. Aussi bon, c'est un ami à moi. Mais donc c'était ça le. C'était ça le deal. Il est encore directeur scientifique, mais là, effectivement, Marie-Ève, elle, elle est devenue entretemps co-titulaire. Elle a embarqué plus tard Marie-Ève ou la chaire… deux ans après.

Elle est restée avec nous deux ans comme responsable du pôle média. Puis elle a tellement travaillé que là, on a dit bon... Et ça n'a pas de sens. Il faut que on mette tout le monde ou même niveau. Elle vient d'être nommée co-chaire cette année, parce que là, on vient d'être renouvelé pour quatre ans.

Donc on en a profité pour dire on a une nouvelle co-chair, c'est Marie-Ève. C'est bien, ça fait la parité. Deux hommes, de femmes. Et puis, on a quatre disciplines. Marie-Eve est en communications, Vivek en pédagogie sociale, éducation par les arts, Ghayda en psychologie et moi en sciences politiques. Donc ça, c'est quand même cool. Quand j'ai commencé à travailler... J'avais un focus très, très sécuritaire. Et puis, quand tu côtoie des gens d'autres disciplines qui sont aussi très impliqués sur le terrain. Euh ben ça donne des résultats qui sont incroyables.

Q : Est-ce que tu peux me décrire un épisode critique de ton travail, ce que s'est passé ou était toi avec qui comment tu t'es senti?

R29 : Ce que je te dirais, ça a été un gros défi au début. Euh, ça a été. De positionner la chaire dans l'écosystème de la prévention de la radicalisation au Québec. Parce qu'en 2015, quand les attentats sont ceux de 2014/ 2015, il s'est mis à y avoir bling bling, bling bling. Plein d'initiatives. Nous, on est arrivé là. Là, il y a des gens qui nous regardaient comme ça. Il y avait une bataille pour l'argent. Donc tu sais, il y avait plein d'acteurs, et cetera Donc je te dirais au départ, ce qui a été important, ça a été d'établir le contact avec les autres acteurs du milieu, que ce soit le milieu de la recherche, que ce soit le communautaire, que ce soit le politique, et cetera pour rapidement trouver notre place, mais surtout… Nous inscrire en complémentarité et patron en concurrence avec ce qui se faisait déjà, je te dirais ça a été assez important ou ça a été un pas, un épisode, mais ça a été une étape critique dans l'existence de la chaire. Ça, c'est la première chose. Et là, c'est sûr que le fait d'être beaucoup, d'être plusieurs comme titulaire, ça nous a aidé parce qu'on allait chercher Concordia, on allait chercher Sherbrooke ou qu'on allait chercher l'UQAM. Tous ces réseaux-là, on était un genre de consortium en arrivant.

Donc ça a été un défi. Le deuxième défi important, qui lui peut être plus critique, c'est de faire travailler tout le monde ensemble. Chacun a ses équipes parce qu'on est sur 3 à 3 campus, donc chacun a ses équipes, chacun a son monde. Donc Sarah va bosser plus avec l'équipe de Ghayda… Je ne sais pas si tu a rencontré Kate Urbaniak, mais elle bosse plus avec l'équipe de Vivek, et cetera Donc là, t'arrives avec des gens qui sont déjà dans des équipes, un peu cetera que tu regroupe, mais. Ça ne fait pas une grosse équipe, ça, il faut qu'il y ait. Donc là, on a eu plus de de défis, de défis au début, à essayer de créer finalement une forme de.. D'identité commune. Je ne sais pas si on y est complètement arrivé, mais on fonctionne bien maintenant quand même. Et des fois, c'est bien en fait qu'il y ait des projets très autonomes, que l'équipe de Vivek, par exemple, soit très autonome face en affaires et travaille super bien. Et c'est bien aussi. Ça a été le deuxième point important ou

critique à mon avis, ces critiques pour toute organisation d'arriver à faire vivre son organisation. Le troisième point critique, ça a été gérer les médias. Ça, c'est difficile. C'est important de parler avec les médias. Le sens de notre travail, c'est de comprendre, mais c'est aussi d'expliquer. Alors c'est ça que ça fait un prof. Ça fait de la recherche, ça comprend. Puis ça me fait de l'enseignement, ça explique. Puis je trouve que la société, j'aime ça. J'étais convaincu, mais c'est avant la chaire. En fait, j'avais créé un observatoire qui n'existe plus vraiment. Avec Sami aussi. Puis avec un collègue de l'Université Laval qui était Stéphane Leman-Langlois et un ancien policier français qui s'appelait et qui s'appelle toujours Stéphane Berthomet. Et on a créé rapidement ça au moment des attentats, l'observatoire avant que la chaire n'existe. Puis, après l'Observatoire, on a tiré la plogue. Mais il y avait déjà la conscience de l'importance d'expliquer à la population. Expliquer, c'est prétentieux, peut-être, mais en tout cas de donner des clés de compréhension face à un phénomène que les gens. comprenait pas. Vous vous voyez sortir de nulle part sur tous les djihadistes. Là, les gens pensaient qu'on avait des terroristes musulmans avec le couteau entre les dents. Ca, c'est et ça alimente le racisme. La discrimination s'alimente quand même des vraies problématiques. Donc on se disait non, il faut qu'on aille parler. Et donc ça, je te dirais que ça a été un troisième point critique dans la chair. C'est quand on avait beaucoup de sollicitations.. qui va parler ? Moi j'aime, j'aime bien aller parler dans les médias. Je trouve ça chouette. Mais tu sais, il y a un moment donné. Faut aussi jouer en équipe, passer aux autres, et cetera. Donc mais ça, ça a été une de nos forces. Un défi, mais une de nos forces, je te dirais. Mais il a fallu. Il a fallu apprendre à le faire.

Q:. Merci. La deuxième partie de l'entretien est à propos de la radicalisation. Donc première question : dans tes propres mots et brièvement, comment définit toi la radicalisation?

R29: La radicalisation… Je le définis comme un processus qui, en fait, amène un individu à adopter une vision radicale d'un problème politique, économique, social, religieux. Et finalement, qu'il l'amène à un point où il y a une rigidité cognitive qui fait qu'il n'accepte plus d'arguments et ultimement… qui peut mener à la violence parce qu'il va estimer que on peut recourir à la violence pour mettre en application ou défendre ses idées là. Donc moi, je distingue la radicalisation, la radicalisation violente. Je pense qu'on peut avoir. On peut être radical dans sa tête, mais ne pas appeler à la violence. Pour moi, être radical, ça ne veut pas forcément dire être violent comme être extrémiste. Ça veut dire qu'il est extrémiste dans tes idées. Mais donc il faut souvent on finit par mettre le mot violent qui conduit à la violence, etc parce que c'est ça nous qui nous préoccupe. En tout cas, c'est mon premier point. Mais mon deuxième point, c'est que je me suis aperçu aussi quand même avec eux en avançant. C'est quand même que l'extrémisme en tant que tel nourrit la violence et donc qu'on ne peut pas arriver à la conclusion avec cette définition-là de

l'extrémisme…C'est correct parce que l'extrémisme finalement prépare le terrain à une certaine possibilité de violence. Donc il faut être capable. Et alors? Là, évidemment, c'est. C'est plus compliqué, mais il faut être capable de trouver des moyens pour prévenir l'extrémisme ou travailler sur les discours haineux. Prenons un exemple concret quelqu'un qui prône la théorie du grand remplacement. Tu sais, les élites sont des symptômes passant.

Je parle à des experts du sujet donc. Bon. Est ce que, en soi, c'est un discours extrémiste? Il n'est pas nécessairement violent. Je ne suis pas en train de dire théorie en remplacement, donc il faut tirer sur toutes les communautés migrantes. Sauf qu'en tant que tel, le discours, la théorie du grand remplacement, elle est extrémiste et elle met la table. Est ce que des gens disent ben oui, il a raison et que nous, les blancs, on est menacé. Puis finalement, il faut passer à d'autres actes, à d'autres actes violents. Donc ça mène à ça, ça mène. Je vais vous montrer un truc. Pour vous montrer un truc. [video showing far-right movement propaganda in Québec]…Parce que c'est quand même ça le problème.. La théorie du grand remplacement, elle met la table à ça. Donc je pense que c'est important qu'on distingue le discours extrémiste de l'extrémisme violent. Mais en même temps, nous, en tant que acteurs de prévention, et cetera, on n'a pas le choix de faire le lien entre les deux et décider qu'on s'en va en amont, travailler sur les discours extrémistes, les discours de haine. Parce que sinon, si on garde juste le focus sur les gars qui passent à l'acte violent, qui disent qu'ils vont le faire, on retombe dans le sécuritaire, on n'est plus dans le préventif. Donc c'est une longue réponse à ta question, mais je la trouve. Elle est super bonne cette question de la définition. Puis on s'entend, les chercheurs s'entendent pas tant là-dessus, mais en même temps, ça ne nous empêche pas d'avancer.

Q : Quels sont les concepts que vous que tu considères comme liés à la radicalisation ?

R29 : L'extrémisme, la violence. Ça, c'est sûr que du point de vue de la science politique, c'est beaucoup ça qu'on regarde. La confiance dans les institutions, le rapport à l'État, parce qu'on s'aperçoit à la l'étude qu'on va sortir sur le complotisme, là qu'on va faire paraître la semaine prochaine. On s'aperçoit que la corrélatio principal entre l'adhésion aux théories du complot, et cetera, est une forme de pensée politique qu'on pourrait qualifier d'extrémiste. La corrélation majeure, c'est avec le manque de confiance dans les institutions qu'elles soient... Politique, scientifique, médiatique, et cetera. Je pense que cette question de la confiance, elle est importante. Donc ça, c'est beaucoup pour la politique après. Je pense que si tu te mets dans une perspective psychologique, ben là aussi tu as d'autres concepts à explorer qui sont explicatifs de ça. Il y a quand même toute la question… quand tu prends les acteurs solitaires, les facteurs individuels de détresse psychologique, on voit que sont importants dans un certain nombre de cas. Donc la dimension

psychologique, elle est super importante aussi. Elle n'est pas, elle n'explique pas tout, elle n'explique pas un phénomène global. Sauf à dire que 5 % de la population vit de la détresse psychologique. 35 % de la population vit de la détresse psychologique en ce moment avec la pandémie. Mais donc là, ça nous donne…

La sociologie nous donne aussi des réponses avec par exemple ce qu'on appelle la privation. Le concept de privation relative. Donc je pense que, en Occident, ce n'est pas forcément des gens qui sont socialement défavorisés, qui adhèrent à l'extrémisme violent, à la différence par exemple de pays du Sud ou c'est complètement différent si tu prends les. Les causes de l'adhésion en. En Afrique de l'Ouest, ça n'a rien à voir, mais ici c'est peut-être pas tant le statut social que le sentiment que finalement tu reçois pas ce à quoi tu aurais droit que tu n'arrives pas à atteindre ce statut social là. Et donc ça, ça crée une forme de sentiment de privation, de frustration. Et donc ces éléments-là me semble important aussi en sociologie. Donc je l'associe à ça, la communication. Marie-Eve On parlera tout à l'heure, mais me semble fondamental parce que il ne suffit pas d'être radical. On s'aperçoit qu'aujourd'hui, comme eux, comme le groupe État islamique, il y a une façon de communiquer là-dessus et ils sont bons. Puis le recrutement est une question de communication aussi. Avec les réseaux sociaux, c'est aussi tout un aspect qu'on associe à la radicalisation. Aujourd'hui, je pense que c'est. Je ne crois pas que les réseaux sociaux créent la radicalisation, mais je pense qu'ils sont un accélérateur de particules.

Ils accélèrent assurément ce phénomène-là. Ils le rendent un peu, même hors de hors de contrôle. On l'a vu pendant la pandémie, on le voit avec les discours haineux de l'extrême droite qu'on réussit à reconstituer finalement. Tout un récit d'extrême droite, violente depuis dix ans. Transnationale, on se réfère au terroriste qui a fait un attentat six mois avant, qui lui, se réfère à l'autre, à l'autre, à l'autre. On échange entre les groupes. Donc tu vois, c'est tous ces concepts là que j'associe un peu et c'est pour ça que je pense que. Tu ne peux pas travailler sur la radicalisation à partir d'une discipline… et dans mon parcours de chercheur ou d'universitaire, je n'avais jamais réalisé autant. Cinq. Depuis qu'il travaille sur la radicalisation, je me suis dit Oh mon Dieu! Mais moi, je voyais vraiment juste cette face-là du problème, alors que ma collègue en psychologie va m'amener ça en éducation dans la mouvance. Ben ouais, c'est ça, c'est ça. Et donc ça, c'est extraordinaire. On touche à tous ces concepts-là, multidisciplinaires à mon avis sont c'est pas des concepts multi, c'est des concepts disciplinaires mais qui nous permettent d'avoir le problème de toutes sortes de à travers toutes sortes de concepts.

Q : Est-ce que tu as rencontré des personnes radicalisées au cours des activités? Et si oui, est ce que tout le monde va m'en dire en plus?

R29 : Ouais, j'en ai rencontrés, j'en ai rencontré quelques unes, j'en ai rencontré quelques unes. Mais ça, c'est plus le travail de Ghayda. D'abord, les personnes radicalisées, potentiellement violentes, il y en a quand même.... Pas tant que ça. Quand elles sont prises en charge par les services sociaux ou par les services policiers, ou par tous les écrans radars. J'ai été contacté à quelques reprises dans le cadre de mon travail par des gens qui étaient inquiets sur des cas spécifiques. Donc j'ai été regarder parfois des cas spécifiques. Des djihadistes, je n'en ai pas personnellement côtoyé. Il y en a eu ici, à Sherbrooke. Quand il y a eu, on a trois jeunes qui sont partis en Syrie. Les trois sont décédés. J'ai moins côtoyé, eux, que les familles. Au fait, l'extrême droite un peu plus l'extrême droite, ça a été plus agressif quand on a commencé à couvrir ce sujet-là, en fait, on a plus de soucis, nous ici, avec les gens d'extrême droite qui surveillent un peu.

 J'ai reçu parfois quelques mots pas sympathiques, les complotistes. Donc là, en ce moment, radicaux, ça oui, on en veut. J'en vois plus, j'en connais plus, beaucoup plus, parce que c'est une idéologie qui est moins marginal le plus répandu. Donc je te dirai oui, mais en même temps, pour beaucoup, c'est juste des citoyens ordinaires mais qui sont radicaux. Au fait. Tu vois, et moi je ne suis pas psychologue, je ne suis pas travailleur social. Donc s'il y a un cas problématique, je laisse ça aux professionnels. C'est leur métier. À eux de prendre en charge des gens qui ne vont pas bien. Je ne vais pas moins improviser avec des outils de psychologues que j'ai pas psychiatres ou de sûr. Je peux y aller avec ma bonne foi, mais on est tous de bonne foi, ça ne fait pas de nous des bons intervenants. Donc, en général, quand j'ai eu à faire à quelques cas qui étaient plus compliqués. J'ai passé le cas…

[On parle beaucoup de radicalisation menant à la violence… comment tu définirais violence ?]

Oui, un discours haineux, c'est un discours violent. Et c'est sûr que si tu dis. Les Juifs, ceci ou les noirs, cela ou les arabes. Retournez chez vous. Vous devriez tous, on devrait vous foutre à l'eau. Et puis pour celui qui reçoit et qui appartient à la communauté, c'est un message violent. C'est sûr. C'est sûr, moi je l'inclut, je l'inclut là-dedans maintenant, en fait. La question, c'est qu'est ce qu'on fait avec ce discours là? En fait, pour moi, le problème, c'est moins le problème de définir la violence parce que la violence symbolique fait partie de la violence. Pour moi, c'est très clair. Donc tu as la violence symbolique, le discours, ensuite tu as l'acte, l'acte, l'acte haineux qui va être plutôt de l'ordre de casser, de casser des biens, de mettre une croix gammée sur une voiture, de mettre une tête de porc devant une mosquée, c'est violence. Et puis finalement, la violence physique et l'agression. Puis là, dans le spectre de la violence physique, tu peux avoir le terrorisme et ça peut aller jusqu'au génocide. Donc tu vois, je mets trois catégories de violence, mais je pense que le défi est moins de définir la violence que de dire ou est ce qu'on trace la limite dans

ce qui est ce qui est acceptable dans une société démocratique? Alors mettre une tête de porc pour moi. D'ailleurs, les policiers ont commencé à changer.

Maintenant, les policiers ont tous créé des modules d'incidents haineux. Donc, il y a ce qui est défini par le Code criminel comme un crime haineux. Puis il y a ce qui, finalement, ne relève pas vraiment du Code criminel, mais doit quand même être noté parce que c'est problématique, ce qui est un incident haineux. Donc une croix gammée, un machin, et cetera Donc maintenant on considère souvent ce n'est pas illégal, c'est solidement immoral. Nous, collectivement, comment on le gère? Ça, je le sais pas. Est ce qu'on l'empêche? Est ce qu'on empêche quelqu'un de dire ça ou d'écrire ça sur les réseaux sociaux? C'est sûr qu'il faut faire quelque chose, mais où est ce qu'on trace la limite? Ça, c'est là le défi du mois. Donc moins dans la définition que dans OK. À quel niveau de violence je suis capable de tolérer socialement avant d'intervenir? Parce qu'il faut que les gens puissent exprimer une forme de violence, des idées. La dernière chose que tu veux, c'est qu'on tombe dans une société où tous les propos sont lissés et ou dès que tu dis quelque chose, là, tout d'un coup, on t'as quelqu'un qui dit tu ne peux pas dire simple, bof. Là, on s'en sortirait plus, tu vois. Donc pour moi, il est là. Le défi, en fait. A quel moment? À quel degré de violence j'interviens collectivement ?

Q : Donc la troisième partie de l'entretien et c'est à propos de la prévention. Mais je présente la première question. Je crois que ce n'est pas nécessaire. Quelles sont les activités qui caractérisent le centre…La deuxième question tu as déjà parlé un peu, mais peut être tu peux ajouter quelque chose. Comment fonctionne la collaboration politique et ou scientifique dans les projets? Quels sont les points forts et les points critiques?

R29 : Oui, la collaboration va commencer par la collaboration scientifique. Ça, ça se passe bien. Parce qu'on arrive à avoir beaucoup de projets collectifs. Je pense que vous avez parlé avec la plupart des chercheurs avec qui on travaille. Alors ça se passe bien. C'est la collaboration est bonne. Il y a quelque quelques ça, c'est difficile à dire, mais il y a quelques chercheurs avec lesquels, des fois, c'est plus difficile de travailler. Mais on arrête de travailler avec eux parce que. Parce qu'il faut signe du plaisir quand même. On va travailler, puis on est rendus à un niveau. Dans notre carrière, on peut choisir les gens avec qui on a envie de travailler, surtout ceux avec qui on a. On se pose entre nous. Je dirais que la collaboration scientifique est assez bonne. On bosse bien évidemment Ghayda, Vivek Marie-Ève et moi, beaucoup de projets en commun en même temps, chacun fait ses projets aussi indépendamment et ça, c'est très, très important. On bosse beaucoup avec toute l'équipe de Cécile Rousseau.

Le défi qu'on a évidemment quand tu es beaucoup de chercheurs, c'est de mener à terme les projets, les projets scientifiques. Ça, c'est toujours un peu compliqué, mais on y arrive quand même relativement. Je te dirais que dans les premières années de

la chaire, j'ai trouvé qu'on aurait pu davantage publier. Là, on est en train de rattraper le retard. On publie beaucoup plus maintenant, mais au début, on avait tellement passé tellement de temps à mettre en place les structures, etc que c'était plus difficile. La recherche, c'est un seul des quatre mandats de la chaire, donc les trois autres prennent pas mal de temps aussi. Mais donc je dirais ça du point de vue scientifique, pour moi, ça va. On arrive à produire des choses intéressantes, à bien collaborer. Si je suis assez, assez content sur le plan politique, je pense que... Une des choses qu'on a réussi à faire. Euh. C'est d'avoir une bonne relation avec la fonction publique, donc pas forcément le politique. On garde quand même une distance raisonnable avec le politique parce que l'on ne veut pas que nos sujets soient trop instrumentalisés. Mais avec les fonctionnaires, on a une bonne relation, donc on les rencontre régulièrement, on leur dit ce qu'on fait, on leur présente les résultats de nos recherches. Et puis, en choisissant simplement ce qui les intéresse, on leur demande ce qui les intéresse. Ils nous contactent régulièrement. Donc je dirais que la relation est assez bonne au fédéral pour, en ce qui me concerne comme en provincial. Vivek e Ghayda ont une très bonne relation fédérale. Moi, j'en ai des bonnes… Et puis moi, j'ai surtout plus de relations provinciales. Donc on le gère, on le gère assez bien. Les défis? Au niveau scientifique, je pense qu'un des défis, c'est de répondre à toutes les demandes. On n'est pas capable. Il y a plein de projets qui nous arrivent sur la table, de gens qui nous disaient on aimerait bien travailler avec ça, et cetera, et cetera On n'a pas le temps. Est ce qu'on a une grosse équipe? On a pas une si grosse équipe avec eux quand même que ça, c'est qu'il faut générer beaucoup de… Tu génère des données mais après il faut les traiter, il faut publier etc donc on a, on a un défi je pense au niveau de la gestion du temps, dans tout ce qu'on nous demande de faire. Des fois, ça prend trop de temps parce que tout le monde fait tout. A droite, à gauche, ça c'est vrai. On est obligé de refuser certaines propositions et certaines propositions, s'étendre dans la durée, et cetera Donc ça c'est assez ça c'est un défi je dire.

Le défi sur le plan politique, c'est de s'inscrire dans la continuité malgré les changements de gouvernement. Nous la chaire. On a été créée sous un gouvernement libéral au provincial, puis ensuite est arrivée la Coalition avenir Québec. Alors pourquoi est-ce qu'on a réussi à continuer? C'est parce que justement, on avait de bonnes relations avec les fonctionnaires qui, eux, sont en charge de la continuité de l'État. Et puis, parce qu'il n'y avait pas non plus forcément une vision complètement différente des choses sur ces enjeux-là. Le défi, peut être parfois sur le plan politique, de conserver totalement. On est totalement indépendant, mais c'est de savoir si t'es très critique du gouvernement, comment tu le fais, comment tu ne l'exprime. C'est la bonne manière de le faire. Donc, est ce que des fois, ce peut être de faire une critique d'abord à l'intérieur, derrière les portes closes, et puis d'annoncer que tu n'es pas d'accord avec ça, donc que tu vas aller le dire à l'extérieur,

tu vois ce genre de choses. Ça, c'est important. Il n'y a pas d'ingérence du tout politique ou même gouvernemental dans nos travaux zéro. Ça, c'est clair. Mais. Tu sais des fois que la façon dont tu vas présenter la question ou un sujet ou aborder la question, ça peut avoir un impact politique important. Tu fais attention.

Q : Et est ce qu'il y a des choses que tu aimes bien faire différemment? Si tu penses à la chaire ?

R29 : Je pense que... Le plus gros défi c'est de penser out of the box est d'avoir des projets qui sont enracinés sur le terrain, qui répondent à des besoins et qui vont rejoindre nos populations qui sont plus radicales. Souvent, on va dans les écoles. Pourquoi? Parce que le public est dans les écoles. On a accès un peu aux profs, on dit au bon Dieu il faut absolument bien éduquer les jeunes. Mais oui, alors les jeunes peuvent être plus radicaux sur certaines thématiques. Mais quand tu prends le. Le conspirationnisme, et cetera Ce n'est pas les jeunes qui sont problematiques... C'est ce qu'on 25 /35 /40 ans. … Il faut aller dans les milieux de travail. Faut y aller. Je ne veux pas stigmatiser un milieu en particulier, mais par exemple aller dans le milieu de la construction. Comment tu fais ça? Tiens donc. Je pense que pour moi, ce qui est important et c'est aussi pour ça que je ne court pas après l'argent. Je pense qu'il faut allouer une certaine somme d'argent à ce que nous ont fait la recherche, la recherche axée sur des données probantes, la recherche axée sur des actions. Nous, on fait un peu de prévention, mais je pense qu'il faut aussi mettre l'argent à la bonne place et mettre l'argent à la bonne place. Et aussi mettre dans le communautaire, dans l'intervention psychosociale. Faut mettre l'argent au bon endroit, c'est à dire faut mettre l'argent. Si tu me demandais tout à l'heure est ce que tu côtoie beaucoup de radicaux dans ta vie? J'en côtoie pas tant que ça. Donc je crois qu'il faut donner l'argent à ceux qui vont travailler avec les radicaux. C'est là que l'argent est bien mis.

Maintenant, justement avec les réseaux sociaux et à cause des moyens de communication, on peut être facilement en contact quand même avec la radicalité politique. Tu sais, ce n'est pas une radicalité qui se cache. Les terroristes se cachent, mais moi, ce n'est pas mon travail de parler avec eux. Oui. Heu, là, tu ne vas pas me reparler. On ne fait pas de la prévention à l'égard, non, c'est pas ça que ça, c'est le travail de la police. Je pense rendu là. En dehors de moi, je n'irai pas me mettre devant les fusils d'assaut. Là donc, donc c'est ça. Mais je pense que ça, ça, c'est important. C'est important de bosser bien avec les milieux de pratique pour essayer d'avancer… Je pense qu'on ne prend pas assez de. On ne prend pas assez de risques. On fait des projets dans des cadres, on coche des cases, on a les mots clés, on fait de la reddition de comptes, on gère très bien notre argent. Je peux te dire au centime près ou à l'argent, il n'y a pas de souci. J'ai plein de monde qui ne s'occupe que de l'argent, que des rapports pour dire on a fait, mais des fois faut prendre un peu de risque pour voir des projets qui peuvent rater. Mais ça. Pour moi, c'est quelque

chose d'important. C'est faut être capable de dire. Le projet n'a pas fonctionné. Voilà pourquoi il n'a pas fonctionné. Mais ça, ce n'est pas du tout sexy pour un bailleur de fonds. Je ne sais pas si tu tiens un bailleur de fonds, mais ça fait deux ans que vous me donnez de l'argent. Vous savez quoi? Ça ne marche pas. Mais pour le prochain, je vous jure que ça va marcher. Il va faire alors Morin. Donc… je pense que faudrait collectivement qu'on soit capables d'aller là. Parler de ça entre nous, alors nous, on le fait quand même. En fait, on le fait derrière des portes closes, on discute de ou il faut attendre, il faut réorienter. Là, attention à ce que tu viens de dire dans les médias, peut être que ça pourrait orienter, et cetera Donc on fait ça beaucoup entre nous parce qu'on a un bon lien de confiance.

Mais c'est ça… prendre des risques, prendre des risques. Ça, c'est important, je pense, parce qu'il n'y a rien qui fonctionne. Si on ne prend pas de risque, tu vas là. Nous, on a. On va essayer de développer un projet. On pense qu'il faut développer un projet post pandémique ou on est capable de mettre ensemble des complotistes et des anti complotistes. Aux États-Unis, il y en a qui ont fait ça des tu, mais des démocrates et des républicains dans la même pièce. Et tu dis ok, comment on avance? Je suppose qu'on est rendu là. On est rendu à ce degré de polarisation sociale qui faut qu'on ait des projets comme ça, qui soit risqué, que les gens veulent pas en entendre qui on teste et on voit comment ça marche, etc faut qu'on fasse, faut qu'on fasse, faut qu'on fasse ça vraiment. Je pense que c'est ça que je te dirais sur peut être ce que je ferais différemment la critique. On est tous assez critique quand on discute entre nous – Adib, mais ausssi Ghayda, Vivek…Ce qui est important, c'est de faire une critique qui soit constructive et utile pour les milieux de pratiques. Est-ce que ce dont tu demandes aux universitaires on est super critique, donc on fait une critique discursive du machin, et cetera On apprend des théories postmodernes…. C'est utile, c'est utile pour moi. En tant que chercheur, j'aime bien lire ça. Mais quand tu dis aux gens « dont and so what? Maintenant, on fait quoi avec ça pour passer à l'action? »…. Mais ça, je pense qu'on y arrive. Il n'y a pas de. En tout cas, je ne sais pas ce que les autres ont dit, mais je pense qu'il y a, il y a. Personne ne se retient de parler au sein de la chaire. En tout cas, il n'y a que des personnalités fortes. Il y a juste moi qui parle trop, mais je pense que tout le monde est capable de dire un peu la critique. Elle est là, elle est là.

Q : Donc je te pose les deux dernières questions ensemble, donc sans doute. Donc je pense que par sa part, donc il. Quelles sont les principales capacités que tu considères et importantes à développer dans les activités de prévention primaire? Ok. Et la dernière question, c'est comment tu penses que les activités de prévention peuvent être rendues durables et efficaces dans le temps ?

R29: Les capacités en prévention. La première. Comme je le disais tout à l'heure… C'est comment on rejoint les milieux de travail. Pour moi, l'angle mort, il est là. Le secteur privé. Il faut toujours, et c'est important, de miser sur l'éducation. J'y

reviendrai tout à l'heure. Mais oui, c'est super important pour moyen et long terme. Et actuellement, notre problème à nous là n'est pas le milieu éducatif, ce n'est pas que le milieu éducatif. Donc là, ça pour moi, c'est comment on se structure pour dire OK, on les a mis. Et nous, on en fait de plus en plus des conférences, par exemple dans les syndicats. Les syndicats. Une coupe, ça va changer. J'ai vu des amis.

----------- **M.E. arrives**--------------------

…. On était en train de finir et après…

R29: Après, je vais vous la laisser, puis je reviendrai. Mais donc c'est ça. Donc je pense que vraiment, renforcer les capacités, c'est les milieux inexplorés, nos angles morts et se trouvent là, dans les milieux de travail. L'éducation, c'est vachement important, évidemment. Je pense que là, ce qu'il faut faire, c'est comment outiller les profs à avancer. Parce que les profs, ils n'ont pas le temps de faire de l'éducation. À la citoyenneté. En vrai, ils en font aux enfants. Quand mamie se débrouille bien par la bande, tu le vois quand tu as des enfants de seize ans, je sens qu'il se passe quelque chose à l'école quand même. Ça, ça va, mais il y en a plein qui nous disent help! Comment on fait? Ou est ce qu'on inscrit ça dans le cursus? Et cetera Donc là, je pense qu'on pourrait être plus intelligents au niveau gouvernemental pour dire OK, voilà comment on va aborder ces questions à venir, là notamment. Je suis sûr que Marie-Ève en parlera, mais la littératie numérique, et cetera Mais encore une fois, la littérature numérique, les jeunes se servent bien mieux des réseaux sociaux et ont un bullshit au maître bien plus aiguisé que pas mal de gens de 40 ans ou 45 ans qui ont découvert ça sur le tard et qui disent en regarde la belle source. Donc milieux de travail, les capacités, éducation importants, le milieu communautaire qui continue d'être sous financé. Je viens vous parler de les problèmes psychologiques. Le gouvernement a annoncé beaucoup d'argent dans le domaine du PC qu'il faut aller. Il faut arrêter les conneries. C'est là qu'il faut mettre de l'argent. Beaucoup, beaucoup les deux. Deux autres angles morts. Je pourrais être intarissable là-dessus. Je pense qu'il y en a deux autres.
Je vais laisser Marie-Eve vous parler de ça parce que c'est vraiment un de ses domaines de spécialisation. C'est la relation avec les médias. Comme je vous disais, nous, on fait beaucoup de médias, mais je pense que là, il y a probablement quelque chose à explorer davantage et à établir une bonne relation distance parce que les médias veulent être indépendants, mais reconsidérer la couverture de certains événements, leur façon de travailler et puis eux mêmes sont super contraints. Mais je te laisse pas y aller là-dessus tout à l'heure. Donc la question avec les médias est le cinquième point, la cinquième capacité pour moi. C'est le politique. C'est que le

politique ne prend pas ses responsabilités. Tu ne peux pas, dans une société, essayer de faire des calculs à la petite semaine de stratégie politique sur le dos de sujets comme l'immigration, comme la colère des gens comme…. Les théories du complot, et cetera Et on le voit, il y a une tentation en ce moment dans une ère de populisme, notamment à droite, dans ton pays d'origine, dans le mien donc on voit ça. Là, les politiques sont pas responsables. Je pense qu'on prend souvent l'image. Ils se promènent avec des boîtes d'allumettes dans des entrepôts de dynamite. Et ils sont responsables de ça. Comment? Nous, on a besoin d'eux? Parce qu'ils financent nos recherches. Mais encore une fois, les fonctionnaires souvent sont conscients de ça. Donc si t'as l'appui des fonctionnaires, souvent tu vas y aller solide sur le politique, t'as pas besoin du politique. Le politique vient signer, mais comment est ce qu'on fait passer ces messages là avec le politique? Et j'ai pas de réponse. Mais ça, c'est une capacité, un site.

Q : Oui, c'est une partie de réponse. Mais je vais répéter la question. On peut commencer avec. Est ce qu'on peut se tutoyer? Oui, certainement. On peut commencer à la fin et après tu.

Je vais répéter la question parce que David tu m'a répondu mais je voudrais savoir aussi une autre chose. La question c'était quelles sont les principales capacités qui tu considères important à développer dans les activités de prévention primaire? Si on pense comment on disait qu'on s'est rencontré, si on pense à la promotion, qu'est-ce qu'on veut promouvoir avec la prévention primaire ?

R 30 : Mais c'est sûr qu'en ce moment, ce qui est le terme n'est peut-être pas le bon résilience démocratique, mais qui est de favoriser une meilleure compréhension et un sentiment d'intégration dans le système démocratique pour les sociétés démocratiques. C'est certain que c'est un enjeu parce qu'est ce qu'on se rend compte dans nos recherches…C'est que l'adhésion à la désinformation, qu'au complotisme, qu'on considère comme une forme de radicalisation parce qu'il y a vraiment un lien avec l'adhésion à la violence, notamment de certains comportements politiques, passe par la confiance envers les institutions très fortement. C'est l'état psychologique, la confiance à avoir, les institutions qui sont dans les facteurs les plus importants. Donc je crois que ce que David a dit, c'est vraiment quelque chose d'important à travailler. C'est certain que du côté du pôle média, il y a tout ce qui est aussi la déontologie journalistique, donc la responsabilité professionnelle des médias d'information ou des réseaux sociaux, notamment des grandes plateformes web, de gérer justement ces contenus haineux, ces contenus radicaux là, pour faire cette prévention primaire. À mon sens...

R 29 : J'ajouterai un terme dans la résilience démocratique aussi. Ce sur quoi il faut travailler, c'est le droit au désaccord et le droit au dissensus.

R30: Et au débat

R29 : et au débat. Savoir qu'on a le droit de ne pas être d'accord, on a le droit de s'engueuler même. Mais ultimement, c'est deux points de vue qui s'affrontent et à la fin de la journée, il faut être capable de vivre ensemble quand même. C'est comme si on avait perdu un peu cette capacité au débat d'idées, comme dit Marie-Ève. Et ça, ça, moi, ça me préoccupe. Parce que la société démocratique, ce n'est pas le consensus, la société démocratique, c'est le dissensus. Et si on perd notre capacité au dissensus? Et ça veut dire quoi? Ça veut dire que moi, je suis dans le camp de ceux qui ont raison et je suis prêt à élire un leader qui va penser comme moi et puis à écraser ceux qui en face ne sont pas d'accord. Et je pense que objectivement, quand on regarde beaucoup là, ce qui va avec le sentiment d'anonymat, un peu, c'est un peu ça la perte de confiance dans les institutions, mais aussi le sens de sa vie, et cetera C'est l'appétit pour des leaders autoritaires. Puis au Brésil. On l'avait aux États-Unis et on le voit en Europe partout et là. Et là, t'as vraiment un risque majeur pour nos démocraties qu'on prend beaucoup trop pour acquis. Nous, on pense que démocratie. Mais oui, les amis, nos libertés, ma liberté à moi individuelle priment ma. Mes données personnelles, tout ça. Ben oui, mais si on est en train de perdre de vue le collectif, je pense que ce qui fonde la démocratie aujourd'hui constitue le principal danger pour la démocratie. Donc c'est drôle, c'est comme une maladie auto immune qui est en train de se déclencher à l'intérieur du corps démocratique.

C'est ça? Et donc ça, moi je pense que ça tu vois en prévention primaire, c'est hyper important. Il faut qu'on puisse s'engueuler dans une classe. Faut que le prof apprenne à ne pas être d'accord avec les élèves et les élèves entre eux. Et c'est pour ça que moi, la notion de la notion de safe space me fait vachement peur parce que je trouve qu'elle va… Alors je comprends le respect de communauté de dire je prends mais de me faire agresser dans un cours. Là, ok, pour moi, là qu'un professeur utilise le mot nigger, ça n'a pas de sens. C'est pourquoi t'as besoin d'employer ce mot-là dans ta classe ?... Par contre, qui dise je vais vous faire lire Les dix petits nègres d'Agatha Christie ou comment faire l'amour avec un nègre sans se fatiguer en prenant le titre du bouquin. Pas. Pour moi, ça c'est correct. C'est si tu le mets en contexte, si t'as la sensibilité pour dire aux gens qui sont dans ta classe. Attention, je suis conscient que là, je vais employer un mot qui peut être blessant, mais je l'emploie quand même assez. Faut qu'on retrouve cette façon de parler parce que là, on est en train de… Perdre le lien. Donc ça, je l'ajouterais beaucoup. Quand tu parlais des capacités en prévention primaire, ça pour moi c'est probablement le cœur du truc, la confiance et aussi le. La capacité à être pas d'accord.

R30 : Je pense au renforcement des capacités aussi. Il faut largement continuer à investir dans la recherche, dans les travaux qui se font en prévention, parce qu'on se rend compte qu'il y a encore beaucoup de chemin à faire pour comprendre ce qui fonctionne en termes d'éducation médiale, en termes de prévention, en termes

d'évaluation. Exactement, c'est le je m'en allais. Donc ça, ça prend de la recherche. Continuer à investir, c'est aussi ça comme un autre enjeu qui est vraiment important pour continuer à faire cette prévention primaire là. Mieux comprendre ce qui se passe, mais comprendre ce qui se fonctionne. Plus de ça dans le corps ou au dos, à mettre plus d'énergie, ce qui fonctionne pas parce qu'il y a peu d'évaluation qui est fait à long terme, de des initiatives dans plein de domaines comme moi. Ma spécialité est plus du côté médiatique, mais dans toutes les initiatives d'éducation, médias, de prévention, de la désinformation, et cetera, il y a peu d'évaluation pour moyen long terme et ça c'est important aussi.

R29 : C'est sur la régulation en ce moment, des réseaux sociaux, et cetera. Qu'est ce qui fonctionne? Qu'est ce qui ne fonctionne pas? C'est Je sors là de dix semaines de travail avec le groupe d'experts du gouvernement du Canada. On est en train de on a fait des recommandations pour qu'il puisse mettre sur pied sa loi là, sur les discours des membres haineux, mais pas seulement. La question violence terroriste, exploitation sexuelle des enfants comment est-ce qu'on peut réguler les médias et pas les médias par les réseaux sociaux, les plateformes, et cetera? C'est eux, c'est super compliqué quoi. Il faut qu'on aille là. On l'enseigne parce qu'on a beau dire aux réseaux sociaux fais pas ci, fais pas ça, ça reste notre responsabilité individuelle aussi, et de ce qu'on met sur les réseaux sociaux d'être là-dessus, et cetera. Donc je pense qu'il y a, il y a beaucoup de. Il y a beaucoup de travail à faire, mais pour moi, la outrance politique est fondamentale. Je vais vous donner un exemple et après je vous laisserai tranquilles. Ce matin ou hier, on apprenait dans la presse que. Le directeur de la santé publique a enlevé d'un rapport qui devait être déposé dans une ville au Québec qui s'appelle Rouyn-Noranda.

Et dans cette ville, il y a une usine et on s'aperçoit en fait que cette usine est hyper polluante et elle utilise du cyanure ou je ne sais pas quoi faire en tout cas. Et qu'il y a plus de cancers, beaucoup plus de cancers. On a trouvé trois fois plus de particules de cyanure sur les doigts des enfants dans cette ville là que dans le reste du Québec. Donc ça met en danger nos citoyens. Et donc la santé publique locale, voulait déposer le rapport. C'était un rapport dur là-dessus, dont une des annexes disait. Et en plus, on a beaucoup plus de cancers du poumon. Et pour des raisons que je ne comprends pas, le directeur de la santé publique, la directeur national de la santé publique du Québec, lui, il a dit dans l'annexe six On l'enlève, on en parlera plus tard. Aujourd'hui, ça sort. L'arsenic, c'est ça…. Aujourd'hui, ça sort dans les médias que le rapport est terrible, évidemment. Et surtout que le directeur a fait retirer l'annexe six. Qu'est-ce que vous pensez que nos amis complotistes sont en train de dire?

R30 : J'ai vu ce matin moi sur les sites complotistes, on disait c'est fini. Maintenant ce n'est plus que raison de moi avant qu'on confirme le complot. C'est une raison d'aujourd'hui, c'est fini.

R29 : Tout le travail que nous on fait tous les matins, on se lève pour dire à ces gens-là Wow slacker, vos affaires tranquilles? Oui, il y en a des complots, mais là arrêtez. Et là, cette décision là nous renvoie nous là? Pffff. Six moi en arrière. C'est ça? C'est une responsabilité politique d'un homme politique, n'est-ce pas? Ce n'est pas supposé être un homme politique par ses problèmes, mais c'est un problème majeur. C'est un problème majeur, la confusion des genres dans le poste. Sans compter que je pense que ce type-là a pas du tout les épaules assez larges pour ce poste-là. Il n'a pas compris que c'était quoi son travail. Il a d'ailleurs dit beaucoup de n'importe quoi pendant la pandémie quand même. On peut ne pas lui en vouloir ou lui en vouloir. Je veux dire, ce n'est pas facile. Je préfère être dans ma chaise de prof que dans son fauteuil élu, mais ça reste que ça. Tu vois que cette question de la transparence et elle vient miner la confiance. Et du public. Et Y c'est important, ce sont les enfants. Nos enfants? Tu m'expliques?

R30 : Oh oui, c'est ça. C'est qu'on se rend compte. Quand on fait des études sur le complotisme, le complot auquel les gens croient le plus, c'est le contrôle de l'information par les gouvernements pour envoyer leurs données complètement raison.

R29 : Parce que il n'y a pas des lézards à la longue langue derrière. Et là, ils nous regardent, ils disent Mais moi, je n'y crois pas aux Illuminati et aux lézards. Ce que je te dis, c'est ça. En fait, oui, c'est vrai, mais là, on a de bonnes choses. Donc tu vois ça à ça? Ça, c'est si tu veux faire de la prévention, là. Pour moi, le plus important, c'est de mettre les gens devant leurs responsabilités à tous les niveaux de la chaîne d'acteurs. Et c'est ce qu'on ne fait pas. On peut toujours continuer de bosser avec nos profs. Ben oui, si tout le monde prend pas ses responsabilités là dedans et le politique en a une majeure, il n'est pas le seul. Nous, on a les médias, on a une politique, on a une politique qui veut.

R30: Partout pendant la pandémie, on entendait Ah, si les gens adhère pas aux mesures sanitaires, c'est parce qu'ils n'ont pas compris. Il faut continuer à répéter le message pour répéter le message. Pour les gens qui ne l'ont pas entendu. Tu dis mais le problème, c'est que si c'est des gens qui n'ont pas eu de formation en communication ou qui ne connaissent pas nécessairement la radicalisation ou la prévention et qui se disent avoir répété, mais parce qu'à un certain moment, les gens le savent, il faut laver les mains, les gens s'en vont être à deux mètres. S'il y a des repas, c'est parce qu'il y a autre chose derrière que ça donne envie de continuer à répéter le message des politiciens ou des acteurs de santé publique qui disent non. Il faut répéter le message que c'est sûr que c'est frustrant pour des chercheurs, que c'est pas ça qu'il faut faire. Il faut expliquer et expliquer pourquoi c'est décidé. On

le doit bien pour montrer plus de transparence, pour que les gens adhèrent. Et ce n'est pas.

Q : Est-ce que tu peux décrire brièvement tes études, tes expériences professionnelles?

R30: J'ai fait un bac en communication sociale. Donc c'est communication, mais très axé sur justement l'intervention communautaire… Communication au sein des communautés, entre autres. On avait un des professeurs qui était spécialiste de santé communautaire, santé publique, qui allait à Cuba faire des plans de communication en Martinique, et cetera Donc c'était vraiment un bac en communication axé sur les enjeux sociaux communautaires à l'UQTR, à Trois-Rivières, à l'Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières. À la fin de mon bac, j'ai fait un stage au Conseil de presse du Québec qui est un organisme d'autorégulation des médias. Donc, le Conseil de presse qui fait en gros c'est il reçoit les plaintes du public sur l'information, il analyse les plaintes, vend ses, sont fondées, puis rend des décisions, voir s'il y a eu des manquements déontologiques dans le travail des médias ou des journalistes. Il reçoit aussi les demandes des journalistes, gens qui ont des problèmes éthiques ou déontologiques. Donc il y a un code de déontologie, tout ça. J'ai fait mon stage là et à la fin de mon stage, ils m'ont gardé pour un contrat pour terminer un dossier d'analyse sur lequel je travaillais, sur un projet spécifique lié à la couverture médiatique dans des centres pour personnes âgées. Et ensuite, j'ai obtenu un poste, donc j'ai fait un remplacement de congé de maternité comme analyste. Ensuite, j'ai fait un remplacement de congé de maternité comme gestionnaire des plaintes. Et puis finalement, je suis resté sept ans au Conseil de presse du Québec à différents postes. À la fin, j'étais directrice des communications. Et justement, j'aimais beaucoup ça parce que ce n'était pas le travail journalistique, mais c'était toute la recherche, la réflexion sur le rôle des journalistes dans la société, leurs responsabilités sociales, la déontologie, améliorer l'information, améliorer le travail des journalistes. Et donc, pendant que j'étais au Conseil de presse pendant ces sept années-là, j'ai fait ma maîtrise, je j'ai fait un certificat en journalisme sportif et puis j'ai fait ma maîtrise qui était une maîtrise en communication, en lettres et communication sociale. Donc, ma maîtrise portait sur la façon dont les journaux télévisés en France, au Québec construisent la réalité. Et quel impact ça a sur notre perception de la réalité, donc de suivre, de prendre une analyse comparative entre la France et le Québec? Les journaux télévisés. J'avais été faire mes recherches avec Sciences Po, Aix en Provence, en France pendant cette période-là et après ma maîtrise, j'ai décidé de commencer mon doctorat. Donc j'ai fait mon doctorat en cotutelle entre Sciences-Po, Aix en Provence encore et l'Université de Montréal à Montréal. Mon doctorat ici était en communication et à Sciences « Po Aix », c'était sciences politiques, section Infocom. Et donc mon doctorat était sur comment les situations de crise affectent la couverture journalistique et les pratiques

journalistiques, donc la couverture des crises, des conflits, des crises sociales, des catastrophes naturelles, et cetera. Donc, je voulais comprendre comment, justement, quand on est confronté à la guerre, à du terrorisme, à des événements qui bousculent le quotidien, ça affecte les pratiques et ça peut affecter notre représentation de la réalité. Donc, j'ai toujours été assez sensible aux enjeux sociaux, à l'impact du travail des médias, de l'information sur notre compréhension des enjeux et de la réalité.

Pendant mon doctorat, ça faisait sept, huit ans que j'étais au Conseil de presse. Donc à un certain moment, j'ai voulu prendre du recul parce que bon, c'est un petit taux BNL qui a beaucoup de problèmes, parfois de gestion de conflits internes entre les entreprises de presse, les journalistes et les membres du public. Donc, je me suis fait offrir un poste chez Raymond Chabot Grant Thornton. Grant Thornton International, c'est une firme de comptables. Donc rien à voir. Mais j'avais goût d'essayer autre chose avant d'être peut-être prof ou autre. Voir dans le privé comment ça se passait. Donc pendant presque cinq ans, j'ai d'abord été conseillère principale ou communication interne. Puis, après un an, je suis devenu à peu près un an, un an et demi directrice des relations publiques et développement des affaires. Pour Raymond Chabot, donc, gérer l'image de marque, les communications, les événements à travers le Canada et j'avais des projets sur des secteurs porteurs miniers développement minier, Plan Nord, et cetera Et pendant que j'étais chez Raymond Chabot et que je terminais mon doctorat à l'Université de Sherbrooke a ouvert un poste de professeur, mon directeur de thèse m'a encouragé à appliquer. C'était en 2014 parce que c'est la même année.. J'ai déposé ma thèse, puis j'ai quitté Raymond Chabot avec une.

Donc oui, voilà, j'ai obtenu le poste ici. Donc c'est ce que ça m'a poussé à finir ma thèse aussi. Parce que bon, je n'étais pas pressé de faire ma thèse comme je travaillais à temps plein. Puis j'ai eu un poste de direction et j'ai quitté Raymond Chabot pour devenir prof ici au département de communication. À l'époque, c'était le département de littérature, lettres et communication. Depuis, on s'est séparé, on est devenu vraiment juste un département de communication. On est beaucoup en développement sur les enjeux de communication. Et dans tout ça? Je suis arrivé ici en 2014. Je travaillais déjà sur des enjeux liés, par exemple à la couverture du terrorisme notamment. Et donc, j'ai connu David dans une conférence, on s'est mis à parler. Je lui ai expliqué qu'on avait des enjeux communs d'intérêt sur radicalisation, extrémisme d'un côté, plus médias et donc à peu. La première année ou la chaire a été créée. Je n'étais pas vraiment très impliqué au départ de la création de la chaire, qui a été plus Ghayda, Vivek et David. Mais assez rapidement, j'ai joint la chaire ou on a développé le pôle médias qui avait vraiment comme vocation de s'intéresser au rôle des médias dans la prévention de l'extrémisme et de la radicalisation violente, la responsabilité sociale des médias, les pratiques

journalistiques. Comment couvrent ces enjeux-là? Tranquillement, ça s'est élargi aussi à tout ce qui est désinformation, réseaux sociaux, complotisme. Et donc, depuis maintenant environ un mois, je suis devenu titulaire de la chaire parce que vraiment on avait comme partagé le rôle de l'agence. C'est un peu comme ça que ça a évolué. Voilà.

Q : Comment tu as décidé de t'engager dans la prévention?

R30: Bien comme je le pensais vraiment par le regard plus médiatique, notamment quand j'étais au Conseil de presse du Québec, on a été souvent interpellé sur la responsabilité des médias dans la prévention de comportements violents. Donc, notamment, il y a eu un certain moment, il y a eu une fusillade au Collège Dawson, à Montréal. Kimveer Gill, l'auteur, était seul comme un jeune qui s'était radicalisé, qui est arrivé armé et qui a tiré dans au collège et les médias a eu plusieurs dérapages à ce moment-là, on a parlé de six tireurs alors qu'il était seul. Ça crée une panique chez les parents. Imagine déjà qui est un tireur à l'école ou ton enfant, et c'est paniquant. Mais de penser qu'il y en a six, c'est encore plus paniquant parce que tu dis les chances de survie. Et donc il y a eu ces dérapages-là. Il y a eu aussi des journalistes qui voulaient absolument parler aux familles de Kimveer Gill, donc du perpétré à terre des victimes. Il y a eu par exemple un journaliste qui s'est déguisé en livreur de pizza pour aller chez les familles pour pouvoir parler. Donc il y avait eu toutes sortes de dérapages déontologiques et on était dans la même période, à peu près ou il y a eu Virginia Tech, la tuerie à Virginia Tech, plusieurs fusillades comme ça, et il y avait vraiment une grande réflexion sur le rôle des médias dans ça. Est-ce qu'on contribué à créer des copycat? Si on en parle trop, est ce que ça donne de l'inspiration à d'autres? Est-ce qu'on en fait des vedettes? C'est quoi le rôle des médias? Est ce qu'il faut en parler pour conscientiser les gens en même temps au Conseil de presse à la même période, ou si on avait eu une plainte contre quelque temps.

En tout cas, un petit peu avant ou après. Je ne me souviens plus exactement. Mais une plainte contre TVA Nouvelles, qui avait diffusé la décapitation de Daniel Pearl à la télévision à l'heure de grande écoute, et gens aient trouvé ça normal ou s'il y avait un avertissement, d'autres non. Donc on était dans toutes ces questions médiatiques-là qui m'ont amené à choisir un sujet de doctorat justement autour de ça, parce que j'avais présidé le comité du Conseil de presse qui voulait créer peut être un nouvel outil déontologique ou un guide pour mieux outiller les journalistes quand ils couvrent les crises, les attentats terroristes, les fusillades. Et ça n'a pas débouché. Il y a eu des conflits internes. Je me suis dit je vais le faire autrement, je vais le faire pendant ma thèse. Et donc ça m'a toujours évité de de m'impliquer. Oui, mais c'est dans un côté très. Comment aider les journalistes? Comment aider les professionnels de l'information comme à aider les médias à mieux faire pour aider la population à prévenir la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent, collaborer avec la

population, recréer la confiance. Donc ça, c'était peut-être mon engagement premier qui est vrai. Ça a déboulé à tous les autres engagements en ce moment. Mes engagements sont beaucoup aussi sur justement ce maillage-là. Comment outiller les citoyens pour mieux choisir l'information? Donc, par exemple, depuis deux ans, depuis le début de la pandémie, je suis sur le comité directeur de Sciences First.

Je ne sais pas si vous connaissez la science d'abord. Donc, c'est une initiative qui vise vraiment essayer de contrer la désinformation en ligne en essayant de diffuser de l'information scientifique de qualité qui fait consensus et qui est facilement accessible, donc qui est vulgarisée, qui est illustrée à l'art science of first qu'on fait ça à travers le Canada. On a une équipe de chercheurs qui collabore avec des employés vraiment, qui sont payés, qui vont sur les réseaux sociaux, qui essaient de diffuser de la bonne information pour contrer la mauvaise… en sachant que ce n'est pas parfait. Mais au moins ça ajoute… On voit vraiment que ça a été fait parce qu'en autres, on a des groupes anti-vax dernièrement qui ont essayé d'imiter Science of First en se passant du contenu de ces vaccins sur le d'autres sciences. Donc on voit qu'il y a un effet les gens essaient de réagir. Donc vraiment ce genre d'initiative sur lequel je me penche, je m'investis le plus. C'est tout ce qui est information qui peut aider à prévenir la radicalisation, les compatriotes demain violents, les comportements extrêmes. Donc c'est un exemple. Mais j'ai beaucoup d'implication comme ça. Je suis en ce moment aussi sur un comité bénévole canadien qui a été mandaté par le gouvernement du Canada pour faire un rapport sur les impacts sociaux, économiques, de la désinformation pour trouver des outils de prévention donc sûrs.

Q : Est ce que tu peux me décrire un épisode critique de ton travail, ce qui s'est passé ou était ou était tout avec et avec qui ?

R30 : Je ne sais pas si ça va répondre à ça, mais disons qu'un de mes gros projets de recherche, un de mes gros premiers projets de recherche comme professeur, donc pas comme doctorant. Mais quand je suis arrivé ici, ça a été un moment où il venait d'abord, juste avant mon arrivée ici. La crise de Lac-Mégantic, donc l'explosion. Je ne sais pas si vous connaissez la, mais l'explosion d'un train au centre-ville de Lac-Mégantic, donc, ça a été la plus grosse explosion de train. Une catastrophe, disons, redevable à lui-même au Canada qu'on n'avait jamais eue. Donc, il y a un train qui était rempli de pétrole brut, qui a été mal arrêté en haut d'une côte à Nantes et qui est descendu et qui est tombé dans le village de la ville de Lac-Mégantic et qui a explosé en plein centre ville. Donc ça a détruit une bonne partie du centre ville. Il y a eu énormément de décès et à peu près tout le monde qui habitait à Lac-Mégantic avait quelqu'un soit dans sa famille, soit dans ses amis, qui est décédé. Il y a eu énormément d'orphelins, donc c'est un évènement qui était vraiment marquant et qui m'a déjà marqué parce que c'est l'été que j'arrivais comme professeur. Et nous, à Raymond Chabot, quand j'étais chez vous, Raymond Chabot Grant Thornton, on

avait un bureau à Lac-Mégantic, donc que je gérais un peu la fermeture du bureau, l'annonce de ce qui se passait là. Je suis arrivé ici comme prof et pas longtemps après mon arrivée, on a eu une conférence des gestionnaires de santé publique, donc, notamment la Santé publique de l'Estrie et les premiers répondants qui avaient géré Lac-Mégantic et qui ont commencé à parler de tout ce qu'ils avaient vécu, comment c'était difficile, imprévu, soudain, qui étaient laissés à eux-mêmes.

Et donc ça, ça a peut-être été un événement marquant de ma carrière parce que ça, ça a créé un projet de recherche. Finalement, on a passé des mois à travailler avec Lac-Mégantic, à interroger les acteurs de première ligne, de voir ce qui avait bien été, qu'est ce qui avait moins bien été, comment on pouvait améliorer les communications sur le terrain avec la population, comprendre justement comment la communication doit vraiment se faire avec la population pour être bien comprise, pour être avec la communauté. La population, ça a créé une sensibilité à la réalité de communautés qui sont parfois isolées, qui n'ont pas les mêmes capacités de littératie. Et je pense que ça a joué sur le développement de mes recherches futures. Beaucoup, parce que tout ce qui est comme stratégique, comme santé, donc je fais. Je travaille aussi sur les médias et sur la prévention de la radicalisation, de l'extrémisme violent. Mais je suis aussi beaucoup en communication, santé, communication de crise, communication stratégique. Et les deux se parlent comme avec la pandémie, on l'a vu. C'est tellement interreliés tout ça. On est de plus en plus dans une société du risque qui est de crise. Donc oui, je ne sais pas si ça répond. Donc c'est un événement marquant qui a beaucoup affecté mes recherches.

Q: Donc la deuxième partie est pour moi de la radicalisation. Une première question est dans tes propres mots et est très brièvement comment définirais-tu la radicalisation?

R30: Ça, c'est une bonne question. Puis je parlais tout derrière. Y a un autre événement marquant, je pense, a été l'attentat à Ottawa ou j'enseignais, puis j'étais dans la classe. On dirait que pendant que c'est arrivé et que j'ai vu les étudiants comme ouvrir leur portable et on a tout arrêté le cours. Et depuis, j'ai travaillé beaucoup sur cet attentat. Là aussi, ça m'a permis de parler de radicalisation, beaucoup avec les étudiants et j'ai fait une recherche avec ma une de mes étudiantes, Sarah Marcel Morin. Pendant un an, on a étudié comment les journaux au Québec avaient traité la radicalisation. Est ce qu'on s'est rendu compte des vies? Mais oui, on s'est rendu compte que pendant un an, il y avait aucun journaux au Québec qui ont défini c'était quoi la radicalisation? Sauf une fois Le Devoir et c'était un article d'opinion écrit par un prof d'université. Donc, depuis les départs des jeunes de Maisonneuve, notamment pour faire le djihad, depuis la montée de l'État islamique, on parlait de radicalisation, de radicalisation, mais on disait jamais c'était quoi? Et une étude qui a été menée par Solange Lefèvre à l'Université de Montréal? Une action concertée des fonds de recherche du Québec. Ils ont posé des questions. Un

sondage populationnel, tout ça. Et c'est ce qu'ils ont démontré. Les gens au Québec ne comprennent pas c'est quoi la radicalisation. Ils vont beaucoup plus comprendre le terme extrémiste. Déjà, radicalisation ne dit rien pour personne parce que ça n'a jamais été bien défini. Donc je pense qu'on a grandes problématiques sociales de comprendre c'est quoi la radicalisation et tout le monde n'a pas la même vision de ça. Pour moi, la radicalisation, c'est quand on a des comportements qui commencent à être un peu extrêmes et qui vont tranquillement nous isoler vers des groupes qui vont aller conforter nos convictions et qui vont nous éloigner de ceux qui ne partagent pas ces convictions-là. Et on va avoir un renfermement sur soi ou sur son groupe pour les convictions qu'on partage et qui prennent tellement de place qui nous isole. Du reste, il faut le dire de façon très vulgarisée.

Q : Merci. Et quels sont les concepts que tu considères comme liés à la radicalisation ?

R30: Forcément l'extrémisme, parce que la peur en est liée extrémisme, radicalisation, violence parce qu'on le voyait soignante, les comportements plus radicaux l'extrémisme, la violence, la polarisation. Polarisation des idées notamment. Pour nous, en ce moment, des informations complotistes, on le voit. Qui a vraiment un lien aussi avec les comportements radicaux. Donc on a tendance à associent ce coup à terrorisme? Mais non, ça peut être de la désinformation, ça peut être religieux, ça peut être de politique, avec l'extrême droite notamment. Donc c'est un concept qui est assez large pour voir.

Q: Ok. Et est-ce que tu as déjà rencontré des personnes radicalisées au cours des activités?

R30: Oui. Je raconte souvent notamment le haut niveau du complotisme. Depuis deux ans et demi, trois ans, j'ai rencontré beaucoup de gens qui adhèrent très fortement aux théories du complot. Des gens qui parfois sont beaucoup sur la défensive ou son départ, très fâché par rapport à nos travaux. Et j'ai justement j'aime beaucoup être en dialogue avec eux parce qu'on se rend compte que quand ils comprennent qu'on ne cherche pas à les démoniser mais à comprendre leurs croyances et à trouver des façons de rétablir un dialogue. Jusqu'à maintenant, j'ai eu beaucoup de bonnes expériences de voir qu'on peut s'entendre et que lorsqu'ils comprenaient que nos travaux ce pas pour démoniser leurs croyances, mais vraiment mieux comprendre. Et beaucoup d'ouverture. Donc j'ai rencontré beaucoup de gens, surtout peut être des complotistes depuis quelque temps. Des gens qui ont adhéré à des thèses conspirationnistes. Ouais, je pensais surtout ça depuis les derniers temps. Qui a été le plus gros… Même si j'ai travaillé sur le terrorisme, sur d'autres sujets. Mais en ce moment, c'est plus le complotisme qui prend la place.

Q: Donc la troisième partie est à propos de la prévention… La première question était sur les activités qui caractérisent le centre… on en a déjà parlé avec David. Et la deuxième question : Comment fonctionne la collaboration politique et / ou scientifique dans les projets et quels sont les points forts et les points critiques.

R30 : Ce que je pense qu'il faut vraiment que ce soit une collaboration. Je pense que c'est vraiment important parce qu'avec le rôle qu'on a et ce qu'on veut faire, il faut vraiment qu'on réussisse à créer cette collaboration-là. On n'a pas le choix entre nous. Pour être financés, forcément, il faut être redevable. Il faut que les gens sachent ce qu'on fait pour qu'ils soient sensibilisés, qui financent, mais aussi parce que la mission de la chaire notamment et de ce qu'on fait, c'est aussi d'être un acteur social. Donc on a une mission d'éducation, de prévention et de formation qui passe beaucoup par aussi le contact avec le politique, donc de faire des formations, d'expliquer nos recherches, de faire un état des lieux avec les ministères et politiques. C'est vraiment important pour réussir notre mission. Et ce n'est pas toujours facile, forcément parce que l'agenda politique rejoint pas toujours l'agenda des chercheurs en termes de priorités et même en termes de ce qu'ils veulent dire versus ce qu'ils veulent pas dire. Donc parfois ça peut entrer en confrontation, c'est certain. Notamment il y a quelque temps, on a fait une recherche action qui a super bien fonctionné. On a essayé de montrer au gouvernement l'impact de cette recherche là pour qu'il donne suite et peut être qu'il aille plus loin dans le projet et pour des raisons politiques qui n'hésitent pas à y aller parce que c'était trop risqué en terme politique, communicationnel, alors il faut vivre avec ça. Mais je pense vraiment qu'il faut voir ça comme une relation qui doit être de collaboration. Parce que si on veut que les choses changent ou que ça passe par le politique, on voit tellement l'importance du politique en termes d'importance, de résilience démocratique, d'importance, de rétablir la confiance, le dialogue pour prévenir certains comportements radicaux. Donc, il faut vraiment garder ce lien très fort là, selon moi, entre les chercheurs et les politiques.

Q : Ok, la dernière question était comment penses-tu que les activités de prévention peuvent être rendues durables et efficaces dans le temps?

R30 : Je crois que d'abord il faut, et je l'ai dit tout à l'heure, un petit peu quand on était avec David. Mais je pense qu'il faut mieux évaluer, c'est à dire là, soit il y a des gens qui évaluent leurs initiatives de prévention ou d'éducation, notamment parce que je pense qu'il y a beaucoup de la dans l'éducation aux médias, la sensibilisation, l'éducation des public au processus politique, démocratique, au débat et à toutes les autres activités de prévention. Et souvent, l'évaluation est vue comme juste un passage obligé pour rendre des comptes, boucler le financement. Et il n'y a pas un réel effort ou une réelle plus-value qui est vue dans le processus d'évaluation. Ça fait en sorte qu'on ne voit pas. Est-ce que, à court terme, il y a des retombées à moyen terme et surtout à long terme pour voir ou on doit mettre les

efforts, quelles initiatives va mieux fonctionner, comment on doit investir dans ses efforts, dans ces initiatives-là davantage et aussi pour éviter des doublons, entre autres. J'ai parlé de ce que je canalplus, mais en éducation média mettait certaines initiatives qui se ressemblent, qui gagneraient à se parler, à se bonifier dans l'autre, à peut-être faire front commun. Et là, ils sont comme tout, un peu isolés parce qu'il n'y a pas cette espèce de processus d'évaluation et de mise en commun. Donc je pense que ça, c'est un élément important à considérer. Ok, je sais pas si ça répondait à la question.

Int. n. 31 and 32

Q: So the first question is, could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

R31: So I have a bachelor degree in sexology. So I did my specialization in creating programs of prevention of violence but for any type of violence and I specialized in sexual violence with perpetrator of violence because of my bachelor's degree in sexology, and then I did a master's degree in education. And my master, my thesis was about systemic discrimination. And this is how I was able to connect after that with the CPRLV and the work that I'm doing today.

I come from France, but I did all of my university degree here in Montreal, at Uquam.

R32: Yes. I've done my undergrad in political science at the Université de Montréal. After that, I worked a bit doing basically surveys for a private company here in Montreal while I was working in my undergrad. So I did a bit of qualitative and quantitative data gathering for that company and after that, I started my master's in political science and international relations at McGill's and I worked there. I did twice a teaching assistantship for class. And then I started to work at the CPRLV after my graduate studies.

Q: How did you start working at CPRLV?

R31: I was working in another nonprofit organization called "Love" (So leave out violence) and I was creating Violence Program prevention for school board in Montreal. And we were invited to a training session given by the CPRLV and when I was there, I felt that I should work for them. So I just reach out to the CPRLV saying, Hey, I think I should work there and they say okay, so this is how I make this switch. It was… five years ago.

Q: Okay. And then what about you?

R32: I had a friend that was working at the CPRLV She's gone now, but she's the one that put me in contact with the previous director of the education team. And actually my friend was actually leaving the CPRLV to go work for another, another organization. So she basically told me that there was an empty spot in the education

team and I went on with the recruitment process and… I started working here in November 2020.

Q: How did you decide to engage in prevention? It How come?

R31: Actually, I was working directly with the prevention of violence. So I've always worked in the third level of prevention, but in the work field that I was, being able to re-engage individuals that had committed any type of violence is really a way to make sure that they will not engage in violence. So doing so you need to have their first level of prevention. And this is how I was really, for me CPRLV nd the work that I I'm currently doing is… makes a lot of sense because when you have to level of prevention to be able to make sure that they will become a citizen and be part of the collective. You need also to have other organizations or…. we're really lucky inside of CPRLV we have the all the different levels, but to you need to have the first level of prevention to be able to make sure that they will after that be okay and gravitate into society.

R32: Um, for me, I I've always been interested in violence, political violence mostly... But in my undergrad I did a research project on the peace transitions of Nicaragua and Guatemala. So I was interested in transitional justice basically. But I was still dealing with you know, violent like post violent conflicts contexts. After that, during my master's I worked on basically the contestation of liberal internationalist norms. So still touching a bit violence but mostly you know, discourses that were going against the liberal internationalist world order as we knew it for the last two decades or so. And I guess that working at the CPRLV was a way for me to actually concretely do something about violence, like I studied violence before, but no at the CPRLV it's more in the practical way of dealing with those subjects, basically.

Q: Thank you. And next question is, could you tell me more about your first experiences at the CPRLV? How have you learned to do what you do and with whom?

R31: My first experience with the CPRLV where I worked back then in what's called the intervention team. So I was doing exactly the same work that I'm doing right now, which is working with individuals who had, you know, gone through a path of radicalization leading to violence or giving support to communities, families, professional workers. And now, the difference is that I'm responsible for that team and now it's called Community Support approach because it reflects more what we are doing, which is not intervention and it's not clinical but really in the mandate of the support community is to empower and re-engage individuals or professionals to be part of the change. So this is how you know my evolution throughout the CPRLV was made but the day to day is exactly the same, just with more responsibilities.

R32: Yes. So, my first experiences here at the center… It I guess it went well is it was pretty gradual. My training, basically was under Roxan, which was the ex-Director of the Education Department. And I, I had a really great relationship with her. My onboarding was I think it went well. And after she left basically I was offered the coordination of the of the Education Department. I started to coordinate the education team last summer, not this summer, but it's been almost a year now. So, the way that we learn at the center is really interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approach. Basically, we will we all work together, the different axes of the center all work together, like we always make sure to validate our work with our colleagues so that they can have a look on it. And offer some comments, suggestions, encouragement, whatever. So I think that the learning process at the center is pretty much interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary.

Q: And can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you when with whom and how have you felt?

R31: I think one of the main elements for the CPRLV… because I was there at the early beginning of the creation of the center and, and now was the media situation. The fact that our last former director was kicked out of his function, and that everything was on the media. And that was really, really hard for us working directly on the field doing the primary, secondary and tertiary prevention because we had to go on… we knew what was true or not true. True, meaning like, what's in the media doesn't always reflect what is going on really, in the situation and that was really one of the main challenges to be able to first deal with this situation that was out of our control, but then after that, to keep going in to make sure that the CPRLV will keep its name and its reputation and that will go on, and that we could after that keep working or creating new partnerships, and you know, rebuild the trust. That was I think one of my biggest challenges as an employee and as a manager at the CPRLV… to be able to pass through that huge challenge.

Q: How long ago was this shift?

R31: In 2019

R32: I guess for me, the main challenge that I faced during my almost two years of the CPRLV is the lack of workforce right now. It's difficult to recruit. So for.. I would say almost eight months, we were only two employees at the Education Department and normally were three, so it took eight months to be able to recruit someone at the at the Education Department. Last fall was a really huge period for us. And we were we were lacking basically people to do the job. So that was the hardest period for me.

And it was also at the same period… like this think areas where I was taking charge of the team and we were lacking employees, so it was a lot of new responsibilities with fewer people to help me to do the job.

Q: Okay, thank you. The second part of the interview is about radicalization. And the first question would be like, in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

R31: I'm really happy with the CPRLV definition because it doesn't categorize ideology and that reflects really the reality where you can have someone with different type and like or cumulative, you know, ideologies, that is more representative, tentative of the reality.

R32: Actually, yeah, I actually am really satisfied with the center's definition. It actually includes a lot of important dimensions to consider when we think about radicalization leading to violence. So as M. said, it doesn't categorize because we're talking about an extremist belief system. So we were talking about multiple beliefs are multiple ideological inclinations. And we know that extremist ideologies are kind of we're talking of multi affiliations right multi ideological affiliation, so I I'm pretty satisfied with the definition of the center because it actually enables us to talk about those different dimensions that, like from far, we could actually think that those ideologies are really coherent, but when you actually take a real close look at them, they're not that much coherent. So yep, okay. So satisfied. The emphasis on the legitimization of violence also enables us to make the difference in between peaceful radicalization. pro social radicalization, rather than violent radicalization.

Q: Okay, thank you. And which concepts do you consider is linked to radicalization?

R31: I consider extremism or terrorism as consequences of radicalization, more than concepts linked to radicalization… in my understanding and in the picture that I have when I talk about radicalization. I think it's really cumulative factors that could lead to radicalization…. But radicalization doesn't always linked to violence. The cumulative factors that I have, I'm just going to name a few that are like, really the principles for me. Yes, polarization, I think it would be also polarization in the society but a lot of part of the media also. I think more in an individual way, it could be isolation, it could be… not being able to develop a sense of belonging…..

R32: I guess I would refer to our, we have like this… We have a slide we have like an image that summarizes how and I'm pretty I pretty much agree with this basically, the different stages of the process and how can we respond to it better, like in relation to the three levels of prevention on which we work on so basically, polarization, radicalization and violent engagement. I think those are related but not always… like it's not because you are, at some point polarizing your opinions at some point in your life that you're going to necessarily engage in a radicalization process, or radicalization process does not mean that you'll automatically legitimize violence, but those concepts are related. So if you're talking about you know, kind of a lexicon map that you can do, those concepts are related, but we have to be

really careful when we actually say that those concepts are related because it does not mean that we fall into one category that fairly we're gonna jump in the next one.

Q: Have you ever met radicalize people doing the activities and if yes, could you tell me more about it?

R31: Yes, 100% of my job. They're complex situations, not difficult and that is really important. We don't have difficult situations we have complex ones, because radicalization leading to violent violence is something that is really complex for a lot of reasons. One of them is, was sorry, or still is when it's really close with political decisions that are still happening… for example, with the pandemic, when you have someone that is radicalized against the government thinking that the government is being really like totalitarian, making sure that individuals do not have any rights and then after that you have a decision made by the government imposing the vaccine passport... It's really hard when you work with that person and trying to disengage him or her in his path of violence when you have after that, all the external factors validating his or her points of view.

R32: I'm not in contact with people knowing your radicalization leading to violence path… maybe in some trainings that I facilitated, there were participants in the room that had extremist beliefs, but that is not you know, that is not something that I can actually point a finger on. So I would say no, I'm more in contact with professionals that are susceptible to encounter in their professional practice situations of radicalization leading to violence.

Q: Thank you. Next question is: Could you describe the steps of one project to which you have contributed from the beginning until the end?

R31: We have created for the support, part support community support a group… a support group sorry for family members that were concerned about someone who was sharing conspiracy theory contents... And so from… we were able to see on the field that there was a need to create those spaces, without judgment for the families and the entourage... And so we did it and I say "we" because I will not be able to do it on my own. So we did it with my colleague in the support community field, and now it's a new service that the CPRLV is able to provide, where you can have those families engaging and creating, you know, a safe space where they can after that, reconnect with their loved ones, even though they're still believing in conspiracy theory.

R32: One per project that I was able to start and finish because there was a there's multiple ones that had already started before I arrived that we're going to complete probably this year or next year. But one project that I was able to see from start to finish, I was in charge of it, was the creation of the train the trainer program for Hexagon, and I facilitated. I facilitated once to the captive in Belgium. And I wasn't charged with the project, but we worked on it with Margo and me a lot. They were helping me, helping me a lot and validating the plan of the training that I was

building. And yet we've tried it... We did it in virtual mode. We decided that for the next "train the trainer" Hexagon, we're going to facilitate them in person because there was a lot of we lost… of the interactive element of Hexagon with doing it in a virtual mode, so yeah, the steps basically was to construct the three-days course on how to be able to facilitate…. the ultimate goal basically is to be able to provide the tools for other prevention actors to be able to facilitate themselves… Hexagon trainings.

Q: And how about evaluation of your activities? Do you do some kind of evaluation system?

R31: 100% and it depends on the project that we have, but for the support group. Yes, we work with Louis because of his role at the CPRLV and they are going and I say they because Louis and other... We work with external also organizations they're going to build an evaluation not by program but really like a concrete evaluation to the support group that we are implementing on the field.

R32: For the for the train the trainer, we basically did a training evaluation at the end of the training but we will also be implementing probably twice a year… mandatory meetings with accredited certified organizations with trainers… as confirmation basically for Hexagon... So it's an evaluation process that is still ongoing since basically, they have finished their training and signed the memorandum of understanding in November or December or something like that. So the follow up will be this year and next year probably and the attestation like the Memorandum of Understanding is lasting two years. So in the next two years, basically the goal is to do some checkups with them to see how it is going and how are they implementing Hexagon in their own organization.

Q: Thank you, and what are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities is there anything that you would like to do differently?

R31: I think it was really hard at the beginning of the creation of the security to reinforce that when you do work in a prevention, first level of prevention…. You are able to do prevention of radicalization that could lead to violence and for that you don't need to just do risk assessment. So that was one of, you know, the challenges to make sure that hey, when we do prevention on the first level, even secondary level, it will have an impact but it just take time and sometimes you are not able to see the impact. So the need of evaluation is really important…. But it also takes time, so human resources, like meaning that was saying. So, to answer your question… I think to make sure that we are able as an organization for the CPRLV to pass our message and make sure that when we do prevention, it has a positive impact on the prevention of so of radicalization that is or will lead to violence.

R32: Um, I guess one of the challenges that I faced in my work is to be able to sell the fact like primary, the primary level of prevention and the secondary level of prevention, so basically a selective prevention and universal prevention… is something that is effective in mitigating social polarization, individual polarization… individual radicalization leading to violence. And I guess my pitch is to say that it starts like it starts really young and there are competencies and knowing how to… abilities how to… you know, engaging in debates with people that don't think like ourselves, being able to empathize with other identities in general, those are competencies that I think they are important to foster in our, for example, provincial / national educative programs in in the ministry program, basically. So, yeah, I guess that's the challenge that I face. And that's all I think all sectors of education might face.

Q: You anticipated the following question… that was what are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

R31: Creating Safe Space dialogue, and this is where we're really looking at the CPRLV because we have mobilization project where we can really engage citizens and also to re-engage individuals. Where we were able to give them support the support that they needed. So to do that and to make sure that they are able to tolerate when you don't think the same way you don't express yourself the same way when you don't have the same background, but you have a common basis.

Q: How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective? Over time?

R31: And this is where the beautiful work of M. is taking place is because at the CPRLV everything that we are creating, at the end, we want to make sure we have an international tool that goes within so even though it sometimes the initiative comes from the field, we really need to make sure that we will have an educational tool that can after that sustain that initiative to make sure that in school it could be useful even though after that the school is still going to call us and go directly on the field because we know more about radicalization they do even… even though we provide training… but I think that would make really the difference between other organizations and sometimes the initiatives will come from the educational aspect that where we can use also those tools during our presence in the field. I think about the "illustrated guide of hate" that was because we had some needs inside the support field, but it was also because we needed that and that was how can I say that? That was because during their training session, they were receiving a lot of questions about what about that sign? What about that reality? What do we know about Quebec? So that was really on their part to say hey, if there's a need, we can and we have the power and the knowledge to create that. And it was also answering another need that we had on the field so it truly multidisciplinary and

being able to target all the type of prevention, the level of prevention, that would be my answer.

R32: I would just add that on the secondary level of prevention, so basically selective prevention when we give trainings to specific environments or fields that may face situations basically… how to render the prevention initiative… To be, to be sustainable and effective over time…. It's basically to really tailor our pedagogical approach to their needs, because in that way, we can actually gather information of their own.. on their own practices and their own. What do they see basically, on the field, we're able to offer a pedagogical approach that responds to those needs, and it usually opens up other opportunities that we might be able to mobilize the support team for example, we might have to, to ask for a reason put on a specific subject to actually be able to provide some tools or information, so it's really being able to tailor our support offer, whether it be trainings, community support, engagement, mobilization.

INT. 33

Q : Pouvez-vous décrire brièvement vos études et vos expériences professionnelles ?

R: Je suis psychologue à la base. J'ai une maîtrise en anthropologie, une maîtrise en sociologie et un doctorat en sociologie dans les bacs et la maîtrise en anthropologie et en psychologie - c'était fait dans mon pays d'origine et donc le reste ici et en France.

R : Depuis huit ans à peu près. Avant, j'étais en France pendant mon doctorat. Et puis, comme je suis arrivé ici, j'étais analyste chargé de projet au Centre international pour la prévention de la criminalité. Et après, je suis devenu directeur de recherche de ce centre. Ensuite, j'ai quitté et j'ai rejoint la Chaire et aussi le Réseau canadien des praticiens en prévention de l'extrémisme et de la radicalisation violente. Donc, j'avais un double chapeau jeté. Donc j'ai travaillé pour la chaire et pour CPN. Et dans CPN-prev j'étais coordonnateur général de réseau. Et donc en fait, c'est pas mal de la recherche dans ces domaines évidemment, mais axée sur la tactique qui dans le cas de la chaire, j'étais coordonnateur scientifique et principalement chargé d'un gros projet que c'était le prev-impact, que c'est un projet qui vise à développer des modèles d'évaluation en prévention de l'extrémisme violent, évaluation des programmes, pour l'évaluation des pratiques. Donc, ça a été principalement ma tâche qui a impliqué plusieurs petites recherches et d'autres chauses aussi. Dans les cas de CPN-prev c'était aussi en plus de la recherche.

Et donc là, en fait, c'est aussi un peu de la recherche systématique, une cartographie au Canada ou j'ai été impliqué parce que c'était plus lâche que moi, évidemment parce qu'il avait quatre volets préventifs.

Et aujourd'hui, je suis prof en travail social à l'Université du Québec en Outaouais.

Donc voilà, il a très peu de temps… il y a un mois.

Q : Vous travaillez encore avec Unesco-prev?

R : C'est justement de la chaire Unesco-prev c'était mon deuxième chapeaux.. À ce moment-là. Mais donc j'étais et j'ai déchargé le coordonnateur scientifique de la chaire et chargée de projet prev- impact. Et oui, et donc c'est depuis 2015 à peu près que je commence à travailler sur la prévention de l'extrémisme violent. Donc qu'il a, c'est bon et j'en passe, des petits projets de recherche et les choses comme ça.

Q : Ok, vous avez déjà un peu répondu la deuxième question qui était comment avez vous commencé collaborer avec dans ces cas là, avec la chaire Unesco? Si vous pouvez me donner, au moins peut être la date. Comment ça s'est passé?

R : donc c'était 2018… jusqu'il y a un mois… donc aout 2018 - avril 2022. J'étais d'abord coordinateur général puis coordinateur scientifique.

Q : Et comment vous êtes engagé dans la prévention?

R : Alors pendant toute ma carrière, je me suis intéressé à la violence et à la prévention de la violence. Donc, soit violence en milieu scolaire, violence, criminalité, violence et jeunes par exemple. Donc en fait mon doc était sur des mouvements sociaux.

Et… dans mon pays d'origine…. Il avait une section concernant la violence, donc ça a été un peu comme ça après. Ensuite, quand j'étais au Centre international pour la prévention de la criminalité. Là, on a fait bon. C'était plutôt criminalité, prévention du crime. Évidemment, il y avait la criminalité et il a. On a commencé à travailler sur la prévention de l'extrémisme. Moi, j'ai commencé. On a commencé à faire des revues systématiques, nos études internationales. On a interrogé des praticiens des 27 pays du monde pour savoir comment fonctionnait la prévention. Mais terre à terre, c'est à dire dans la pratique, pas dans la description des programmes, sinon c'est avoir un peu de milieu de la pratique….

Ensuite… pendant cette période là aussi, j'ai mené une recherche action en France pour monter un dispositif de prévention de la radicalisation et de l'extrémisme en milieu pénitentiaire en France dans le système de probation. Et quoi d'autre? On a fait des petits, on arrive de petits projets d'échanges France-Québec avec d'autres pays aussi, éventuellement. Et c'est là donc que, titre Ghayda (principalement c'était Ghayda au début) m'a contacté. Ensuite, c'est David qui m'a contacté pour me dire… On va ouvrir un poste de coordonnateur général si cela t'intéresse ou pas. Et bon, j'ai accepté.

Q : J'ouvre une petite parenthèse.. dans le site de l'Unesco-prev, dans la carte du monde, toute l'Amérique latine est blanche… selon votre opinion. Pourquoi ?

R : C'est dense. Je dirais un jeu épistémologique. Si les particularités de l'Amérique latine. Donc c'est on se donne lors de discussions, c'est long à dire, mais écoute principalement le concept de radicalisation est nés par le monde à partir de 2004/2005…

Avant ce que tu disais. Mais c'était justement avec ça qui commence ce que j'appelle le tournant préventif, ça veut dire quand on commence vraiment à s'intéresser aux facteurs qui expliquent à la base ces phénomènes et les trajectoires mises en visant justement la… Et la prévention en tant que telle. Avant, il y avait aussi, évidemment, les plus concept radicalisation. Mais dans d'autres domaines, aux différents mondes, on s'est immiscé dans les processus politiques. Mais là, dans ce processus, c'est quelque chose qui naît en Europe. Il faut l'expliquer, notamment de terrorisme domestique on a commencé à parler de ce moment-là. Mais alors c'est une conception très occidentale de la radicalisation et on ne peut pas l'objectivité objectivité, on ne peut pas la s'analyser. Et dans le sens qui est né des racines européennes et occidentales pour répondre à des besoins occidentaux. Ok, alors ça n'implique pas qu'il n'y a pas des violences politiques ou il n'y a pas d'extrémisme. Il n'y a pas de phénomène qu'on peut associer au terrorisme Amérique latine ou, ailleurs aussi. Mais la conceptualisation autour de la radicalisation a été très ancrée aussi sur l'islam, ce qui fait en sorte en fait qu'il est l'Amérique latine, ce en termes plus éloignés de ce type de conceptualisation. Et même s'il y a des phénomènes, je dirais qu'ils sont plus proches à l'insurgence, par exemple. Il y a aussi des groupes anarchistes, anarchistes et les groupes éco terroristes. Il y a tous les conflits, par exemple dans mon pays, le conflit mapuche ou il y a tout ou partie de qui considère cela comme de l'extrémisme. Si je mets la conceptualisation, ce n'est pas radicalisation, ça n'a pas été pensé de cette façon.

(…) On ne peut pas essentialiser ces phénomènes en tant que tels, parce que même moi, personnellement, je considère que le terrorisme, c'est une catégorie politique et que ce qu'a fait, justement dans le sens qui est, il y a des phénomènes que l'on considère clairement de terrorisme. Si on essaie de les le voir comme un objet…. Et qui n'en sont pas dénoncés comme le terrorisme… aux Etats-Unis, pendant une longue période de temps... Ils avaient des actes, ils nous ont dit c'est bon, il a l'idéologie à la base, il y avait un acte violent, un passage à l'acte et donc il ne le considère pas comme le terrorisme, le considère comme une fusillade, un massacre. Mais c'était parce que c'était associé à un groupe spécifique. Donc qui aujourd'hui on dit c'est l'extrême droite, mais c'est des suprémacisme blanc qui sont des choses. Mais auparavant, c'est la même chose au Canada et c'est parce qu'il y aussi un problème juridique dans le sens qui est prouvé l'acte terroriste est très difficile même par exemple ici au Québec. Dans le cas de Bissonnette, je peux le voir que ce sont les scélérats qui a fait l'attentat à la mosquée, à Québec… Donc, par exemple, au début, et c'est clair, tout le monde va dire c'est l'extrême droite, c'est un acte terroriste, mais juridiquement, c'est hyper difficile à prouver. La caractéristique principale de terrorisme… dans la législation actuelle dans la plupart de monde, et c'est le fait de produire de la peur et ça ce n'est pas possible. Alors si tu considères cette catégorie comme produire de la peur, il y a plusieurs

phénomènes dans le monde le dit, c'est la peur, qui ne sont pas forcément de terrorisme non plus, et donc aussi d'éprouver l'idéologie à la base. Que ce n'est pas le sport, c'est facile. Parfois, ce n'est pas facile. Dans le cas de l'islam, c'était hyper facile parce que, en fait, ça se voyait en Europe comme un phénomène qui était vraiment à l'extérieur, un phénomène étranger vers l'Europe occidentale et chrétienne. Et donc, voilà, c'était facile de dire voilà, cette radicalisation mène à la violence et que c'est une radicalisation. Et on va l'associer à la communauté musulmane, comme on dit ici au Canada. Donc c'est complètement différent dans les racines conceptuelles et historiques de concepts sont très importants pour comprendre pourquoi pas aussi en Amérique latine même. Sinon, on peut considérer qu'il y a des groupes extrémistes clairement de droite ou de gauche, et il y a une diversité religieuse.

Il a des groupes qui sont très fondamentalistes. Les Farc sont considérés au fond, même aujourd'hui que par le Canada et les États-Unis comme un groupe extrémiste. Mais on considère comme si les phénomènes soient différents. Mais aussi c'est une particularité que c'est intéressant de réfléchir à ça. Pourquoi pas l'Amérique Latine? Mais aussi, je dirais que c'est parce que le tournant préventif, même si des phénomènes étaient et hyper politiques, le tournant préventif a eu comme conséquence de cacher justement les composantes politiques de la radicalisation. Donc on va les considérer comme des malades mentaux, des criminels, mais on ne va pas répondre à la cause politique en tant que tels. Dehors donc on a dépolitisé le phénomène pour le considérer comme une problématique psychosociale. Par contre, en Amérique latine donc, cette idée, par exemple, d'intervenir si psycho-socialement sur l'extrémisme, c'est même mal vu. C'est mal vu parce que c'est des considère que c'est un poste politique et donc qu'il voit. Il doit avoir une réponse politique à ça. Et ça peut être aussi la criminalisation, évidemment. Mais en comprendre la criminalisation? Pas seulement, comme la marginalisation des groupes extrémistes, mais aussi comme une stratégie politique pour essayer d'anéantir ces types de groupes. Donc l'interprétation de la réalité, c'est complètement différent d'un côté que de l'autre. Et la même chose, on peut dire par exemple par rapport à… C'est pour cela qu'il y a d'autres types de concepts qui encore sont plus politiques, sont plus proches de la théorie des mouvements sociaux par exemple, comme les insurgences, ces types des choses.. de voir qui sont OK. C'est même pour moi, je dirais. C'est très difficile de dire qui est les Mapuches qui est à l'intérieur de la communauté Marmoutier. Il y a des groupes extrémistes. Pour moi, c'est difficile, ça me fait, ça me fait penser à un truc en plus bizarre dans la compréhension du phénomène.

Il y a des personnes qui s'intéressent, mais ce n'est pas forcément comme en Europe, centrée sur l'Occident ou l'Amérique du Nord s'intéresse au phénomène, donc...

Par exemple, en sciences politiques, il a fait pas mal de sociologie des gens qui s'intéressent au processus de radicalisation, mais ils ne voient pas le processus de radicalisation qui va aux phénomène qui mène vers la violence. Pour ce moment, il leur incombe processus plutôt de polarisation sociale et de polarisation politique. Là donc, c'est plutôt un phénomène politique, un phénomène par exemple de marginalisation. Comment été, et je dirais créé en Amérique du Nord même, par exemple dans les cas des catégories d'extrême droite, par exemple en Europe, notamment en Europe, en Amérique du Nord, dans des pensées qui ont pu appliquer la catégorie radicalisation à l'extrémisme de droite, ça a plus de temps qui, même aujourd'hui, dans des pays comme la France, c'est difficile d'associer la radicalisation de l'extrême droite.

Donc c'est vraiment ça un sujet qui a été ancré sur la communauté musulmane. Et quand il n'y a pas de musulmans associés à ce type de problème, donc c'est plus difficile de dire qu'il y a de la radicalisation?

Et en fait, il y a un autre problème concernant ce concept. Dans cette réalité de ces phénomènes, qui est quand il est né, il a été pensé d'une façon très exceptionnelle, comme un phénomène exceptionnel. Comme quelque chose qui venait de Jupiter par exemple, et qui tombait sur fait à la Terre. Et après on devait avoir des mesures exceptionnelles. On devait penser de façon exceptionnelle, on devait l'évaluer de façon exceptionnelle. Par contre, cette idée, cette exceptionnalité, je dirais que ça a été mise en question depuis un moment déjà. Oui et non pas depuis un moment. Je dirais plutôt récemment pour le lien avec les facteurs à la base. Il y a eu déjà des remises thématiques de montrer ça. Les facteurs à la base de la radicalisation et d'autres types de phénomènes sont assez semblables. Les mesures mises en place pour prévenir la radicalisation sont aussi assez semblables à n'importe quelle autre mesure de prévention… Généralement, les équipes qui ont une expérience en prévention. Au préalable sont plus des succès dans la prévention de la radicalisation et ceux qui sont nés juste pour prévenir la radicalisation, les modèles de collaboration de police par exemple, le secteur psychosocial qui c'est vraiment très conflictuel, et le clash vraiment née entre les secteurs de la sécurité et le secteur psycho social. Quand il y a une expérience préalable par rapport à autre type de sujet par exemple. Donc la collaboration est plus facile. Et quand la collaboration se base sur d'autres types de problématiques, dont la radicalisation, la collaboration, c'est aussi facile. Donc tu vois donc ces types d'idées d'exceptionnalité… Je dirais qu'elle fait plutôt mal à l'idée de la prévention e a la conceptualisation du devient. Si je le considère comme ça, juste d'un point de vue très positiviste, je dirais oui, en but à se poser le point de vue de l'Amérique du Nord et de l'Europe. Des programmes de prévention en Amérique latine. Et mais j'insiste, est ce qu'on peut penser vraiment en prévention primaire de fondamentalisme chrétien en Amérique latine? Imagine toi ce qui se peut relever pour soulever comme des questions à la

société dans telle politique. Oh et dire non, on va aller prévenir par exemple, on va, on va appliquer un programme de prévention primaire des Farc en Colombie. Or, on va aller par exemple prévenir l'extrême droite au Brésil et en Argentine. On va les prévenir, par exemple, que je ne sais pas des Mapuches et qui vont rejoindre…, ça veut dire. Ça veut dire que tu n'a pas compris dans le monde depuis l'Amérique latine? Si je le comprends, ne t'a pas compris qu'il est en cause politique et qu'il faut adresser la question politique au lieu de simplement appliquer des mesures de santé mentale. C'est juste, je parle ouvertement. C'est juste que tu sois condamné à fléchir par des guerres.

(…) tu peux développer un programme sur la pensée critique, de développement de la pensée critique, mais pas axé sur la prévention de la radicalisation. En fait, ça sert à tout le monde, ça te peut faire un peu des gens, c'est pas… des formations dans le numérique par exemple. Et mais ça se fait à tout le monde, ça de voir plus loin du phénomène dit plus large c'est ton approche et moins spécifique…. Il te fait dans ces cas-là plus et prévention primaire. Ça veut dire que d'autres touchent un éventail de phénomènes beaucoup plus important, et pas seulement de la radicalisation. Et donc c'est un problème pour les programmes de prévention primaire qu'on on de la radicalisation parce qu'on n'y est pas. Est-ce que nous, on doit nommer des praticiens, par exemple, que nous, on travaille sur la prévention de la radicalisation parce que nous, on fait des trucs comme on l'a fait toujours. Ils sont exactement les mêmes types de problèmes et de programmes d'emploi, par exemple, en Afrique…. C'est deux toujours comme ça. Mais parce que les financements on a été adressés comme un problème de radicalisation, ils ont changé l'objectif. On a ajouté ces composants comme objectif, mais les activités restent les mêmes. Tu vois, donc il y a une croyance, il faut l'évaluation des programmes de prévention primaire par ce qui est en bas. Jamais on va, on ne va jamais pouvoir évaluer positivement. On a un programme de prévention primaire de la radicalisation parce que le phénomène est trop loin des activités qui sont mises en place.

Q : Pouvez-vous décrire un épisode critique de votre travail? Ce que s'est passé ou étiez-vous? Avec qui? Comment vous êtes-vous senti?

R : Mais je peux penser à deux choses. La première, c'est une rencontre qu'on a eue avec un groupe des représentants Français.. qui étaient intéressés au travail de la Chaire. Et voilà, on a fait une présentation sur les pas de la politique publique... Voilà, la nouvelle stratégie nationale de prévention de l'extrémisme. Et hélas, déjà, il y a une claque, je dirais au niveau d'interprétation de la radicalisation. Ce qui pensaient les Français c'était très diffèrent de ce que nous pensions ici par rapport à la radicalisation… d'abord des études, déjà la conception. Donc nous, on essaye de parler de prévention de la radicalisation menant à la violence pour quoi ? parce que conceptuellement, on nous dit il y a de la radicalisation comme phénomène normal…

Dans les sociétés démocratiques et libérales comme les Occidentales…

Et là, par exemple, ils parlaient que des de radicalisation violente, c'était encore très axé sur l'extrémisme djihadiste. Et donc voilà. Donc il y a évidemment un échange un peu musclé entre les représentants français et certains des membres de la Chair, mois parmi eux, ils sont plus concernant ce type d'approche qui a été très critique des services demandés, donc des choses que les Français n'ont pas aimé du tout, évidemment. Et quoi d'autre, je dirais?.. Bah écoute, c'est aussi pas… Ce ne sont pas des problèmes en tant que tel. Je dirais que c'est aussi par rapport à l'interprétation du phénomène. Donc, on était en train de rédiger, par exemple, un chapitre sur la prévention de l'extrémisme, avancer sur notre review systématique, cheminer sur tous les programmes, tous les programmes évalués à l'échelle mondiale. Donc depuis toujours jusqu'à 2019. Donc pour savoir comment c'est fait, c'est surtout méthodologiquement, comment c'est l'évaluation. C'est un enjeu, on sait très peu, c'est quelle fonction, ce qui ne fonctionne pas. Par exemple… Et donc on a fait un portrait de la réalité par région géographique… Et donc, lors de la de la thématique, j'ai remarqué qu'il y a eu vraiment un écart énorme entre la production scientifique de l'Afrique et l'Europe et l'Amérique du Nord. Donc ça veut dire qu'elle est notamment par rapport au type des langues qui a été utilisé et qui faisait l'évaluation. Pourquoi on faisait l'évaluation, ce type de choses? Donc, c'est une réflexion qui finalement m'a amené à penser qu'il avait une approche très colonialiste de la prévention de l'extrémisme. Ok donc j'ai bien en fait une considération… c'est un point des view plutôt coloniale… les flots des connaissances entre le nord et le sud étaient de toute évidence étaient inégales. Par exemple, je ne sais pas, tous les rapports des programmes évalués en Afrique étaient en anglais et même dans des pays que la langue, je dirais courant, étaient les français ou les dialectes locales.. tout en anglais. En plus, les personnes qui faisaient les évaluations, pour la plupart, c'étaient les européennes des américaines, on dirait américaine, canadiennes et européennes. Et donc les 20 % des auteurs étaient des Africains et le reste était tout de ces étrangers. Donc ils avaient une façon encore une fois très économiste de penser l'Afrique et les problèmes de l'Afrique à partir de l'Occident. Donc on a commencé à réfléchir par rapport à cela, mais il y a eu aussi donc des débats dans la Chair… ça veut dire autre... Ce type d'interprétation est un peu militant, je ne sais pas. Est-ce que c'est vraiment plus de justifier cela? Est ce qu'on peut dire respect et de cette façon parce qu'il est temps de l'article? L'écart est hyper important. Mais voilà, finalement on a oublié. Ce n'est pas un article, c'est un chapitre d'un bouquin qui va sortir. L'année prochaine. Je ne sais pas quand on va voir la fin vers la fin de cette année, mais c'était plutôt par rapport à la conceptualisation, je dirais du phénomène, mais sinon je dirais qu'il ne semble pas à sévira. On est assez correct par rapport à ça, parce qu'il y a aussi intérêt de la

chaire et de la plupart des équipes d'avoir un certain équilibre entre le Nord et le Sud par exemple.

Q : Ok merci. Donc la deuxième partie de l'entretien à propos de la de la représentation du concept de radicalisation. Première question dans votre propre mot et très brièvement comment définiriez-vous la radicalisation ?

R : Ah, ou là là, c'est le grand débat ! Ok, donc la radicalisation.

C'est un problème. Parce que quand on pense à radicalisation, on pense toujours à terrorisme. Et on fait, l'association, ce n'est pas le cas. Donc, à mon avis, ce n'est pas le cas. Donc radicalisation, comme indique le nom, c'est un processus et un processus que peut amener ou pas, donc à la violence politique. Radicalisation, pour moi aussi, c'est un processus qui implique nécessairement donc un questionnement politique et des débats actuels autour des notions culturelles, politiques, religieuses. C'est très varié. Ok et qui amène justement… donc à la pensée extrême, ça veut dire qu'il est plus en plus c'est un processus, je dirais des dépluralisation. Dans ce sens-là, tu perds de plus en plus le sens de pluralité de ta pensée, pour adopter une pensée plutôt binaire amis/ennemis, noirs/blancs… donc... C'est une sorte de « *sensalisation* » de l'altérité… tu vas confronter une altérité radicale en même temps, dans le sens qui c'est tout noir, et en fait la personne qui va éventuellement dans le groupe… qui est en fait de tous les capacités pour contrer ça. Voilà, grosso modo c'est ça.

Q : Qu'elle est là la plus grande différence entre la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent ?

R : Alors je dirais … D'abord, la radicalisation, c'est le processus, l'extrémisme, de reste c'est le résultat. Et le terrorisme.. c'est le stade ultime de ce processus, quand, si on le pense depuis le terrorisme, alors la plupart des gens, évidemment, quittent les milieux extrémistes. Oh, vont penser autrement. Or, on continue à penser de façon radicale. Ils ne vont jamais faire un passage à l'acte.

Cette radicalisation surtout, ça dépend en fait de cette chose. Parce que, j'insiste, le concept de la radicalisation a été pensé pour l'islam principalement. Donc c'est très difficile de la sortir de là. Et c'est donc la théorie est très euro centrique, comme je disais avant... Et même des concepts de l'extrémisme, c'est quand même assez euro centrique et occidental. Mais le grand avantage, je dirais de de concepts de radicalisation. Mais vraiment, je dirais que c'est une catégorie opérationnelle pour la pratique aussi. Ça veut dire qu'est-ce qu'on fait avec l'extrémisme? En termes de… c'est amène à rien. en fait en terme de prévention ou de pratique en tant que telle. Par contre, la radicalisation, comme c'est un processus, c'est à dire que ça t'a permis des penser aussi d'ouvrir l'esprit à penser à la prévention. Ça veut dire quand tu penses à la radicalisation de te pense dans le processus, puis dans sa trajectoire. Ça veut dire qu'on peut penser en amont les actions que tu peux entamer afin de

prévenir ce processus. Donc, c'est très axé sur la pratique et c'est très, je dirais. C'est plus associé dans ces cas-là au tournant préventif.

Q : Quelles sont les concepts que vous considérez comme liés à la radicalisation?

R : Alors les frontières, de toute façon, sont créées. Et la zone grise entre les différentes conceptualisations sont énormes. Donc des gens qui vont parler des ça et qui nous en considèrent comme ça. Donc c'est pour cela qu'en générale je parle de violence sociopolitique. Donc comme concept, je dirais chapeau pour parler de la radicalisation menant à la violence, de l'extrémisme violent, des crimes et discours d'haine, que pour moi, la haine, c'est une violence en soi parce qu'elle est gamme de discours qui ont finalement une amène à au mépris de certains communautés ou groupes spécifiques. Donc déjà il y a une violence là-dedans et qui peut évidemment sont d'un certain point de vue sont alimentés ou que puisse produire aussi une polarisation sociale. Alors le concept de polarisation sociale, même si c'est assez intuitif pour n'importe qui qui peut le penser, c'est très vague, vague comme concept en même temps, ok, mais il faut quand même le considérer parce que je verrais que si la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent, même le terrorisme est pensé à l'échelle des individus et des groupes. Dans les cas de polarisation sociale, on monte une échelle et on va déjà parler au niveau sociétal. Donc on ne peut pas, de mon point de vue, appliquer la polarisation sociale à des groupes parce que la polarisation sociale concerne la société au complet. Par contre, la radicalisation et l'extrémisme donc et oui, c'est plutôt associé. On ne peut pas parler d'une société radicalisée parce qu'il y a déjà les concepts de radicalisation et d'extrémisme et de terrorisme implique d'un certain point de vue marginalisation et ça veut dire que c'est un groupe minoritaire à l'intérieur de la société.

Q : Merci. Avez-vous déjà rencontré des personnes radicalisées au cours de vos activités ?

R : Bah je ne sais pas. En fait, comme on le sait. S'intéresser plutôt à la prévention de l'extrémisme. Donc on n'a pas un focus sur les personnes radicalisées en tant que tel. Donc ça nous intéresse moins de penser aux facteurs qui expliquent la radicalisation. Que pensez plutôt à quelles sont les mesures mises en place, et analyser ces mesures ou ces initiatives de prévention de l'extrémisme. Alors, c'est plutôt rare de rencontrer des jeunes gens. J'ai rencontré de toute façon des personnes radicalisées.
J'ai rencontré aussi des personnes qui ont quitté la vie d'extrémistes. Oui, absolument.

Je suis direct et sais pas s'il a toujours une histoire personnelle par rapport à ça. Donc c'est clair, je dirais qu'il y est généralement. C'est associé à un évènement dans la vie, un point tournant de la vie, le fait d'avoir par exemple des enfants, le fait par exemple d'avoir une crise qui est pas pour plusieurs de la personne. Il n'y a plus cette personne qui considère qui est même dans le littérateur qui une crise t'amène un peu à la radicalisation, mais une crise aussi t'amène à sortir de la radicalisation. Alors dépenser autrement, alors il a toujours quelque chose de radical dans la pensée, ça veut dire qu'il y est. J'ai trouvé des gens qui ont quitté les milieux extrémistes qui dit que ressemblent à n'importe qui. Et oui, ça veut dire qu'il y a en fait, et je suis convaincu que n'importe qui, dépendamment des conditions, peut devenir un radical puis se radicaliser. Ça, c'est clair. Mais pour ces personnes-là, une au moins, je dirais qui est parce que c'est comme n'importe qui et qui n'avaient pas grand-chose de spécifique. Ils l'ont vécu comme un moment de sa vie, comme qu'ils étaient en situation de radicalisation. Plutôt, il a passé à autre chose quand il a senti qu'il a eu une certaine maturité. D'autres, par contre, je dirais, et dans certains, mais qui vont continuer à avoir une certaine rigidité de la pensée dans le sens qui est. Je ne sais pas. Il y avait là, en bas de quoi on voit des troubles de santé mentale aussi, qu'on peut associer des traits de personnalité très marqués qui mettent tout le monde quitté. Les extrémistes à vraiment continuer à penser de façon assez semblable vont changer simplement de sujet. Mais je dirais que ça ne vaut pas la peine parce que ça devient un peu anecdotique ce que je viens de raconter. Et donc il y a pas mal de littérature par rapport à ça.

Q : Ok, merci. Donc si on pense toujours à l'Unesco-Prev, comment fonctionne la collaboration politique et ou scientifique dans les projets? Et quels sont les points forts et les points critiques ?

R : Donc il y a plusieurs dimensions de l'aspect politique. Là, ça veut dire qu'il y a une dimension politique, c'est à dire la relation avec les gouvernements, directement, le gouvernement fédéral, le gouvernement provincial - c'est une chose. Il y a des relations politiques avec les organismes internationaux, pour des gouvernements étrangers aussi. Donc, dans la France, par exemple, l'Organisation internationale de la Francophonie, il y a des relations aussi. On a des partenaires aussi que parfois individuels, mais aussi des groupes qui sont plutôt associés a um gouvernement. Voilà. Donc ça, c'est la dimension politique, un peu à l'extérieur. Juste pour classifier ça, tout ça. Après, c'est la dimension politique, je dirais, de la constellation des programmes ou des centres spécialisés… c'est un peu méso politique.. puis il y a la micro politique simplement à l'interne. Mais de la chair. Donc on peut dire pas mal de choses.

Par exemple, David est très bon pour la politique, donc c'est vraiment très bon pour la politique, ça veut dire il y a ce titre et il fait science politique... C'est quelque chose qui l'intéresse d'avoir une influence sur la politique, c'est ce qui l'intéresse et donc il est très bon par rapport à ça. Donc il a des bonnes relations avec le gouvernement et il a toujours sa pensée politique. Par exemple de dire… Il faut avoir une approche plutôt diplomatique. On ne peut pas dire cela de telle ou telle façon. Il faut le nuancer... Et d'ailleurs tout le monde, donc plusieurs là. Note qui est comme moi, comme Ghayda qui avons relations et ce n'est pas politique, c'est plutôt une relation technique avec la politique et c'est différent. Tenez, appelé en termes d'expert à parler un sujet spécifique ou à produire des rapports par rapport à cela. Et qui c'est correct, ça veut dire. Mais en même temps, je dirais qu'une apparente relation conflictuelle. Alors dans le cas de la constellation des programmes, je dirais que et c'est un sujet à étudier, je dirais que c'est la collaboration, non? En prévention de la radicalisation, c'est un enjeu énorme, pas seulement au Québec, ailleurs, mais au Québec… Je dirais qu'il a grandement entaché le Québec. C'est qui est en à la constellation des programmes et des centres de personnes spécialisées dans le domaine. Le plus grand au Canada, évidemment. Donc, ça veut dire qui est Montréal, par exemple. Il y a donc vous trouvez déjà quatre ou cinq personnes, quatre ou cinq institutions, organismes qui travaillent un peu sur le domaine.

(…) Donc les points forts de la chaire... Je dirais que ses capacités à s'adapter quand même et être respectueuse des différents contextes et à essayer de parler avec tout le monde, oui, de ne pas s'effacer facilement, de ne pas être trop territorial parce que nous, on a une échelle qui travaille le niveau local. Oui, mais on travaille surtout au niveau international et ce qui fait en sorte que ce n'est pas, on n'est pas menaçant. Par contre, pour d'autres qui vont en avoir, vont faire la concurrence et vont compétitionner pour des fonds de recherche, pour des fonds pour développer un programme par exemple. Là c'est rare quand même.

Je dirais que la chaire... est bien placé. Les gens qui nous intéressent, on les maintient proches, les gens qui nous intéressent moins... On garde un rapport diplomatique, les points faibles. C'est quoi le point faible ?... Le c'est qui est, je pense, qui est nous devons jouer un rôle plus prédominant dans la coordination de ces efforts. Dans ce sens-là, ça veut dire aider les plus proactifs d'essayer de rassembler les gens, de les faire parler afin d'éliminer ce type de choses.

Q : Quelles sont les principales capacités que vous considérez importantes à développer dans mes activités de prévention primaire? On a déjà parlé par exemple de la pensée critique…

R : Oui, la pensée critique, je dirais... quelque chose que David a commencé à développer un peu, mais qui est toujours ce dont il est vague, c'est la résilience démocratique.

(…) toutes ces processus de polarisation sociale amènent à la fragilisation des démocraties contemporaines occidentales… On peut gérer si ce sont les conséquences de la polarisation sociale, des extrémismes. Et la fragilisation des démocraties. On peut travailler aussi à l'inverse, ça veut dire qu'on peut faire les traversées un peu le chemin. Il ne sera pas la solution complète, mais je pense que c'est tout de même intéressant comme point de vue. Puis la Digital Literacy… Celle-ci est quelque chose que c'est intéressant. Je dirai que c'est très s'associer à la pensée critique finalement. Mais c'est plutôt de montrer aux personnes qui sont en formation surtout je dirais qui est et il faut comprendre d'où émerge l'information. Finalement, je dirais que c'est très important qu'ils comprendre, qui ont fait qu'il y a des processus de propagande qui existent et qui ont été créé en fait pour contrer les groupes extrémistes. On se rend compte en fait que tout le monde fait de la propagande. Donc, c'est plutôt de renforcer les capacités de dialogue, de renforcer les capacités de dialogue interculturelle aussi… C'est une situation un peu cachée, je dirais la dimension de l'ethnicité, la racialisation du phénomène de l'extrémisme ou encore l'association à la migration aussi. Par exemple, c'était des choses. Donc tout de même l'effet des travailler sur…. Je dirais un dialogue interculturel. C'est quelque chose d'important. Autre chose, je dirais qu'ils sont des faux. Mais les presque tous les programmes de prévention et qui ont été pensés pour les sphères publiques, mais très peu pour les sphères privées. Ça veut dire que, et on sait qu'il y avait niche d'extrême droite dans les milieux de la construction et des niches qui commencent à se développer et à travailler sur cela. Et l'extrême droite aussi, par exemple, dans le cas des forces armées. Et qui c'est bon, c'est public, mais c'est bon, c'est très... très fermé comme milieu au même temps…. Mais aussi au niveau des entreprises, je dirais que on n'a pas abordé ce sujet. Ce sont des niches qu'il faut aborder parce que c'est quand même important. Ça veut dire que je crois que comme thème des promotions, le fait de travailler sur la démocratisation me semble hyper important. Et quand on parle de démocratisation, on parle de participation, de dialogue… on parle des valeurs aussi de la démocratie en général, de la promotion de ses valeurs les plus petits, par exemple la tolérance. Et l'effet qui est finalement surtout au Canada avec son on est une société multiculturelle et il faut accepter et savoir quoi faire dans la multiculturalité. Voilà grosso modo.

Q : Comment pensez-vous que les activités de prévention peuvent être rendues durables et efficaces dans le temps?

R : Ah.. alors, moi je suis pour la décentralisation des compétences. Là, ça avait l'air hier, ça ne vaut pas la peine d'avoir des centres forcement spécialisés en prévention. C'est bien d'avoir une sorte de équipe d'intervention, éventuellement

surtout psychosociale, mais il est plus important de les former les plus grand nombre de personnes dans le milieu afin de comprendre les enjeux afin de qui comprend en fait des façons que la prévention se fasse.. Je dirais pas par un équipe spécialisée si cela se passe d'un certain point de vue pour toute la politique publique et sans le savoir éventuellement, mais d'avoir une approche, je dirais préventif par rapport à cela. Et ça, c'est la pérennité…tu peux renforcer les capacités, les compétences des équipes qui travaillent déjà. Voilà. Et sur ce ça se fait là. Autre chose qui je dirais qu'il est sur peu les expériences des Raps au Canada et les expériences des équipes multi multisectorielle et le fait que tout doit travailler plutôt. Et de façon plus large avec les différents sujets et aux associés d'un certain vulnérabilité dans la radicalisation, c'est à dire qui est pour moi s'est focalisé spécifiquement sur la radicalisation, ça ne sert pas à grand chose. Par contre, quand tu travails dans une diversité des problématiques, dont la radicalisation, et tout peut aborder aussi la radicalisation. Ça fonctionne beaucoup mieux. On ne va pas réinventer cette idée exceptionnelle de la radicalisation...

Ah dans les sens ça fait du mal parce qu'il y a une tendance vers la spécialisation. Et moi je considère qu'il faut plutôt travailler sur l'intégration et pas sur les spécialisations. Et il donc dans ces cas-là, il le fait d'avoir des équipes au préalable et qui avaient une expérience dans d'autres domaines. Que peut apporter et qui éventuellement vont avoir une couche de formation en plusieurs couches de formation sur la radicalisation, une certaine spécialisation. C'est beaucoup mieux qu'avoir par exemple une formation spécifique en radicalisation. Donc ça veut dire c'est vraiment des capacités souples… plutôt, je dirais que des capacités dures et concernant le phénomène.

Int. n. 34

Q: Could you describe briefly your working and studying experiences?

A: Formally, I have a BA in Social Work master's degree in Public Health and individualized PhD here in Arts and Social Sciences - it's individualized. And most of the time, you have to combine the three disciplines.

To be direct, my professional work started with Unicef at the age of 24. So after my master's studies, but my social engagement with more or less contracts, volunteer work started when I was 11 years old, because of war, so I was part of many volunteering, semi-professional work. So I worked with UNICEF for almost nine years. Then I worked for a national organization that is focused on providing care to children. And then I started this "Families' program" which is exactly the opposite from residential care, to supporting families, so they don't fall into

separation. And then I worked as an independent consultant between 2009 and 2015, when I immigrated to Canada. And Lebanon also established an NGO advocating for the right to know for individuals who were victims of illegal adoptions from Lebanon during the war time. Now I'm at the center of study of learning and performance. I'm also working with another University on developing and delivering the service work, but also training modules on child adoption. I'm also a consultant for many NGOs. I recently developed a child protection policy in media for Lebanon and other regions.

Q: Thank you. And how did you start working here?

A: I graduated in 2021. And as an immigrant, you always need an established experience. So when I saw the call for application, I applied and I got interviewed… it took me two weeks.

Q: How did you engage in prevention?

A: Yeah, actually, my work. My engagement work on prevention started in post-war. So I lived all my life until I was 24, but even after I think, we're always living in war.. until now, economic war, so different types of war and we have never felt that we are secured at any time. So I think my engagement at the age of 11 was a way to survive myself. So working to support trust and internal displaced people but then also refugees coming from Syria, but also from Palestine. So and then I think I was engaged in working on non-violence. I was a non-violent militant, and I think that kind of work… now I reflect back on this… was mainly to survive and protect myself from engaging in violence. Because you have no choice. You cannot. You cannot live your life when you when you're living constantly in war without getting involved. So that was my stance, my stance at that time. And then working with UNICEF, I was more focusing on children's lives. And then slowly I went back to focusing on violence against children, then preventing violence against children and then connecting, preventing violence against children with prevention as a whole because it's a cycle… like an ecosystem… Within the prevention, I felt that there is a high network with children and youths who are forced into separation because they were and they asked for more, more vulnerable to all types of invasion into extremism in war acts. So some of the youth aging out of care in Lebanon were recruited by militia to engage in war until recently. And worldwide.. This is also a phenomenon. So it's a kind of starting with the personal, but also going deep into knowing who are more vulnerable.

Q: Could you tell me more about your first experiences here? How have you learned to do what to do and with whom?

A: Yeah, I come from an experience of managing big organizations, managing directing, I was the director of the NGO with around 5 million euros budget, nearly about 250 staff who are serving a vast population... I came to here with that experience. But here it's mainly learning the internal procedures and the internal

bureaucracy, and also matching this bureaucracy with the needs of the researches and the programs being carried by the center. But to be clear, with you, Marina, my work is strictly managerial here. So with letter enforcement at the programmatic level.

This is the job description… And also because yeah, it's the job description. I am still hoping to be part of the programming group programmatic aspect. Because I could contribute and learn as well... But I understand also that from a managerial perspective, this is no it shouldn't be actually. Because yeah, it shouldn't be actually.. there is no conflict of interest. But it's demanding…. So little details, especially coming out of confinement…. and the center went through major changes… with high turnover and stuff. So I guess it needs a kind of stability in terms of the restructuring. The managerial aspect of the work by but I'm still hopeful that yeah, an opportunity could come up.

(…)

Q: The second part is related to the concept of radicalization. So, first question is, in your own words, in very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: My first answer, that it's not an answer, but statement that I make, is that you can.. we can sometimes fall into the trap of being radical in combating radicalization…it's a conflicting statement in a way, but the simplest way of seeing radicalization is the inability to see the other's perspective…and the inability to seek and reach an extent to deny the existence of the other perspective. And the spectrum can go up to killing the presence of that other perspective whether it's an idea or a person. So as I said, But when as much as you go further, it might reach that extent. And when you are on the extreme side, and you start losing all the sight of the other… of the other side.

Q: Thank you, and which concepts they consider as linked to radicalization?

A: The first idea that comes to my mind is injustice. Oppression, racism, systemic violence and if I put all of this in one image, so when the entity that you expect to protect you, is the entity that is offending…. It's when you one person might be more vulnerable to fall into the trap of radicalization.

(…) This is why also when I speak about radicalization, I try to deconstruct the abstract of it, because we are surrounded by radical people at many levels… so what is left for them is the act.. so if your mind is flooded with this…You just need something to act on it. Sometimes you act without having a weapon. You can kill someone else by exclusion or by denying access... So it's different levels…

(…)

Q: What are the positive and political aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Prevention starts by deconstructing the oppressor in yourself. If you go to engage in prevention, like.. (I will speak about myself)... I don't stop deconstructing or while engaging in prevention, deconstructing also my oppression, my oppression and oppressive aspects, because we really have a oppressive

This is my training on non-violence that comes mainly from the Pedagogy of the oppressed... Also a lot of our exercises on non-violence come from Paulo Freire..and Theatre of the oppressed, as well… Because I think with all the money invested in preventing radicalization and we're still into where we are… This is why I find indigenous methodologies a great answer to many of our misdoing.. and in indigenous methodologies there is a as a research, but as an engagement, ethical engagement process. It always starts with a self-positioning and the deconstruction of the colonial in us and the oppressive in us and then the relational… why we're doing this?

For what objective and for what world views…so there is a lot of work on that level prior to thinking or before, or more than thinking… why the others are not changing? We need to think about why we're doing that and what we're doing wrong. I come from a belief that most of the people would like live happily, and be okay, be nice and be engaged. But then something in the system that is creating that exclusion leading to radicalization, and while thinking about the interventions... The big question whether we are not creating the same oppressive circumstance when combatting radicalization.. and this is my biggest concern. And my biggest concern, and also the hope… change is possible. If we start changing ourselves, and we're ready to undergo the process, we cannot prevent radicalization while wearing gloves and masks…

Q: Thank you. What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: the voice… they have the voice and they have the experience. So they are a major source of information, but also of solution. So investing… (I am against "empowerment", because it means that I have something to give that you don't have)… Instead of these terminologies, I am for giving, giving a space that gained because of my privilege and arguments. So, going and engaging to work.. the space is important … the safe space is important and letting go a lot of the privileges… the primary experience is an important tool because within it, you have all the keys for the solutions… are we listening enough? But then.. it's not only above the shoulders of the individuals. There is a need for a system to change. And without that systemic change, it's very unfair to put everything on the shoulders of individuals.

Q: You have anticipated my last question: how do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective?

A: Our systems are based on oppression and violence – be it through economic violence or other… its own system of the violence is ingrained within the colonial systems. They need to be constructed otherwise, we are blaming the victim. So get rid of the of the source of the problem. So we'll go back to fighting the example of the of the colonial oppression in Canada. So in the 1900…. Separating the indigenous children from their families, communities by facing them was it will be your weapon to get rid of the problematic Indian. So the system of separating the indigenous children from their families, placing them crucial was to get rid of the Indian problem.. So if we continue with that mentality… deconstructing unwanted families - so it can be the Indian side, that can be the poor family, it can be anything that doesn't fit our own measures of what is good and bad. So just get rid of them, put them in a space and let them die. You know the concept of quarentine back in the 1800s. Whilst there is a plague there is a disease. There is the ability there is mental disability, put them into a place separated and they either die or survive, but away. So our systems, our economics.... So you cannot prevent radicalization when you are creating injustice and oppression.. and with the little amount of money that is left for you, you do research, instead of providing sake water for the community. Imagine in Canada there are several indigenous communities with no access to safe water…. But for my research…

I'm seeing the reality is it's very overwhelming and very, very shocking. And the amount of ignorance among Canadian first, even indigenous. They don't know that the history, because the history was denied. Yeah. So if I go back to the work with the 15 youth …. I started first by listening to their history. Validating who you are… and from, from where you come, and what you've lived and letting this be known to others, because this is who you are … denying the history…. It's just killing half of you.

Int. n. 35

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?
A: Yes, actually I have a background in medical studies. I did pre-med. I have a degree in Medical Sciences at Université de Montréal. And that's where I discovered forensic psychiatry. And I decided to do an internship in Montréal, studying violence markers in individuals suffering from schizophrenia to try and predict which patients are more at risk of acting out and which ones are not. Then I did an Arts and Science minor at Université de Montréal as well in Languages. And then I went back on a Master's degree in forensic psychiatry, which is when I started studying violent extremism and radicalization and then I switched to the PhD in Psychology, which I am still completing. I'm on my fourth year. I'm starting my fourth year, this fall, but it's a seven year PhD because I'm doing both research and

clinical PhD, so yeah, it's, it takes a while. Yeah, and my PhD focuses on risk assessment in a context of violent radicalization. So trying to assess which individuals are more at risk of committing hate related offense or ideological related offenses. And in addition to that, I also work with CPN-prev (Canadian practitioners network for prevention of radicalization and extremist violence). I think you met Ghayda.

So, I'm the mapping coordinator and basically before CPN prev there wasn't any inventory of which team were doing what in terms of prevention of radicalization across the country. So the mapping was aiming to identify the individuals and the teams that could take on cases of individual individuals who are engaged on a trajectory towards violent radicalization, and who had the right credentials to work with them. And we identified mostly organizations working more in the mental health sector and psychosocial sector, community organizations, and also ex-extremists trying to help people exit extremist groups. And now I am conducting a mapping of the security sector to know what the police is doing to prevent hate and radicalization in their communities across Canada. And the ultimate goal is to bring everyone together so they can share their experience. And stop working in silos. They were really isolated before we created CPN prev, and we really wanted to bring them together to share their experience and to develop guidelines etc. So they can develop better practices in terms of prevention of radicalization, because it is a new field of intervention. (…) It is still but well, online, you have the interactive map with intervention teams working in the secondary and tertiary prevention across the Country. We don't have many intervention teams, because it is a very specific subject of intervention. And some of the teams don't want to be branded as to in prevention of radicalization... So not everyone is on the website. We do know them. But the ones that you see on the interactive map are the ones that agreed to be identified. There's also the first mapping report on the website with the description of the work of the intervention teams that we've met and interviewed with the main subjects of preoccupations that they shared with us and the main challenges and solutions they propose. There will be another report that will come out that is about collaboration. Collaboration is extremely important in terms of prevention of radicalization because there are multiple sectoral approach, bringing people from different sectors of society to manage cases is… seems to be the way to go in in Canada and is more effective than you know the police centered and…

Yeah, so basically, I was saying that in Canada, we have a more public health centered approach and multi sectoral approach that seems to work best to prevent radicalization than other countries… like in Europe, they are more focused on, you know, that identifying the threat and arresting people putting them in jail, and sometimes in the States as well, even though they are starting to shift towards that public health approach as well. So, that report really talks about the importance of

these collaborations and the challenges it brings because when you bring people from different sectors of society together, there are things that they can and cannot share and information sharing is one of the biggest challenges in terms of intervention, because as a Psychologist, there are things that my deontological order tells me or no it's confidential, I can't share it with you but the other person will say but I really need that information and it can cause some frictions. So yeah, finding a way to share that information and get along is one of the future elements that should be worked on. And especially between the mental health psychosocial sector and the police sector because it's, it's a lot more difficult to collaborate and which CPN prev, we are aiming to organize workshops to facilitate the collaboration between the police and mental health actors.

Q: And CPN prev is also engaged with education, with primary prevention or it's more about clinics?

A: Actually, we don't do any clinical intervention. Here. We are practitioners' network. So we give them information about the research we are conducting about the systematic reviews we are conducting that will inform them regarding the best practices etc. We can refer them to other intervention teams that do clinical intervention, but per sé we are not a clinical team. We are more of a center of reference. They can call us whenever they need something and you can refer them to the right place. And yeah, we do a lot of research and also training and knowledge mobilization.

Q: Okay, thank you. How come did you decide to engage in prevention?

A: Myself personally? Well, I've always been interested in violence, because it is something that I do not understand. And I tend to be curious about the things that I can't figure out why a human being would do such a thing to another one, especially in the name of an idea and which is why during my first degree during my internship … So they're basically working on the intersection of correctional facilities and mental health and violence. So that really made me even more curious to keep pursuing my research about violence and risk assessments. Other than that, I've also made a lot of humanitarian projects across the world, especially in conflict zones.

Q: Could you tell me more about your first experiences at CPN prev. How have you learned to do what you do and with whom?

A: Yes, of course. So I started with CPN-prev when it very first started in 2017. And, yeah, so I think that Ghayda was really my mentor because she's the one that has a lot of experience in terms of prevention of radicalization. But then, there's a lot of, you know, learning as you go because it's such a new field of research and intervention that there's a lot of literature to read, a lot of research to make, and you have to use your own resources and creativity to reach the goals that you need to attend because there is no checklist that you can follow, like people working in, in other fields that are very well documented in terms of, you know, project

management, or also in terms of literature, etc. So, yeah, I'd say it's, you have to be very resourceful, creative, independent, but also having Ghayda to rely on really helped me develop those skills, but also building my confidence. Because there is a lot of question marks everywhere. You know, like, where do I start? We don't know anyone working in this field in Canada and I'm supposed to identify them. Like, you know, so yeah, so Teamwork was extremely important, meeting with my colleagues, benefiting from their experience, because most of them are older than me. I was 24 When I started at CPN prev. Now I'm 29 So there was that factor as well. I did manage a few research projects before but if they weren't as big as the mapping project, and they weren't as specific as this one, so you know, admitting what you don't know, but also trusting what I've learned and what I know was really helpful. And reaching out to people whenever I need help, and not being afraid of contacting people that I do not know, is extremely important to know some people have a lot of anxiety sending email to people that they don't know and without an introduction or anything, but I was just contacting… Oh, I found your name, and that website…. You seem to be working on the prevention of radicalization. Can we meet and yeah, not to being afraid to reach out to people and yeah, that's me admit, when I don't know things, because the world of academia is full of big egos and a lot of narcissism. But I don't think that's helpful. So I think being humble and adopting an approach where yes, I am competent, and I know it, but I'm also learning as I go so and yeah, being supported by my network, the people I work with, not being afraid to ask for help. When I'm stuck, I'm not seeing it as a failure. A lot of people think that when they reach a point where they need help, it's because they failed, but it's not the case. It's just another occasion to learn.

Q: Thank you. Can you describe one critical episode of your work? So what happened? Where were you in with whom and how have you felt?

A: Well, I guess the mapping that I am conducting now about the security sector is the most challenging one, because usually police services and also correctional facilities are an extremely closed environment and they are not really open to share with researchers or anyone… even journalist or anyone about their practices, about their work. So basically, when me and my team you were reaching out to police services across all Canada and the territories and also correctional facilities... We had to face a lot of people that just shut the door on our face, or a lot of bureaucracy you know, oh, you need to contact the administration. Then they sent you to many places to get authorizations and it was really complicated. So I guess dealing with building a trust between us as researchers and as an organization and CNM, with police services and correctional facilities was the most challenging problem that I've had to face up until now. I would say that we did manage to counter that problem by doing some informal meetings with some of the stakeholders to say, hey, let's just have a small chat. And if after that, you don't want to participate, it's

fine. And if you do then let's do this. So yeah, and I think just making them see the human behind the researcher and us seeing the humans behind the uniformed police officer with the gun…. It really helped building a relationship, that trust relationship, because, you know, they're afraid that we will share information with the media and the work on the prevention of privatization it and hate crimes is extremely sensitive, because of the national security implications of that work… So they're afraid that we might not manage the data properly and not remove the names that they will tell us etc. So, there was a lot of meetings just to reassure them and build a relationship, a personal relationship, which took a lot of time and efforts. It was supposed to be a one-year research, but I would say six months of that research was only meeting with people, just to gain their trust and now we are conducting the actual interviews.

(…) Mostly me, sometimes me and Ghayda, it depends of the police forces, because Ghayda also has contacts in some of them. So she is the trusted individual... So she introduces me as an individual of confidence, so then they talk to me. Other than that, sometimes my assistants contact them first, and then transfer them to me. But yeah, I did most of the talk and the meetings… and I think it was really worth it even though it was extremely time consuming and it's difficult because no, we're on different time zones, etc. But now that I'm conducting the actual research interviews, they're in pijamas, in their restroom and not in their uniform and they're talking to me like you're talking to a friend and they're telling me they know stuff about their job and their work and how difficult it can be and their feelings too. And I never heard the police officer talking about their feelings before, so I was like, Oh, wow, it feels like therapy. But it's, it's still research. And I think, I think with my team, we really managed to overcome that huge challenge. And it was worth it in the end because now we were supposed to have a one hour interview, but some interviews… like yesterday I had an interview that was three hours instead of one hour and I kept telling the chief of police "you know, we only we only pre scheduled an one hour interview… if you want to end it, I know you're really busy"... and he was "No, it's fine. You're easy to talk to, let's continue" and I was feeling bad because you know there's they keep telling me how busy and overworked they are. And yet to this day, stay with me for three entire hours telling me about their job and stuff that they would have never told me if we didn't take the time.

Q: So, the second part of the interview is focused on radicalization. Okay, so the first question is, in your own words, and very briefly, how would you define radicalization

A: Oh, I am not a definition person… It really depends. Do you want a destination for violent radicalization or radicalization?

Well, radicalization is a process where individuals develop ideas and ideologies and beliefs about a subject of their own interests. You know, it can be you know, related

to environment, or it can be a neo Nazi ideology. And they keep making research about that ideology and looking for like-minded people to share their ideas… That share their ideas…. And these ideas can also be extremely positive for society, for instance, they can be feminists or human rights defenders or you know, like, say black lives matter… It can also be considered as radical as radicalized, a group of radicalized people. So yeah, people strongly believing in an idea or a concept and wanting to create some change in the society they live in… And that idea, the notion of radicalized person comes in when this idea is really at the center of their life. And their thought process and it takes most of their time and energy and they focus on it so much. And they participate in group events, and also join other groups that share these ideas, like I said, to cause a change in the society. Radicalization for me, it's, it's, you know, the desire to create a change, a social change that goes on a certain way, according to your beliefs on what you believe this society should be like. No matter what kind of ideology and it's not necessarily negative, it can be extremely positive.

Q: Which concepts to consider as linked to violent radicalization?

A: Violent radicalization starts when you start accepting the use of violence to make your point or to make people accept your vision and your idea of how society should be like, the values you want to put forward. So yeah, I guess the legitimization of the use of violence as a means to an end. That would be the sum of the key elements, but also I would say cognitive rigidity, you know, not being open to people questioning your thought process, your ideas not being open to debate because you are sure that you are right and that what you're thinking is the only route that can be a precursor of becoming even more involved in radicalization and using violence. Yeah, but I think in French, we say, "le fin justifie le moyen"… When it comes to that, there's a red light, because, you know, violence can just could be that mean that justifies the end and that's when we talk about violent radicalization, and that violence can not necessarily be from human to another human but it can also take different forms, like destruction of property, insulting, graffitis, etc. It can also be online harassment, online publications, I'm thinking about the incells for instance that are moving mainly online and using extremely violent and misogynistic vocabulary in their blogs, even though they're not necessarily saying it's to women face to face, it's still violence, and they still legitimate rape… Their idols are like Matthew Finn... So you think using violence as a means to end then as violence in its various forms?... And thinking it is the right thing to do to put forward their beliefs and ideas

Q: Have you ever met radicalized people during your professional life? And if yes, could you tell me more about it?

A: I have… sometimes with CPN prev because during conferences we often invite former extremists they are not actively involved anymore… mainly far right extremists… they got out of these groups, but they did share their experience with us and how it was what they did. So that's my work with CPN. So yes, I did met previously involved individuals, but also during my work in refugee camps in the Middle East in Warzones. (…)

Q: Thank you. So, the last part of the interview, regards, prevention practices, okay. So the first question is, could you describe the steps of one project to each you have contributed from the beginning to the end?

A: Yes, of course. So first, I was starting from zero, from scratch because there was no database about professionals working on prevention of radicalization in Canada, whether it is on research on intervention, the Police.. nothing every everyone was shutter around the country and some people even from the same cities didn't know about each other. So, my first step was to identify the key stakeholders and to do that, you know, we actually can prep we are financed by Public Safety Canada. So we reached out to Public Safety to ask them, you know, what are the projects that you are currently financing and that you know about that aim to prevent hate and violent radicalization in Canada. So with that information, then we really used a snowballing technique. You know, contacting these organizations that lead us to others etc. And we… I built a database, an internal database of the individuals that were pointed out at me and that I met with so that I know who does what and works on what across Canada… then. So that's one part because the government, even the government wasn't aware of everyone that was working on this subject. So then, I said, okay, so Ghayda has been working on that subject for a very long time. So let's go through her contact list and the people they know and she's been collaborating with. So Ghayda that gave me access to her business cards, and to emails that she received from people that she met during conferences. She sent me also, you know, the program of the conferences with the key speakers that were also talking about radicalization. So that also gave me access to a broader... Inventory of people to reach out to and to keep going on this snowballing technique. And then there were the internet researches that we did. So we went on multiple university websites to see which professors were working on prevention of radicalization in all the universities across the Country and they put they gave us names as well. We contacted community organizations across the Country, professional organizers, like your like say social workers order… we sent a message asking.. do any of your member work on prevention of radicalization? So we were really going fishing for information, and yeah, I would say yeah, developing a good research strategy was very challenging, but with both what Public Safety gave us, with what Ghayda gave me with her contacts and all her colleagues contact and etc, we were able to, to have very a very wide data base of people who are working on the subject… but of

course, as a practitioners network, we are more interested in people who have hands on experience on the on the ground, you know, intervention more than research. And those were extremely difficult to find. We had a lot of researchers, we had police officers were reached out to, especially in Montreal, because from Quebec, so of course, we will have more information about what is going on in our Province than about what is going on in the rest of the Country. And yeah, so we also have the Raps... I think you know.. we have close contacts with Cécile and her team, which is the most experienced intervention team, I would say in the Country, that existed at the beginning of the project. That the other intervention teams were at their infancy, which is why we had trouble finding them. And you know, says Cecile and her team directed us to others …. And they were also giving trainings to people from other provinces. So we reached out to them because they were starting to build their own intervention teams. So this, this is mainly how it worked. And then the second step I would say once we had that database, a few thousand people, some more relevant than others and some at international levels, some at the national level. It was really to work you know, triaging, going through all this and identifying the key player that could have experience in intervention. And that's what I did with my team. And then for the mapping project... In addition to identifying these teams and putting them on interactive map, we also had to conduct interviews for our research project, to meet with those teams, document their practices. And we were following the four W methodology. I don't know if you're familiar with it… Often it's used in the humanitarian sector to determine who does what where in this sector, so if they need someone's help, so they know where to go and who to ask. And we did the same methodology with the mapping. So, we know who, so then to meet them to know what they do, when and how. And we interviewed about 30 key players that had intervention experience across the Country to know more about their work about their challenges, about their needs as well, about their day-to-day, about how they carry out intervention, about the types of ideologies they were seeing, because it can vary from one side of the country to the other. You know, some people in Alberta tell me about, you know, old Viking ideologies linked to the far-right ideology and here in Montreal, people are like… "what, Vikings?...". So, yeah, each region has their own specific needs, and they are facing different ideologies and challenges and they develop their expertise as they go on these ideologies. And yes, so we were documenting this and after we did that, then, you know, all the process of qualitative analysis, writing the report… which was the first report that is on our website. It is only general description of who does work were in Canada in terms of prevention of radicalization, but more specifically intervention. And at the time of the research, like I said, they were only starting off they were extremely anxious... They were like, "we're trying but we don't know what we're doing"... But now if you ask if you meet with them now,

they will have very different answers because they've built well, the fact that we brought them together, that they discovered other partners, they've developed a lot of expertise and now they know what they're doing. So, the answers to the mapping questions would have been different… and it's really nice to see the evolution of their practices over time. So this is basically the methodology that we've been following. And another important part of the methodology is to keep the database up to date, because there are more and more teams working on that subject. There are new subventions from the government…. There are new initiatives, sometimes from the community that we don't know about, that are not financed because it's like, let's say my neighbors that are starting an organization trying to help families that are dealing with someone who went to Syria, to fight with Islamic State. So there's a lot of research updates that we had to do, that we still have to do on a continual basis. Yeah, and keep writing reports about it… because we've identified so many teams that one report would be like 1000 pages. So yeah, so the first one was a general description that helped, you know, CPN prev, developing its curriculum according to the needs that were identified by the practitioners, their ability, their collaborations… soon will come out and we will develop a curriculum, hopefully, if our financing is renewed, that is focused on fostering collaborations and having better relationships between different sectors, the importance of multi-sectoral work and intervention. And then we will have a report that is specific to intervention methodology. So it's really what you are doing once you get a call, okay, we have an individual that has been identified as being at risk to the moment they stop following the individual because they don't need their services any longer. So it's really to find intervention models… That intervention teams across Canada are using what works and what doesn't for them… and yeah, CPN really base their activities on what we found – the mapping project because it is a network for the practitioners. So it is logical that what we do directly comes from what they told us when we went and met them on the ground.

Q: Thank you very much. Next question is what are the positive and critical aspects of prevention activities? Is there anything that you would like to do differently?

A: Something I keep saying over and over again to people is… decolonizing this sector of prevention of radicalization, because it is a sector that despite all of the cultures and different ideologies that are involved is still very white and Western and most of the main actors are also very white and Western, so this, this can cause issues regarding the approach to prevention… That should actually be more open to diversity, you know, and it's also still a very white male dominated field. But it should be you know, there should be a rainbow people working in that field because it touches everyone. And not only people from different ethnicities, but also you know, sexual diversity, like LGBTQ + communities, First Nations as well… The second point is adopting a more culturally sensitive approach to prevention of

radicalization because often there is still this stigma that when you say, radicalization, we're talking about Muslims wearing bombs you know… so yeah, I think yeah, changing the approach, changing the connotation of the word, radicalization. Changing the idea that writing radicalization is always dangerous also, but especially, you know, co-constructing programs that are more adapted to the community it is supposed to be in, you can't just take the social polarization team, right, model an intervention and put it in the Northwest Territory. Because it's the same population. There are not the same needs. It's supposed to be built with the people that are there and they say they're supposed to have a voice in how prevention is approached and developed within their community. And how culturally sensitive it is. And it should, it should always be updated, you know, and be open to criticism and not being focused on you know, performance, but more on human… adopting a humanistic approach is extremely important. Taking a human a whole, not seeing people as a radical, not putting, you know, stickers on people's heads and saying "ok, you're an extremist"… which I find extremely oppressive. You know, people that say, "Oh, I am working with extremists and terrorists" and I'm like… this is cringy. You know, just not defining people by their mistakes… But seeing them as an individual, a very complex individual that has other parts of their lives that are important, but yes, they did engage in a trajectory towards violence… But it's the thing that's going on in their life. So yeah, adopting a holistic and humanistic approach is extremely important.

Q: What are the main capacities that you consider important to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: Resilience is something that is extremely important… Both for me personally because of, you know, my background in in Warzones, etc. And from what I've seen, it is the factor that makes that people can bounce back from negative experiences in their life, to, you know, contributing to the society in a positive way and reintegrating the society, after having you know, extremist ideologies and also resiliency so that they are not attracted to extremist groups…. So it's very important for me, but also in the literature, but to me personally, it is so important that I have a tattoo that says resilience because it is the key…. It is what makes the difference between an individual that will join an extremist group and some or act out to a violent acting out or not. Because it's not illegal to be racist or misogynistic, but just don't be violent. You know… Resiliency, through access to mental health or substance, which is extremely difficult right now, not only in Quebec, but everywhere. In Canada, especially at a young age… Resiliency through living together.. You know, learning how to accept other people's differences, how to accept your own differences, and how to live with diversity of opinion. Even though you disagree with someone, it doesn't mean that you need to kill them. You know, let's agree to disagree and live together in the same society. We might not be friends

but I respect you and you respect me. That's it. That's all you know, we don't attack each other. So yeah, promoting the "vivre ensemble". Yes, promoting discussions as well. Yes. And I think that joins the critical thinking elements that you mentioned earlier, promoting democratic debate at a young age. So people learn how to share their opinion and be accepted for the opinions they're sharing… and how to share them respectfully, both online and offline. So yeah, having a safe space for young people to share what they think and someone to, to be there for them and know how to manage the discussion in such a way that they are not judging, but they are still establishing boundaries in the debates, so they know how to so when they grow up, they will know how, how to express their opinion without becoming aggressive and violent, and how to formulate arguments that are well taught and well researched. You know how to access reliable information. I guess media literacy also is extremely important. Having more online activities, because the youth is more connected than we might have been when we were their age, and I'm, I'm talking about young people a lot because that's when we should start you know, they're the future of society. And if they learn how to do that, at a young age, then chances are there will be less hate crimes and trouble when they reach the adult age I guess also something that is very important is giving them many opportunities to express themselves… Both intellectually but also artistically and also, physically, I mean, sports and music as well. To learn different ways of expressions, you know, in psychology. There is this process in psychodynamic called as sublimation you know, where, instead of becoming aggressive, you sublimate these aggressive pulsions into something productive for the society. So… Well, the classic example is the surgeons that instead of killing people, save people's lives by cutting them up. Yes, but they still saving them or the artists that create beautiful paintings or all arts, or music instead of becoming violent and can be I don't know songs and rap so you know, working in different ways of expressing all the anger and frustration they have towards society is extremely important. In addition to the educational side of things and their critical thinking, etc. Also… what was I thinking about? Yeah, developing democratic values is very important, and most important, giving huge place in the society, in the politics, because a lot of them are infantilisés… you know, the politicians say, Oh, they're just babies and what do they have to bring to the table? And when they feel left out of society, the system, it just brings out more grievances, that they could have expressed if they had more space to do so. In a politically correct way, because they were invited to the table you know, so I think reaching out if the political class if I can call them that way, reached out more to us to get their ideas about prevention, about their thoughts, about what they're going through as young people and some of them have a lot of thoughtful things to say that we as adults and researchers and experts will never think about… you know, even six year olds, sometimes say things that have more wisdom than what a

grandma would say. So bringing youth to… giving them space into a political sphere…. In a non partisan way, you know, you don't have to be a liberal or a conservative or a socio-democratic person to join, just being part of the political life of your community, your municipality, in the country as well. Because there are committees that exist but they're kind of elitist, if you know what I mean. You know, they, they go through a huge selection process to pick… The best of the best, but that's not how it is you want to hear what people have to say, in general. And they do that with adults. They, they organize events, where people can talk and ask questions to politicians, but they don't necessarily do it with youth. And they should my opinion, if they want to prevent radicalization.

Q: How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time?

A: Sustainable and effective over time? I would say if they are made by the community, through the community, and always updated, because society changes, communities change, doesn't remain the same. Over the years, so yes, being sensitive to how the community changes something needs changes, always assessing, you know, the changes that are happening. All the programs really have to be organic, to the community they are taking place in and giving a place to everyone like I said to the table, and not saying "oh, we are the government or we are researchers, or we are an intervention clinical team and this is what it's best for you to do it". You know, that's very paternalistic, and it doesn't necessarily respond to the actual needs of that community. So I guess co-creation like I mentioned earlier, and yeah giving a bigger place to the community than to the experts would help a lot because when they feel that it comes from them, they are more motivated to keep it going because there's some personal engagement. And you know, if they see their brothers and sisters that are involved and little brothers and little sisters will also want to continue or neighbors, etc. And they will get more involved and they will make it their own… and they will do anything to keep it going. But of course, it has to be evidence based… And there has to be some scientific evidence behind the program. We can just let people do whatever because it can backfire. And of course, there has to be some kind of involvement of, you know, whether it is mental health actors, social workers, or community actors, youth workers as well. Sometimes, sometimes police officers if they are welcome by the community. In some communities, they don't have a problem with the police in others. Like there might say, Okay, no, we don't want the police to be involved because they're preventing hate as you know, we don't want anyone to be targeted by these. But yeah, letting people decide who they invite to the table. How they're coming up with the program, what their needs are, while still having some kind of scientific and clinical references that are there for them. If they need it. And of course… adopting a generalistic approach in developing a program that is aiming to tackle

only Islamic radicalization because it is stigmatizing but just aiming to prevent hate in general, and social polarization in general.. having many branches for instance, some programs aimed to prevent toxic masculinity in young men without accusing them of being incells or anything, it's just.. it's more general and informative and based on activities and collaborations between members of the community and being exposed to people from different backgrounds because it's someone who grew up in a in entirely white environment and never saw immigrants in their life. Then maybe just getting to know them and see them and that kind of activities will take away that fear that they have of immigration that is invading the country, you know, they're gonna see that "oh, okay... Immigrants are people just like us and I have friends" and

yeah, so I guess also adopting an anti-oppressive approach is extremely important. Recognizing the failures of society towards certain groups that were historically mistreated and still are such as visible minorities, but also indigenous people. I think owning mistakes is really important as well, and reconciliation is extremely important in prevention as well. I guess restorative justice, you know, when someone might, I don't know... Making a swastika graffiti on a synagogue instead of directly putting that person depending on the condition, of course, if it's a very violent person that Jews and want to kill them, we're not gonna go through restorative justice. But if it's a 16-year-old, that wasn't his lead and draw this on a synagogue, just sometimes using restorative justice, giving them a chance to talk to the people they've hurt, have a conversation with them, give the chance to the victims to express their harm they have felt because of their actions, and perhaps coming to a good ending and understanding and maybe, even an involvement of the perpetrator in some activities with the community you know, just to get give them a better knowledge…. Of what the Jewish religion is or what the "vivre ensemble" is and expose them to teachers, I think, yeah, we don't see a lot of restorative justice at the moment. Interventions in Canada, maybe because it can backfire, and we want to prevent harm to the victims. And we have to be very careful, but I do think that eventually if we develop guidelines, and if we select well the people that would be eligible to and open to being part of such programs, it could be interesting to add to preventive measures in the future. Because we don't see that across the country… I think I've met two organizations that do that. And it could prevent youth from getting into the justice system. And it completely changed their lives. So yeah, I think that's, that's something I would like to add that is not often talked about, I believe, I don't know if the other people that you've met with talks about restorative justice and reconciliation, but according to my work, it's not something that comes up often in prevention practices. And when I met with indigenous people from the territories, where there is mostly in with communities, reconciliation was a huge

part of the work to do. You know, they were victims of a genocide, I mean, let's be honest, and nothing that we can do will ever make up for what happened to them. But this is why I think programs should be by the community for the community. I don't feel comfortable that even if I was doing my PhD on indigenous people, building a prevention program or a reconciliation program because it's even more oppressive than oppression you're living right now, and they should be the ones that initiated or we can initiate it, but they can build it, you know… The same thing with other populations. That are often marginalized well with the black lives matter movement, people of color or other people that are more afraid to speak up. That comes up a lot is the Asian community that are afraid to not only report hate crimes, but also you know, talk to the police or open up to other communities so… it would be great to include everyone give them a seat at the table build trust, I think would be the most important thing. Yes, so everyone has their own interest and you know, words to say about how prevention is constructed within.

Int. n. 36

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?
A: I'm a psychiatrist, a child psychiatrist… Professor at McGill University. I think I have been working for almost forty years in the field of social and cultural psychiatry.. first with extreme psychosocial situation adversity.. so migration, refugee children... And I'd say since 9/11, I've been working in inter community tension discrimination and racism increasing the risk of violence…
Q: How did you engage in prevention?
A: I would say… this also is a very long story. So why when I began doing research three years ago, I first worked all risk protection factors for Children of War. At the time, I realized first that they were not using mental health services… second, that mental health services were not appropriate or adapted to that kind of clientele because of cultural and social issues. And the best way to reach refugee children and immigrant children was in school, proposing universal programs, which were much less stigmatizing that targeted programs. The idea of having kind of a public health approach in mental health having a long standing issue, which I've been kind of applying during the pandemic with a project called "Co-vivre" dedicated for marginalized community in Montreal, which with the aim of mitigating the collateral damages of the pandemic, which were over-represented in minority communities, in which range from school program to vaccination programs, to socio-economic support, so I got to do that all of that is mental health. If you decrease adversity and our resiliency and strength that is much more effective than providing direct counseling, therapy, which doesn't mitigate the fact that life hurts. First, you have a child hit by his father, or mother and the first thing is to stop the

violence. It's not to give therapy to the child so that he suffers better the violence…
is the same at the social levels when you deal with social issues – social justice,
human rights and reestablishing and improve the environment is the first thing is
the same in the violent extremism. Grievances are at the forefront and they are…
offline extremism, decreasing social grievances, decreasing the associated
psychological distress, decreasing social grievances per se, or providing with other
opportunities is key.

…Yes, what psychosocial factors are involved... Our aim is to transform the
environment, not just to adapt the individuals so that they kind of can cope with this
environment, which can be important too.

Q: Can you describe one political episodes of your work? What happened? Where
were you when? And how have you felt by political episode like whatever the first
thing that comes to your mind

A: Okay. So what comes to my mind is that there is it's a field which is dominated
by security approaches…. where they say, Okay, we're right, and they're wrong and
there are good and bad guys… this makes things worse and the fact of keeping it
apart from the social reality, schools, community organizations… One critical
episode that comes to my mind was during a meeting conversation that we had
within the intervention team. There are interventions when you have life or death
issues and very difficult decisions to make... in which level to intervene… if you
need to call social services or not… In that case, the school was used to call very
rapidly security forces… and young community didn't trust them… so the question
was how to preserve the trust and manage to solve the situation before calling
security forces… it's a delicate question.

Q: Thank you. So the second part of the interview is about the radicalization
concepts and the first question is: in your own words, and very briefly, how would
you define radicalization?

R: Radicalization is what happens when dialogue doesn't work. It's a systematic
issue in which two or more parties will crystalize their position, in a more or less
rigid way, because they're not able to establish a dialogue. Usually there's a
motivation to change the social status quo (injustice, an exploitation situation…).
Radicalization is a process, that can lead to positive social change or may also lead
to violence (when you don't have an alternative social project)

Q: Which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization?

R: In the 70's and 80's, radicalization was more linked to a social justice view… in
a moral and progressive view of the world. Before you had the ideas of terrorism
and violent extremism not linked to radicalization per sé… In literature
radicalization started to be more used in the other sense after jihadism gained space,
so religious radicalization was considered as synonym for terrorism or violent
extremism. There was a kind of appropriation of the term by the governments. I

think there are many models that are not scientifically founded. It's not because you have a radical view, that you progressively come to legitimizing violence. It's not a linear relation. There is a relation between the level of legitimation of violence and a number of violent acts, but the relation is not linear. Having a polarized or radical thought doesn't mean that you will become a terrorist, absolutely not- The problem of linear approaches like the pyramid one…. Is that it makes suspect of the social discourse… that is problematic, that is used as a tool of social control. The problem in the field… if in name of terrorism and extremism, you politicize those concepts to implement social control of any protest, then that becomes very damaging.

Q: Thank you. A question about Raps: how political and scientific collaboration in the projects work and what are the strength and critical points?

A: Raps is a heterogeneous research teams, with one twenty-five researchers from different disciplines and a lot of partners, so school boards, Ministries, Security forces, community organizations… One of the characteristics of Raps is that the continuum of researchers and partners are not in agreement. And this disagreement is important. I don't think… I think it's a very bad sign when we work on radicalization, on social polarization and on violent extremism… If we all agree, this is a very bad sign… because it means we're only at one side of the problematic and we're not able to represent what's going on in society. So within Raps we have people… who have a feminist stance, who have an anti-racist stance… and we have also people who are very critical of those stances and disagree with those. You have people who absolutely reject extreme right or white supremacists or with a masculinist view and we have people who deeply understand what's under that, which do not mean that they adhere to that. So we do have people who, for example, deal with gender dysphoria, gender identity and orientation crisis is very different ways. To me, the fact that we're able to dialogue and descent… presently, one of the things which is happening, but it's very difficult with the social polarization in society to dialogue, because convictions on both sides are much stronger than before. You can very rapidly become a heretic, on one side or the other.

Well, how can we, how can we think those things to understand… I'll go back to one of my colleagues, who grew up in Paris, suburban is herself from Maghrebin origin and what she was saying… and she's working with youth… she was saying… if I listen to Daesh Imams on Friday, 95% of what you're saying is totally right, because it's about injustice, it's about oppression, it's about racism… the problem is the last 5%. If you look at what's happening in Ottawa you know, with the content of the speeches you may totally disagree with for example, the middle west, white supremacist men… it gives you hives, of course, but politically… What's under that? What are they talking about in terms of poverty? In terms of feeling that they don't have a voice? An this is true, even if you reject both the white supremacist

and of course, xenophobia and of course, masculinist speeches… they're telling "we don't we feel we don't have power. And we're more than ever, helpless" And that is true. If you don't recognize that, you're just going to say "you're wrong and you're criminals", so you make them more hopeless, and that is worsening the problem. Of course, you're right. But being right is not the problem now. Being right is a great way to make things worse.

Q: Thank you. Next question is: what are the main capacities that you consume in order to develop in primary prevention activities?

A: I would say first thing…. Primary prevention, secondary prevention and tertiary prevention are often presented as a continuum. And again, I think that is a problem, because they're not. They have totally different goals and should not be implemented by the same actors.

I think that primary prevention should be restricted to social rail and security agencies and forces should back off, and should not be involved nor funded… and this is a problem, because most funds come from security agencies… it's none of their business and they're making things worse so… In Canada, for example, we have the "Community resilience fund" created by the security Ministry… that undermines community trust. Why should a security Ministry, who's in charge of the police, be concerned with community resilience? Community resilience should be the business of Welfare agency, municipalities, educational system, and so on. So primary prevention should be implemented by social and political actors who are in charge of social life, not security.. and the aim is multi-layered, so the first was appropriately with United Nations. The first thing is, if you don't have basic human rights and social justice (and that is the main problem)…. whatever we do as a secondary and tertiary level will not work. That is, we have a global problem. At least, it needs to be said… given the fact that you do not have this social equality or good conditions…. There are a number of mechanisms which can give grievances a voice and facilitate that people can take a certain power… and that can mitigate the fact that violence is the only solution. Either you make things better, or it's about giving people a voice and a certain power to change things. Now, power it cannot be given, it should be taken…. So the mere notion of empowerment is problematic… at a certain point, people get things in their hands.

So how can a society decide and help to redistribute the power?... One thing that we see in Canada and in Quebec is that young people are more and more anxious and depressed. And that is a stable threat. And it's not because they're genetically more pro to anxiety or depression. It's psychosocial suffering and psychological distress which is increasing and in a very interesting longitudinal study that we did with Diana during the pandemic…. We realized that the rebellious ones, those who didn't want to be vaccinated, who absolutely didn't trust the government or the institutions... Well, their mental health was better. So that is protective. This is

important because presently we're pushing people to believe evidence base bla bla… be conscious of what's going on in the planet and follow the rules, increasing rules of all the institutions that regulate the life… If people do that, they may be rational, they may be good citizens and they will be very depressed. Because they have no power and no voice. Our lives are increasingly hyper-regulated…. 30/40 years ago everything in university, in health care, in society was much less regulated. Now we're in a state of hyper control, hyper regulation, everything is regulated. I think that is making people very depressed and very helpless.

So if I think about primary prevention, I would propose an isolating things like… ok, let's change the curriculum in schools. Now we're teaching kids to write abstracts, 250 words… Structured you know, it should be an intro and then you so much words for the second part, and so on… You need to learn to write, like to write and some will write one page and it's okay and other will write ten pages and it's ok. Learning to write an abstract is not a good way to learn how to like to write… same thing with art, music, visual arts, music, sports in school… the thing should be… participate and have fun… and do whatever and be allowed to do a mess. If you participate and do a mess, it's okay… you will not be penalized because you do a mess. We have over regulated the behaviors also in school yards… we occupied kids, so that they will not fight… I'm sorry I think it's very important to learn to fight… but not too harsh. So the idea is not that kids stop hitting each other and always talk… is that they may fight and sometimes hurt a bit each other, and they'll learn how not to go overboard. This is much more protective than never fighting. That's why young people are so attracted to evil, to violence, because they are in a society that mitigates all of that. They say we're good, violence is bad… but this is totally false. We are in a society with "clean violence", bureaucratic clean forms of violence… are they necessarily better than forms of physical violence? Not sure.

The whole idea is that we should rethink the educational system, we should rethink also social space of expression… If we think about the debate around the use of words in social space.

So, thinking that some words can be hurtful is important…. Now, regulating what can be said and what cannot be said is very dangerous and it's very violent. And that doesn't minimize the fact that some words are hurtful for historical reasons stories. For example, the number of bad words relating to women in various societies, including Italy, is enormous… Are you going to ban all these words? In order to protect women, will the ban of the words help misogyny disappear? Absolutely not. It's not that if you cannot name a phenomenon, it doesn't exist… it just makes it more perverse… All these things are important to rethink society and also primary prevention activities… the fact that yes you can protest, yes you can descent, yes you may want to transform societies in radical ways… if it does not involve killing anybody. I do think that is important to reestablish the fact that life

is not easy… and it's ok to name that. The system presently is not working and that even government is powerless for changing it. I think primary prevention is about the education system, is about the media – how the media can represent this plurality of social, while being conscious that it can be hurtful, how do social spaces, local spaces in municipality and neighborhoods can welcome diversity without making it rosy. Diversity is great… and hurtful. And it brings conflict. The issue is not a rosy social space with a constant idea of mediation. Mediation is hard. But we've been working a lot in mediation during the pandemics… Presently there's lot of conflict in school around gender identity and orientation issues and some migrant communities who are religious and feel very uneasy with the official position of the government and the school board… and in all of that, there's not a right or wrong position. There's a diverse society, which hurts… and in which you have conflicts, and in which every party has the right to descent… the thing is how to provide a space for people to express these differences and to see what is it kind of a good or a bad enough solution, and how can we survive with our disagreements.

Q: Thank you. How do you think prevention activities can be made sustainable and effective over time? Yes.

A: This is one of the reasons why we work so much with decision makers. I think that in terms of process… we have launched what we called Creative expression programs in school. I've been doing that for almost 30 years. And the idea is that.. (there are four randomized control trials to test the effectiveness and so on). So the idea is that you begin very small, when you do prevention, it's a trial and error process. You try something and you see does it work or not… and then you may add one or other elements…and really go back and forward with youth, with communities, with parents… whoever is involved in in the prevention program… until you feel you have kind of a good enough program, or product or practice. When you think you have a good enough practice, then you try to evaluate it more rigorously. And then the idea is how can the pilot or the program either inspire and transform mainstream practices. And that is true in whatever domain… how can some practices suddenly become mainstream and sustainable. I'll give you an example of the community gardens. Very nice way to to bring together people of different generations, people from different backgrounds and so on… around working the earth and producing vegetables… I think they're very protective spaces. How do you make that sustainable? On one hand, you have some kind of very nonspecific project, which I think has an important role in creating social links, like community garden… parks… Spaces where kids can play together… those are safe environments… People will say "that has nothing to do with violence"…. Yes, it has! In a school, what helps decreasing violence is not security measures, it is a warm school climate, in the neighborhood… having shared space…shared spaces which are peaceful and playful is very important. All of that I think is primary

prevention. When you do more specific things, for example… after the Quebec attack, at the Mosque… We did play an activity in a mural which I think it was done by the Muslim school in which the families of the victims were… and in another neighborhood, where we didn't have any Muslim kids, came together to build this mural…

In another project, we worked with immigrant refugee kids playing and dancing with old people for example…. Old people may have prejudice about diversity. These kinds of things. Then they become these the work is really school boards. of education. For example, during the pandemic, we produced tools to all schools in Quebec to reduce the conflicts between the vax and the anti-vax, because that was a matter of polarization.

INT. 37 AND 38

Q : Ok, donc la première question si vous pouvez me décrire brièvement vos études et vos expériences professionnelles.

R37 : Ok, donc moi je vais, si tu permets… Donc moi j'ai commencé mon parcours professionnel dans les années fin des années 80 dans le secteur de la recherche en économie. Donc j'ai fait une dizaine entre dix et quinze ans de recherche dans un département d'économie appliquée sur deux matières pour être très synthétique, sur des matières en gros liées à la discrimination sur le marché du travail discrimination BAAM, discrimination selon l'origine et cetera et cetera. Après j'ai quitté l'université et je me. Je travaille pour un institut d'études statistiques publiques en Région wallonne. Toujours sur la même matière liée au marché de l'emploi. Voilà. Et puis après j'ai quitté le monde de la recherche pour plus travailler dans la formation. Le secteur de la formation professionnelle et puis des les cabinets politiques, etc. Etc. Et pour finir, je suis arrivé ici au ministère à la Fédération Wallonie Bruxelles où j'occupe pas spécifiquement des fonctions de recherche, mais dans les services que je coordonne, il y a des services qui s'occupent de la de la recherche, de la recherche sur les matières générales de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles, soit effectivement des recherches qu'on a pu mener sur la prévention de la radicalisation, radicalisation violente. Et comme formation, je suis sociologue de formation.

R38 : Alors moi je suis de formation politologue. Et j'ai également une formation complémentaire en anthropologie. J'ai travaillé pendant une bonne quinzaine d'années comme conseiller politique au sein des différentes assemblées parlementaires de Belgique, donc au niveau fédéral, régional et communautaire. Et puis je suis, j'ai été actif pendant deux ans au sein de la CUP, au sein du Centre national de la coopération au développement. Donc. Pour des thématiques qui n'ont pas véritablement de lien avec l'extrémisme violent puisque c'était flou. La

souveraineté et la sécurité alimentaire et sur des objectifs de développement durable. Et puis il y a. En 2016, je suis rentré au sein du ministère de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles et de son administration des Maisons de justice au sein du Cap Rêve qui est le centre d'aide et de prise en charge de toute personne concernée par le radicalisme et l'extrémisme violent. En tant que politologue dans un premier temps, et puis après quelque temps, j'ai exercé la fonction de directeur adjoint. Et depuis. Depuis le mois de. Depuis le 1ᵉʳ septembre, je suis effectivement directeur du Centre de ressources Appui, le CRÉA dont O. a mentionné l'existence il y a peu. Qui qui travaille également sur la problématique du radicalisme et de l'extrémisme violent.

Q : Comment et pourquoi vous avez choisi d'engager, de vous engager dans la prévention?

R37 : Pour un peu, peut être que je ne vais pas dire que c'était un choix personnel parce que c'est en fait un choix institutionnel. Donc ça, en fait, en 2015, le gouvernement de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles a décidé de mettre en place un dispositif de prévention de la radicalisation violente et j'ai été désigné référent radicalisme par référent prévention de la radicalisation violente par le gouvernement. Ce n'est donc pas une démarche de ma part, c'est une démarche de la part du gouvernement après les attentats de Paris et un petit peu avant les attentats de Bruxelles. L'idée au début, c'était simple. Simplement l'idée au début, c'était de coordonner toutes les initiatives en termes de prévention de la radicalisation violente qu'il y avait, qui étaient prises dans les différentes compétences de la Fédération et de Bruxelles, c'est à dire l'enseignement, la culture, le sport, l'aide à la jeunesse, les maisons de justice. Chaque secteur de compétences prenait des initiatives et l'idée c'était de coordonner ces initiatives et de pouvoir avoir une vision à 360 degrés des initiatives qui étaient prises au sein de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles. Il faut savoir qu'historiquement, nous sommes une administration qui travaille de façon très collaborative avec le secteur associatif. Donc, la plupart des initiatives que nous prenons dans le cadre de la prévention de la radicalisation violente sont des initiatives qui sont faites avec le secteur des PME, des ONG.

On a donc des organisations non gouvernementales du secteur associatif chez nous. 2016, ce sont les attentats de Bruxelles. A ce moment-là, le gouvernement décide de renforcer le dispositif et de mettre sur pied deux outils. Un outil qui est un outil de soutien aux intervenants de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles qui est le créa que Benjamin présente ici. Et un autre outil qui est le CAP Bref, est un outil de prise en charge des trajectoires individuelles de personnes. Soupçonné ou ou identifié, ou dont la famille nous interpelle par rapport à des processus de polarisation individuels et d'autres pouvant mener à la radicalisation violente. C'est donc en 2016 que le gouvernement prend cette décision-là. C'est mis en place 2017 2018. Donc, ce n'est pas une démarche personnelle, si vous voulez, c'est plutôt une volonté

politique qui a fait que je me suis impliqué dans ce processus de prévention de la radicalisation violente. Et, pour ma part, mais Benjamin a sans doute une autre histoire. Oui. Après, c'est un peu les circonstances de la vie qui font que l'on arrive dans un dans un service ou dans un autre.

R38 : Bon, ici, effectivement, contrairement à O., je ne suis pas depuis le départ dans cette construction de des dispositifs qui ont été mis en place. Je suis quand même arrivé en 2016 au cas et donc il s'agissait effectivement, au niveau du cas bref, de créer, de créer véritablement un service, une activité et la mise en place des missions qui lui étaient octroyées. Mais je n'ai pas l'antériorité d'O. qui, par sa présence au ministère, a pu voir l'évolution de la problématique et en tout cas des demandes qui politiques, qui qui ont émergé pour pouvoir mettre en place ces dispositifs. Ceci dit, même si à priori j'étais complètement novice en ce qui concerne la question de la radicalisation ou de l'extrémisme violent, y a toujours eu un intérêt, pour ma part, pour le travail dans le cadre du service public et dans le cadre du processus de prévention. Donc, je j'ai postulé vers ces 20 sociétés, vers ce service, avec également comme on dirait une orientation, des valeurs qui étaient précises, qui étaient assez claires en ce qui me concerne, c'est à dire pouvoir mettre entre guillemets mes compétences au service de la société et du public d'une manière générale.

Q : Comment avez-vous appris à faire ce que vous faites et avec qui?

R37 : (…) J'ai appris comme on dit en Belgique, j'ai appris sur le tas, donc je n'ai pas de formation spécifique en prévention de la radicalisation violente. C'est vraiment en étant en contact avec des spécialistes académiques et universitaires que je me suis formé. On a eu, si vous voulez, un encadrement, on va dire, par un comité d'experts qui a été mis sur pied par le gouvernement. Dans ce comité d'experts, il y avait des chercheurs issus des universités spécialisées dans les matières liées à la prévention de la radicalisation violente et notamment la radicalisation d'origine islamique.

R37 : Donc, le comité d'experts était présidé par (…) , qui était le professeur de l'Université libre de Bruxelles, et elle a fait plusieurs… elle nous a fait des séminaires ad hoc, des séminaires sur mesure. En fait, pour expliquer un peu le phénomène de radicalisation, les mécanismes de prévention, et cetera. Donc, ça, on a quand même et on a quand même eu un encadrement, une formation académique, et puis, pour le reste, ça se fait sur la base de séminaires qu'on a nous-même mis sur et avec les praticiens, avec des académiciens, on a on a eu à cœur d'une fois par mois, on peut rencontrer le monde académique et le monde de la première ligne avec les gens qui doivent intervenir dans le secteur associatif, dans le café, et cetera. Pour qu'il y ait un dialogue et pour qu'à la fois, à présent puisse s'enrichir des connaissances de l'autre et de la pratique, et cetera. Qui abrita le dialogue entre les chercheurs et les praticiens. Et ça, ça a été très formateur pour moi également.

Comme c'est bien de cette façon-là que je me suis formée. Bon, j'étais à plusieurs conférences, et cetera, mais disons que je n'ai pas eu un cursus universitaire complet sur la prévention de la radicalisation.

R38 : Pour ma part, c'est la même chose. On va dire que c'est une formation par les pairs entre eux. Bon, moi je ne suis pas non plus un praticien de terrain, donc je suis plutôt dans la gestion d'un service. Mais effectivement au sein, au sein des services, il y a eu la formation s'est faite par la rencontre avec d'autres services, la réflexion qui a pu se mettre en commun avec des personnes d'autres horizons, mais d'autres raisons géographiques dont je pense notamment, en tout cas au niveau du CAP tel qu'il y a eu beaucoup de relations qui ont été établies avec des services qui se sont développés en France notamment. Et puis il y a aussi les formations un peu plus structurées qui ont été notamment proposées par le RAC. Donc. Au niveau de l'Union européenne, qui permettait donc d'avoir des moments précis et spécifiques, de pouvoir faire rencontrer différents intervenants de terrain sur la pratique de la prévention de la radicalisation. Et tout comme O., moi je n'ai pas eu une formation ou un cursus universitaire spécifique. Effectivement, j'ai suivi des séminaires, des colloques et des conférences diverses, un processus de formation continue qui m'a permis aussi d'avoir l'occasion effectivement de suivre au niveau de l'UMP un certificat universitaire sur les enjeux entre guillemets, de l'islam moderne et contemporain, notamment dans la zone géographique européenne. Mais voilà, c'est en tous cas au niveau des praticiens. C'est quelque chose qui s'est fait sur le terrain, par la rencontre, l'échange de bonnes pratiques et l'ouverture à ce que à ce que des experts externes pouvaient nous apporter comme com, comme expérience, tout en ayant quand même un regard relativement critique avec un objectif de prévention bien ancré et une méthodologie qui est propre aux deux services qui ont été mis en place. Et effectivement, je pense que comme le dit Olivier. Les personnes. Et il y a effectivement, je pense, des ressources permettant aux personnes qui y sont, comme peut être sans doute plus adéquates par rapport à votre.

Q : Dans vos propres mots et très brièvement, comment définiriez-vous la radicalisation?

R37 : Ça dépend si vous parlez de radicalisation, de radicalisation violente. Pour moi, la radicalisation en tant que telle n'est pas un problème. Ce ne sont pas des chocs ou on vit dans des systèmes démocratiques qui permettent à tous les citoyens de développer des positionnements politiques ou idéologiques radicaux tant qu'il n'y a pas de passage. Ou de volonté de passer à une action violente. Pour moi, la radicalisation par le fait d'être radical n'est pas un problème. La radicalisation est un processus dès qu'on part d'un point et qu'on en rencontre. On se fixe, on se fixe dans un gant un système de pensée, dans un système de pensée extrême, idéologique, où petit à petit on ne parvient plus de ma définition. Petit à petit, on ne parvient plus à entendre les points de vue opposés et on ne parvient plus à rentrer

dans une logique de dialogue où on se ferme par rapport. Aux personnes qui peuvent avoir des points de vue et des goûts, des points de vue opposés ou des points de vue divergents. Et donc le dialogue devient de plus en plus difficile et de plus en plus impossible. Pour moi, c'est cela le phénomène de radicalisation qui s'approche donc pour moi très fort du phénomène de polarisation, parce que la polarisation, c'est la radicalisation dans des groupes en petit, mais donc moins, c'est relativement, c'est relativement.

Q : Quels sont les concepts que vous considérez comme liés à la radicalisation ?

R38 : Comme l'a dit O., il faut vraiment faire la distinction entre la radicalisation et la radicalisation violente. À mon sens, effectivement, la radicalisation, être radical, enfin, ce n'est pas problématique. Enfin, c'est à dire tout le monde peut avoir une portée radicale dans le discours qu'il y a, dans le discours utile qu'il adopte par rapport à. Un défaut de société la notion de mam et le terme mam de radical et est-il est présent dans certains partent dans certains partis politiques. Donc on conçoit la radicalité mais n'est pas problématique du les problématiques de l'instant où cette radicalisation va pouvoir légitimer l'usage de la violence pour arriver à elle-même, à une mobilisation ou à une modification d'un état de fait et. La radicalisation violente dont l'usage d'actes violents peut à ce moment-là, effectivement générer vers la boue ou être considéré comme étant un fait de terrorisme ou un synonyme à l'aspect terroriste peut plaire à certains. (…) Donc le fait de ne plus ne plus accepter les normes en fait des normes qui sont qui sont celles de notre vie en société qui est vraiment à rejeter. Mais comme l'a dit B. d'ailleurs, un rejet des normes, des normes institutionnelles et de nos normes de vie en société qui fait qu'on casse les codes de ce qu'on peut appeler de façon globale des codes de vivre ensemble. Oui, et peut être autant qu'on peut parler de terrorisme, d'extrémisme violent. Donc vraiment toute. Ce sont des notions et des concepts qui sont comme une, qui sont relativement, qui s'auto alimente d'une certaine manière.

Q : Quels sont les points forts et les points critiques de vos projets? Et est ce qu'il y a quelque chose que vous aimeriez faire différemment si on parle de prévention de la radicalisation ?

R37 : Je pense que s'il y a des difficultés pour mener un certain nombre de projets chez nous, c'est la répartition des compétences en Belgique qui était compliquée. Et donc, pour bien coordonner une politique de prévention de la radicalisation violente et pour mettre autour de la table un nombre important de partenaires qui, du fait que ce sont aussi des gouvernements différents, ont des options politiques différentes. Mener une politique de prévention de la radicalisation violente. De la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles. Avec la Flandre, c'est compliqué. La Flandre a une vision beaucoup plus… sécuritaire que la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles et donc mener des politiques sur le territoire de la Belgique à une certaine avec une certaine cohérence. C'est un élément qui rend notre travail très complexe. Un autre élément

que je voudrais souligner aussi, c'est que la prévention de la radicalisation violente n'est plus au top des priorités… Ce qui nous empêche quelque part de mener un travail de fond. Donc, le point d'alerte qu'on a eu en 2015 et 2016 en disant.. on n'a pas vu les choses arriver, parce qu'on a pas vu les choses arriver. On retombe dans ce même travers qu'est le débat. Tout va bien.

R38 : Tout compte fait, je caricature, je le pousse à l'extrême, tout va bien, mais tout compte fait, faut plus s'en occuper. On a d'autres priorités, on a le code BIT, on a la crise de l'énergie, on a la précarité des ménages et peut être on ne peut plus s'occuper de ça. Je pense que ce n'est pas fondamental parce que. Pour reprendre une expression qu'on utilise souvent à Bruxelles, ça bouge dans les quartiers, c'est dans l'air, dans le quartier, dans les petites zones qu'on conçoit quelque chose, que les choses remuent, qu'effectivement des tensions se créent. Et je pense, là, c'est une. A bien peu de théories personnelles au rabais. Il pense également que le phénomène de crise qu'on est en train de vivre, qui va avoir des effets de précarisation importante sur la société, notamment dans les couches les plus défavorisées, et donc en partie dans les couches, dans les couches issues de l'immigration, que les difficultés d'intégration risquent de redonner de l'ampleur à des phénomènes de radicalisation qui ne sont sans doute pas les mêmes que ce qu'on a connus il y a 17 ans, mais qui risquent de bloquer, émerger. Donc, ça se tasse aussi, c'est qu'on a moins d'échos au niveau des au niveau de nos autorités politiques par rapport à ce qu'on pourrait leur proposer. Pour le reste, évidemment. Pour le reste, on le garde presque tout juste, peut-être plus. B. a répondu à ce message de plus près que moi. C'est ce que je dirais en gros

R37 : C'est un atout on va dire. Je pense qu'on a réussi à avoir des dialogues intéressants, non seulement attachés à la musique, mais aussi avec nos collègues du Québec qui s'occupent des mêmes matières et avec nos collègues français. Donc, on a réussi quand même à créer une zone de dialogue et de champ d'expertise qui a pu être utile et qui est utile à ce moment-là. Je suis aussi content. On a réussi à faire admettre le fait que ce à quoi il fallait s'attaquer, c'était la radicalisation violente et pas la radicalisation. Donc, briser cette idée du continuum, à le dire par ce n'est pas parce qu'on est radicalisé que d'office, on va aller vers la radicalisation, l'on. Alors, en parallèle, ce sera se comprendre qu'on bouge que d'office on va être. Donc c'est un parallèle un peu facile, mais c'est ça l'idée. Ça, c'est un premier point que je suis assez content qu'on ait réussi à convaincre nos interlocuteurs politiques. Et deuxième point, on a pas, peut être pas tout à fait réussi à convaincre ou qu'on recommence à être entendus. C'est qu'il n'y a pas de que le concept même de déradicalisation ne soit pas pour fond très intéressant et qu'on n'y arrivera sans doute pas et que plutôt que déradicalisation, il faut parler de désengagement, c'est à dire sortir du processus de violence. Voilà en gros deux éléments qui, pour moi, sont importants dans le projet qu'on a.

R38 Mais je rejoins ce que dit O. Effectivement cette notion de désengagement est importante. On déradicaliser pas personne, on n'est pas dans mon. Il faut aussi entrer des méthodologies propres aux cas. Bref, c'était d'éviter d'entrer dans le contre discours plutôt valorisé. Valoriser la question du discours alternatif et de la réflexion commune pour avoir un développement d'esprit critique. Parce qu'effectivement l'opposition de deux positions ou de deux dogmes ne vont faire que les renforcer l'une et l'autre. Et plutôt que de créer des zones de compréhension mutuelle risquent de renforcer des positions arrêtées. Pour revenir à ce que disait également Olivier, effectivement l'erreur peut être l'erreur actuelle au niveau du politique et de considérer que le radicalisme est un peu n'est plus vraiment à la un phénomène d'actualité. S'il ne l'est pas maintenant, il le deviendra certainement. L'histoire du radicalisme, de l'histoire du terrorisme, c'est un. C'est un. C'est une histoire qui. Qui est linéaire et qui existe depuis. Qui a pu être notamment classifié comme les quatre phases du terrorisme, avec le à la fois l'anarchisme, les mouvements de décolonisation et de libération nationale, puis l'extrême extrémisme de gauche. Puis on est parti sur la notion de d'islamisme politique et radical. Donc il est. Il est probable que dans des années à venir, il y ait une autre forme d'idéologie qui soit poussée à son extrême pour pouvoir être dans ceux qu'il le faut, en tout cas être entendu.

Voilà pour le reste, je pense que ce qui est important au niveau du cas presse, c'est qu'il y avait une volonté de mettre la personne au centre et de de travailler avec l'environnement de la personne, de pouvoir considérer cette personne avec le principe de résilience, plutôt de partir de l'idée que la personne a des choses encore à ne pas partir sur l'idée de ce que la faire uniquement sur l'idée de ce que de ce de ce que la personne a fait, mais plutôt de pouvoir partir des ressources que la personne peut avoir pour l'avenir. Donc c'est un travail de prévention et de reconnaissance également des capacités des personnes qui sont, qui ont été, qui sont accompagnées dans le cadre de de la prévention secondaire et tertiaire qui est menée au niveau du haut niveau du carnet. Voilà pour le reste, je pense qu'effectivement ce serait sans doute utile et je peux vous envoyer par mail des personnes contacts au niveau du CCAS, bref qui pourront vous apporter un éclaircissement, un éclairage plus précis de la manière dont ils mènent leurs les activités de terrain.

R37 : Peut être qu'un des éléments de déception va dire ou de regrets, c'est qu'effectivement on a mis beaucoup d'énergie dans la construction du réseau Franco Prev, qui est un réseau d'experts francophone sur la prévention de la radicalisation violente. Et vu le désintérêt progressif des différents décideurs politiques tant de la part de l'OIF qui est à l'initiative de Franco que de la part de nos de nos interlocuteurs politiques, on a plus les leviers nécessaires pour donner toute l'ampleur qu'on voulait donner au projet. Et cela, on pense que c'est vraiment dommage parce que c'était vraiment c'était un lieu assez rare d'échanges entre

374

experts venus de pays, ce qu'on appelle les pays du Sud à nombre de pays Afrique, Afrique subsaharienne, du Canada, de Belgique, de France. En échange, on a quand même pu réaliser quelques conférences et à telle télévision intéressante, on peut remarquer quand même que malgré les différences de situation, les approches pouvaient être semblables, les réponses pouvaient être semblables. Donc ça c'était un c'est un regret, c'est qu'on ne parvient pas à redémarrer ce projet comme on voudrait le faire.

INT. N. 39

Q: Could you briefly describe briefly your studying and working experiences?

R: Well, I'm a cultural psychiatrist, which means I work at the intersection of culture *grosso modo* in many different ways, and mental health. That means work with indigenous peoples in Canada. It means work with immigrants and refugees. It means work in global mental health in different places. But underneath it all for me is… I have training in psychology and in psychiatry, but I'm most influenced by anthropological perspectives that understand our practices and mental health as having a cultural history and a cultural basis. So I'm especially interested in what could be called the anthropology of psychiatry, kind of how where are we coming from? In other words, when we work with other people and how can that sort of self reflectiveness about our own practice and our institutions help us to better understand people and help us to adapt our work to meet people where they are?

Q: Thank you. Can you tell me a bit more about the specific case of McGill? Because you are like one of the most important transcultural psychiatry centers in the world. Could you tell me a bit of its story?

A: Mcgill is the oldest formal program in the world. It started in 1956 as a partnership between anthropology and psychiatry, Jack Fried in anthropology and Eric Wittkower in psychiatry. And it was driven partly by the fact that McGill had many people coming for training in psychiatry from different parts of the world, probably as part of the legacy of the British Commonwealth. Mcgill was on their mental map of the world, so people came from East Africa, from East Asia and South Asia and so on. And when they came to train here, they raised the issue right away that, you know, people don't talk about their problems in the same way where we come from. So it's not always immediately obvious how to apply the categories and the tools that we're learning. And so, the suggestion then was this is something rather than just a technical problem of translation, how to how to apply, you know, northern, western, whatever perspectives universally, it was seen as an opportunity to try to understand human variation. So they started a network of people who trained here and went back to work in other places, started a newsletter, which eventually became a journal of Reviews, which eventually, when I took over in '91,

became a peer reviewed journal, Transcultural Psychiatry. And originally there were just a small number of people, three people in particular, Eric Wittkower, Henry Murphy, social psychiatrist, and Raymond Prince, a cultural psychiatrist, I guess I could say, who were doing this. And then they attracted around them a variety of other students.

So many people were trained here and went on to other places and they founded different organizations like the section on Transcultural Psychiatry of the World Psychiatric Association was founded by Henry Murphy. The Society for the Study of Psychiatry and Culture was founded by people who came from McGill, so they played a key role, having been exposed to this sort of comparative perspective in, you know, in influencing things. And then an important shift occurred. Well, I mean, that went on for many decades. Several decades, an important shift occurred in the 70s and 80s with a kind of renewal in medical anthropology through the work of Arthur Kleinman and others who began to adopt the position I just mentioned, which is that psychiatry itself is a cultural institution. And while it may produce generalizable knowledge, that's intertwined with its own perspective, its own, taken for granted categories, and that needs to be questioned in some ways. So it's a kind of post-colonial, post-Thomas Kuhn kind of turn in in medical anthropology. So my mentor when I was a medical student, was an anthropologist called Margaret Lock, who became one of the leading medical anthropologists, and then someone who came here after I started on the faculty here and we became close friends and colleagues, was Alan Young, who was also a very influential medical anthropologist. So those became my closest colleagues as well. Ellen Corin, who's a psychological anthropologist who is still practicing…. Gilles Bibeau also.

So they became important colleagues for me as a young psychiatrist and researcher, although my as I say, my background was in psychology, experimental psychology and physiological psychology. And then my research work, which I began in the 80s, was in partnership with the sociologist, the medical sociologist Jim Robbins, and we were looking at bodily expressions of distress from a sort of more cognitive and social.

So anyway, that that so what I would say is what happened at McGill then when I took over in 1991 from Raymond Prince and I was mandated to make the journal into a peer reviewed journal. So that was a switch from the previous sort of in-house publication that was mainly of reviews to a, you know, a more rigorous peer reviewed journal and also sort of began or extended my own research program, which is at the intersection, I would say, of psychology, sociology, anthropology. And so it I guess it differs from what you would find in France or what you would find to some extent in Italy in terms of cultural psychiatry by being more directly grounded in empirical social science. And so that's kind of work that I've done. But what we've had at McGill from the beginning is a very friendly interdisciplinary

network, even though the people involved have quite different perspectives sometimes, like Ellen Corin, who's a, you know, a psycho now trained as a psychoanalyst, used to she and Gil and myself and others used to do this last class in the cultural psychiatry course, which is now in its 29th year. And we would, you know, discuss very, very different points of view on things. And so what was interesting was there was space for that. It's not I would say our program is not a school in the sense of here's the sort of, you know, here's the pyramid, here's the approach to things. And everybody has to follow that. It's much more pluralistic and much more dialogical in terms of engaging with many different perspectives. So I can say more, but I can also send you some things. There's some interesting writing that's been done through this program and so on, so I can send you that.

Q: What about at the beginning of your career? So when you started working on this field, how did you learn to do what you do? And mostly with whom? I'm interested. So when you're working practices.

A: Well, as I said, as an undergraduate, I studied psychology. So I had at McGill, which was very, very experimental, empirical. One of my mentors was somebody called Teo Hebb, who's really represents a very, what can we say, a very experimental comparative, in the sense of animal behavior and human behavior and the similarities and differences. And, you know, so that was the background when I got and then when I went to medical school, I trained in psychiatry in various places. But my last year of medical school, Margaret Lock came to McGill. She had just finished her PhD. So she gave a seminar in ethno psychiatry. And that I decided at that point, this is what I want to do intellectually, not necessarily what I want to do clinically, but this is what I want to do intellectually, I should say. I went into psychiatry because of the influence of Anti-psychiatry, of people who were critical of psychiatry. And I went into psychiatry… I was going to go to clinical psychology. I went into psychiatry thinking… I can prevent some of the abuses if I'm more involved. So that was my fantasy. And then I went after medical school. I went to do a residency in California at University of California. And that was the moment when Byron Good and Mary Jo Good from Harvard came there.

So we started a reading group in medical anthropology. And then when I came back to Montreal, I continued to group with Margaret Lock and David Howes and John Leavitt, all of whom are now sort of senior faculty at Concordia. So I managed to find a way to train myself, I guess, in psychology, in anthropology. And then for me, the question was how to put that together with psychiatry. My training in psychiatry was very much centered on family therapy and family theory, so it was already a system-oriented way of thinking, which I think is a good balance to the tendency in psychiatry, especially these days, to be very sort of biological and individualistic. And I did consultation liaison psychiatry. So that also is a kind of systemic psychiatry because being asked in the hospital, would you see this patient

who's having trouble? And your analysis is usually not just about the patient, it's about the nurses and the doctors and the situation. You're trying to analyze a system. So that was the approach that I developed and that led to a more sort of cultural and social way of thinking. I also had the experience actually at University of California with Byron Good. They started a small cultural consultation service.

And what happened there was they met patients from the community with religious people, from the community, healers or teachers in the university clinic. So there was a kind of cultural consultation that used local healers and helpers with a person and a patient with some problem. And the rest of us watched through a one way mirror and help to formulate the case. So it was already a kind of a model of bringing to bear cultural perspective to formulating a case. And then in 1999 we got a grant… I got a grant from the Canadian government to try to see if we could build a kind of cultural consultation service. So that led to this model of trying to see patients where the clinician thinks there's some issue that they're not understanding or something that's not going well because of cultural difference or because of cultural things they don't understand. So our job was to take a referral to meet the patient, talk to the clinician and come up with suggestions about how to improve communication, improve mutual understanding. So we have a book on that. It's actually also been translated into Italian.

(…)

Q: Thank you. So the second part of the interview is more specific about radicalization. Okay. And the first question is, in your own words and very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: Well, I would first of all, distinguish, as my colleagues do, between radicalization and radicalization of violence. Right. Because, yes, one can take a radical or extreme position. And that's, you know, sometimes a very good thing. That's where a lot of creativity and art comes from, from people going to one extreme and seeing what comes of that. What makes it radicalization in a way that we want to call it something that is either unusual or a problem is about the rigidity of the of the extreme position. So it's not just taking an extreme position, but it being very rigid and unresponsive to ordinary dialogue, ordinary back and forth counter-evidence, all these other things. So that kind of polarization and adopting an extreme position vis a vis something that matters and defending it against counter evidence or other influence and then in particular, when it then connects to very negative things. Because again, you could say somebody takes a radical position, but it's radical love, let's say. We might still think there's something unusual going on there, but we would not have the same degree of concern or we might respond to it very differently. Someone who's decided they're going to imitate Christ without actually being delusional about it, we might think, well, this is a great virtue. Now. This is a, you know, a person who's spiritually alive. And, you know, anyway, the

fact. So it has this other element, often of a negative valence in the sense that there is anger, there is fear, there is antagonism… So it becomes a social problem for many people. I would say all those elements have to go together for us to call it a specific type of problem. Otherwise, we would be taking it apart and saying, okay, so what leads people, for example, to have very strong biases in their thinking or to identify very strongly with a subgroup in some ways. And these are ingredients into the phenomenon we call radicalization, but they're probably not the phenomenon we mean by themselves. By themselves, they're not sufficient. I mention that, though, because if we think about what's going on right now, where this seems to have become more prevalent and more problematic, then it's partly about what forces or processes are amplifying certain factors or pushing people to extremes, letting them live inside social bubbles or spheres in which they don't have to compromise or engage with others, you know, creating frustrations and hurts and grievances that that are satisfied partly by adopting a certain position, you know, all those kinds of social and psychological dynamics that get to very quickly when we start characterizing a certain set of problems as radicalization. Having said that, I mean, historically, this has occurred in the context of particular the current version of particular sort of geopolitical events. And it's can't be totally separated from that because the way that it's been framed is heavily influenced by that.

(…) it's definitely important to think about violence on a continuum. At the same time to distinguish physical violence, material violence from symbolic violence, let's say. And years ago, Gilles Bibeau actually organized a meeting on interpretation and violence. They published a book… I forgot the exact title, but it's something like that. This was at a meeting in Zagreb for the International College or International Congress of Anthropology and Ethnographic Sciences. I think it's called something like "Interpretation and violence". So for me, and they were fond of both Elen and Gilles were fond of sort of saying, well, all interpretation is violence. Well, for me that's a very metaphorical way of talking. That is a bit risky because it starts blurring the distinction. You know, of course it's violence in the sense that once you make a firm position, you're excluding certain things and maybe you're excluding certain people or maybe you're putting pressure on certain people, intellectual pressure or social pressure of some kind. But I would not want to collapse that into, you know, physically attacking and hurting people. We want to reserve a unique slot for that and then for other things. So but having said that, for me, hate speech can be violence and it doesn't have to result in shooting at somebody for it to be causing actual damage to people. So I think we therefore do have to distinguish gradations and kinds. Maybe they're not on a continuum, but different varieties of violence and think about them in their own way. And so for me, the point of violence then is we're talking about it, is that it is something that results in hurt and destruction that is not helpful.

I mean, there can be helpful destruction if you tear down the walls, if you, you know, end tyranny, you're using violence to a good end. You can imagine that the prototypical example is like the Second World War. And, you know, the fight against fascism. People say, well, if people weren't violent in that, we would still be living in a fascist world at this moment. So, you know, thank God people took arms and fought… at the same time… That kind of aggression can spill over, can be indiscriminate, can cause harm. So we're concerned about things that cause harm. I mean, that's an evaluative a value judgment, but it's again, in the extreme case, it's easy to apply that there are grey zones. But in the extreme case, it's not hard to say. This person's life was ended prematurely. This person was physically injured, this person's option opportunities were destroyed. And I would call all of those violence. You know, Johan Galtung introduced this idea of structural violence. So we can say, look, a society that doesn't allow people equity, doesn't allow women to rise to a corporation or puts black people in a subordinate position, is committing real violence. And interestingly enough, you can show that it is causing physical harm. It's shortening the lives of people. It's leading to high blood pressure. You can say, okay, there are these physical effects, too, if you want to trace it that way. But it doesn't have to be doing that to legitimate saying this is also violence, because it is it is harshly and unilaterally constricting or restricting or oppressing the lives of other people. So we would say, well, that's violence.

(…) Freedom of speech is not a natural property of the universe. It's an agreement in certain forms of social life that people will be free to express their position, experience, whatever. I think there's no reason why that should include the freedom to hurt another person. In reality, again, there might be situations where you say, well, it's necessary. If I say this is a racist society, that hurts Monsieur Legault, our premier, because he likes to pretend that it isn't so. Yes, I say something, you know, aggressive and firm, and it causes some emotional pain to someone else, but it's hopefully being helpful or, you know, pointing to a problem and to benefit other people. If I say "all Jews are crooks", it's not clear who's benefiting from that. And the cost could be huge to other people. It could be the step toward other things. So I don't believe that there is an unlimited right to free speech, just like there's not, you know, the example of people say you're not free to shout fire in a crowded theater because people will stampede and die. So the meaning of free speech, actually, just like the meaning of human rights, has to be located within a particular arrangement. And in particular, human rights are a vehicle and we can say free speech is a vehicle to allow the subdominant or the subaltern to speak back to power. So we could say, you know, free speech especially makes sense and especially important to defend when it is the expression of a position or a reflection of someone who has no power or less power, who is challenging arrangements of power. But then that would have to be a I guess, to be assessed against the question,

you know, what, what is it aimed to gain? What is it aim to do and what harm is it causing? And I think that could be asked of anything. So I don't believe in an unlimited right to free speech.

(...)

Q: Thank you. And following question is which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization? So if you had to build like a mini map, which other concepts would you put around?

A: Well, I would say that… There's a basic mechanism, not unrelated… Related to what we were just talking about of in-group and outgroup identification. So probably very early on in human evolution development, we, you know, we have this tendency to bond with people who are familiar and feel comfortable. It's pretty basic to learn. We have this capacity to fear the stranger, to protect against that boundary. Who it gets attached to depends on culture, because we can decide. Even though this person's skin is dark, there are brother. They're part of us. It just depends how we're brought up. There's not an obvious reason why that has to be the case. But that ability and that tendency to define in-group and outgroup and define it very quickly and easily based on generalizations is an important dynamic. And it's attached to strong emotion. In other words, we feel very, very great comfort with what's familiar and we feel more apprehension also sometimes fascination and attraction. So a complex set of emotions toward what's different and what's strange. So this is an important emotional engine, if you will. Then I think we have another set of issues around the desire to organize our life in a way that's coherent, to have a tolerable level of complexity. And one of the challenges we have in the contemporary world is we're all receiving huge amounts of complexity through the Internet, through mass media, whatever. We get lots and lots of diversity. For some people, because they like a higher level, this is enjoyable. This is they have in terms of personality traits, they're high on openness and they're interested in other cultures and they're fascinated.

But for some people, this is way too much. And it leads again to wanting to homogenize, wanting to keep things very similar. So that's another dimension that has more to do with tolerance of diversity, of complexity, of uncertainty, which is, I think, separate but then interacts with this sort of in/outgroup dynamic. So I think those are two important things. I think there's and we can probably think about more personality traits, more sort of facets of human nature. Aggression is certainly one. We talked about that earlier. I mean, violence or aggression is a normal drive. I mean, it's there to protect us from the aggression of others. So we can we can get into a fight mode to protect ourselves. So that's there. It's available. The question is, how does it get socialized? When and where is it okay to do so? This is then finally, why this other dimension, which is fundamentally a social dimension? What are the norms? What are the range of behaviors that are acceptable? And this is,

again, a key moment at this, because we have people like Viktor Orban or Donald Trump, you know, …. Unfortunately, poisoning the air and lowering the level of civil society. You know, the word civil from civilization implies a kind of politesse, a kind of respect, a kind of care for each other. That's what makes it possible to live in a large society because we're not related to everybody, but we're supposed to show respect and acknowledgement and care, even for people we don't know. That requires a certain kind of socialization and a certain kind of norms and a certain kind of enforcement of those norms. So when a leader starts talking in a way that is very base, they lower the whole level of the threshold for what's acceptable, what's okay, or they raise the threshold, they anyway, they increase the possibility of people saying, you know, very harsh and negative things, which then interacts with these other processes that I'm talking about. So I think that I would emphasize that sociopolitical level that is about the nature of social space, the nature of public discourse, the shared values and ideals that people aspire to and that are reinforced by the society that's equally important to any of the specific psychological dynamics we talk about, because ideally we live in a society that helps us to, you know, land on the side of the good side of our nature, you know, the better angels of our nature rather than the more, you know, anxious and aggressive and violent aspects which are also part of our nature, of course. So I think, you know, and I'm especially interested in that social side because I see that as the thing. First of all, we can try to do something about it by making sure that the right kind of discourse is circulating.

And by going back to your question about free speech, by making sure that some of the most violent forms of speech, the most violent forms of rhetoric are called out, are challenged, are and to some degree controlled. You know, if someone gets up and says "kill all these people because they're not human", they should not be given a big platform to say that they can say that in the privacy of their home, but they should not have a megaphone on the Internet, you know, like Tucker Carlson or something. This is really, really bad. And I think governments should intervene. Actually, I you know, even though there's a risk if the government intervenes, that the government acts in its own interests. It's better. What what's happening now, of course, is not free speech. I mean, Tucker Carlson or other people like that are there not because of individual freedoms of their own. They're there because billionaires behind them are using them to make more money. So it's very far from saying, oh, let this person express their opinion. It's much more like saying, oh, by expressing this kind of opinion, this person feeds into a toxic process that other people can make money. You know, Rupert Murdoch and other people can make money from that. So I think if you analyze what's going on, you're not left with saying, oh, this is just free speech. They should have freedom. But you're left with is a small number

of people are controlling the big megaphones and polluting the environment that we all want to live in.

Q: Thank you. Next question is: have you ever met radicalized people during your activities, obviously radicalized people in your activities?

A: Actually, I don't think I've met very many such people. I really don't work in that area and I wouldn't count most of the people I see as having that position. I think what I've encountered more commonly is taken for granted prejudice. So I'm more alert to that, having experienced that more both professionally and in my personal life. So we live in a society, as I mentioned, that is racist and anti-Semitic and work at a hospital that was built in the 1940s because of anti-Semitism.

(…)

It's very important because if we humanize the other, then we have an empathy. We have an attitude of care, an attitude of concern. It's like and this goes back to, you know, it goes back to ancient tradition, to the Bedouins and the antecedents of the Jews and the desert. If somebody comes to your tent, you must have a moral obligation to take care of them, to welcome them and show them hospitality and so on.

(…)If you start viewing them as an object. So it means you can act toward them. This goes back to what is what happens with violence. You now can act toward them in a very extreme way because of that sense of, Oh, I'm causing pain to another or this could be me. You know, in that position, none of that's operating anymore. It's like just like picking up a, you know, tearing a piece of paper in half. What does it matter? It's just a piece of paper.

A: So the last part of the interview is about prevention - from what you from your point of view, what works, what doesn't, and which capacities should we work on when we do prevention?

Q: Well, I think what works for people is friendship, right? So, I think the most basic issue is if you spend enough time with someone else in a common activity or goal or something that is rewarding, you begin to see them as a person, not as an object. And you can break down a lot of prejudice, a lot of walls that people have through that kind of activity. So then if you take a step back, you have to say what kinds of social spaces create that and how do we get past the barriers that prevent people from engaging in that? You know, because people won't go to that. So we can start getting the ingredients there. And then I think we have to understand that some people may be so wounded or so angry or in such a bad state that they can't begin that process. So, then something more specific needs to happen. And that's where like a team, like the one that Cecile is working on, where they look for, you know, the most extreme and acute moments when they try to intervene. But if we ask society wide what's going to make a difference, to me, you know, it's through, through representations, through the arts, through participatory activities that bring

people into contact with each other, where they have a shared feeling of communitas, of solidarity, of exchange, and begin to break down the "US and them" thinking that is always potentially there and needs to be worked with in some ways. So I think I've actually suggested that even our intercultural work where we see somebody in a clinic when they're in trouble, that that's a moment at an important moment where we can have some impact on someone. You know, someone might have a very radical position, but their child is sick and they bring the child to the clinic. If they're dealt with compassionately and respectfully, that may open a little door, a little window for them at that moment where they start having a bit more trust and a bit more interest and a bit more openness. So for me, that's a way, even in our everyday work and you could sort of look at that in many places, scale that up in many places to say, what do we need to do? I think it involves active education. So I need we need to do things with children when they're very young to break down prejudice to help with the feeling of connection and to help with that feeling of, you know, that we're all in one boat as humanity, we're all in one boat. So, then you don't get the kind of cover to the magazine that you described that sort of says, No, there's us and then there's the others who could drown, you know, as far as we're concerned. (…)

Int. n. 40

Q: Could you describe briefly your studying and working experiences?
A: I've been head of society for a very long time and one of the McGill teaching hospitals. I'm the founder of the Cultural Consultation Service at McGill and I'm a professor. My areas of study have been: impact of abuse and trauma, etiology of borderline personality, earlier on and I did a lot of work in refugee camps and things like that. So those are my main areas of research.
Q: Could you tell me briefly about transcultural psychiatry at McGill?
A: It's a very small center, but it's incredibly productive. It's Laurence who's now in his 70s and myself and I'm retired from here. I moved to the West Coast, but I just teach here pro bono.
(…) We're very small. Oh, we're very important. Yeah, but we're very productive. Yeah, we worked really hard. We worked really hard to develop the summer program internationally and the journal like.
You're lucky if you survive as 1 or 2 and then you have students. But it's a political problem, because psychiatry and I mean, think about if you think about the DSM and how powerful it is, how long did it take for the DSM five to include culture in even in its diagnostics? So that's not that many years ago. And that should tell you a lot about what psychiatry's viewpoint has been on culture and how ethnocentric it is. It's terribly ethnocentric. And because it's so ethnocentric, people like us who do

cultural access work with refugees and minorities or indigenous people, that was just in invisible issue. Yeah, most of my colleagues would say "Why are you doing that?"

Yeah, well, it's very it's very much an issue of advocacy, to even get it on the curriculum or even I at the current university appointment I have at UBC gives three hours in five years of training to the child psychiatrist. And I give it and they don't hire. They have nobody in their department and doing cultural psychiatry. This department, because of our constant lobbying, might give you maybe nine. And that's after constant lobbying. It used to be three. So, it's not it's I would say COVID and George Floyd's death has done more for cultural psychiatry in this continent than anything else that's happened, actually. Because the social determinants of health became abundantly clear and the racism became abundantly clear. And it's too hard for people to deny something that's staring you in the face. But the imperviousness of the white culture here and European colonialism, a shadow of it in North America, is so powerful on psychiatry, including the residencies from Europe, it is so powerful. It has absolutely overwhelmed this whole agenda. The only reason that people are interested is now because there's global migration and now there's an interest in diversity because the numbers and the agendas have become far more difficult to ignore. Now people are interested in, well, "will we move from a healthy society or a partition society? How what will we do with all these people? Let them drown in the sea?" I mean, what are we going to do with them? No, but the point is. That I…. My family's been here for more than 100 years. But if you meet me, I still get treated like I came off the boat. Yeah. So, this is deeply, deeply understand.

Yeah, we're very small, but we're, we've been working very hard for a long time, but we're very underfunded and pretty much ignored at McGill.

Q: Can you describe one critical episode of your work? What happened? Where were you and with whom? How have you felt?

A: Well, first of all, you have to define for me what you mean by radicalized, because I mean, in Quebec, you know, it's very popular in Quebec. People are talking about this all the time. Yeah, so I mean, so how do you how are you defining that word? Yeah, because I have a lot of trouble with it and I have a lot of trouble with Quebec… I'm not pro Quebec, so. Yeah, so it's been very it's been very hard for me as a citizen here.

Q: One of the following questions is exactly this… because I have trouble with the radicalization definition too, one of the following questions is in your own words and with very briefly, how would you define radicalization?

A: See, I have you know, I have done a lot of work with I'm a child psychiatrist. I have done a lot of work with the post slavery trauma in. And I worked for a long time in Jamaica on the issue of violence in the society, because 400 years of slavery

and the violence of it, the violence of colonialism, was such a savage and horrible violence. And it has left Jamaica as it has left Haiti and other places, including Brazil, for certain kinds of wounds. Yeah, well, yeah, but it's a small island like Jamaica. 400 years and it's a plunder colony. It's not a settler colony like Brazil was a settler colony and is quite wealthy. But Jamaica is not wealthy in, in the same way drugs flow through it. But in general, people are quite poor. So, there's a very particular there's a very particular kind of agenda to the Caribbean and Haiti particularly, and Jamaica in terms of violence, and that violence goes back to colonialism. In my current work, I not only am dealing with minorities and the and I'm still very connected with the Jamaican project.

We worked on the agendas of violence in Jamaica preventively. So, what we were doing was working with children like because there's such a high level of child abuse and violence in many of the constituencies we started with Kingston and Kingston was, I think, maybe the third most violent city in the world after Baghdad and maybe one other Central American city. I can't remember which one.

Kingston is one of the most violent cities in the world. So, I have a lot of thoughts about violence and violence prevention and working with schools and working with many layers of internalization of the slave genocide. The population I work with right now is the indigenous population. And I'm actually the only consultant for child and youth on Southern Vancouver Island, a job which no other child psychiatrist ever wanted. So, I took this job one or two years ago.

I'm responsible for the refugee services and I'm responsible for indigenous health, child and youth… that violence, that cultural genocide has resulted in terrible violence inside this community and plus the racism that's directed towards them and plus the number of indigenous women that have disappeared and been murdered and God knows what else. So, my agenda around violence and minorities is rooted in these experiences, the experiences of refugees and displaced people after war. For example, I'm writing a paper with some colleagues at McGill on the Sri Lankan war displaced on unaccompanied minors, people like that and the post slavery wound. And those are the things I know something about. And I know also because of my work in India, the terrible oppression of the Dalits and the incredible violence that is directed towards Muslims and towards minorities in India. So, my experience of violence is about Sri Lanka, Nepal, India, Jamaica, Brazil, indigenous people and black people. That's where my experience is. So, I can't really talk about radicalization in Québec. That's a whole other story for me, because this society actually creates radicalization, in my opinion. (…) This is so to me, this is a highly politicized funded by government, funded by Quebec. I have no love for the Nationalist project. I have respect for it. I understand the love of country that it comes from, but it has so many scotomas and it has very little room for indigenous

people and it has very little room for people like me. So, this is not a welcoming society for people like me.

So, the illness for me is in the collective. And you see here is the problem with Freud and this kind of analysis (I'm an analyst, by the way, I'm a trained as a psychoanalyst and a child psychiatrist). Freud gave us a great gift to theorize about the intrapsychic. But when you start jumping from the intrapsychic to the social to the collective and you have already ignored the rest of the world, because you believe that what you discovered on the couch in Europe applies to everybody. You really you lost me right there. And psychoanalysis did not take root in India. And I'm very good friends with Sudhir Kakar, the first trained psychoanalyst - I'm very, very good friends with him. And I've met a lot of people in analysis, like Solomon Akhtar is my friend and a lot of people. But the thing is that they are not really touching what you're talking about, which is taking those theories and then projecting them into an analysis of a political collective agenda that then relates to fragility amongst youth being translated into violence. So, do you say, well, oh, I'm going to treat these shooters in America without addressing the issue of guns, without addressing the issue of values, without addressing the issues of equity? So then put metal detectors at the door then if that's as far and deep as you want to go, just put metal detectors in every school in Quebec and solve your problem that no gun will come.

It's happening in the heartland of Quebec, where it's where there's a mentality of this is our nation and it's a homogenized country. And now these weird people are coming in. Now that we've driven out the Anglophones, even more weird people are going to come in. Not weird white. They're going to be weird others.

There's a lot of fragility amongst youth across the world after COVID. The youth are very affected by what has come out of COVID, just the stress of it economically, this closing of schools. I mean, a million things. So, we are dealing with a very complex problem. And for me to take that complex problem and say… so and so many radicalized events have happened in Quebec and therefore there should be a commission and therefore there should be, you know, I should consult with the minister of the government and make recommendations for all schools. I'm having a very hard time treating cultural genocide out of the slavery issue and out of the indigenous issue. And that's where my preoccupations are.

And how do you heal a nation while you do it? It's the legal system. It's saying, I'm sorry, it's truth and reconciliation, it's legal parameters, it's the support to schools. It's how much you're willing to give nutrition to children. How much time are you going to occupy them with things that are worthwhile, like theatre and music and art? And why aren't you putting that money into children and why aren't you making sure that they get a stable start so that they can think, you know, instead of like going home to families that are very, very distressed. So, you know, so different

people see different problems. I'm very focused on children. I think we should spend far more time on prevention and far less time on "oh, I'm going to have a special service for anybody who's radicalized and they'll all come to my clinic and then and if they're very fragile, we'll even go out to their homes and we'll interview them and we'll, you know, and we'll work cooperatively with the police when it is necessary, etcetera". Well, that's a very nice idea, but you'd never get me to work there.

Q: I understand your position, but if you had to define… what is radicalization and what is violent extremism, how would you define them?

A: Well, I don't know. I mean, so do you want me to say, well, Gandhi was a radical, Martin Luther King was a radical. (…) Gandhi didn't take a gun. But he can shut down a nation by saying you're not going to buy salt anymore. And you're not going to cooperate, etc. The word radicalization is really taking a radical new approach to a grievous problem. Okay. So then if you want to tag the word violence onto it, when it becomes a problem for my society, that your radical solution or radicalization or opposition to whatever… it also involves harm. Would you call it radicalization in the streets of Jamaica because the guns are turned on each other, or would you call it violent radicalization when a mother beats up her child because she's so frustrated from all the trauma that she's had? And it's just gone down and down, and just so you have to so you have to say, well, no, most people, when they hear that word, they mean 9/11. They mean someone turning against the state and creating upheaval and unrest and destabilizing the civil order. Basically. That is how I understand the anxiety of radicalization. And until 9/11, nothing of that scale ever happened on this continent. So that was a terrible, terrible shock, I think, in North America.

Well, let's say shock, because their position is shock and awe, right? If you do something to the Americans, they can look for the biggest bomb and whatever. So, they created Guantanamo and they're going to incarcerate you without a trial and they're going to chain you. And they're going to waterboard you and they're going to torture you. So, you know, so you have to get very careful about what you mean by who is the victim and who is the perpetrator and what created it. It becomes very complex. I'm just saying to you, I don't know beyond when the FLQ started to blow up people and kill people on this street right opposite us. Okay. Was that violent radicalization? I think it was. But when they had to put those people on trial, they let them go basically, because the majority of the province agreed with the agenda, which was that we Quebec should separate. So therefore, it wasn't radicalization. It was actually attaining something that was owed to the society because they had a wound and this was a healing strategy. Okay? It was a healing. So, how you use those words can never be understood without understanding the context. That's all my point is. I don't know if that makes any sense to you.

Q: How can we understand or try to understand when radicalization like radical positions can become violent?

A: Well, let's look at the FLQ in Quebec. Look at the FLQ in Quebec, in the 60s, in the 70s, when they were blowing up everything and killing ministers in the government. This is an example of violence. But I mean, like nowadays there are many people who have extremist positions and it's okay.

Paolo Freire and Gandhi and Martin Luther King are radical thinkers, but they are not violent – they are radical thinkers, obviously. So, the position of the political clinic that's oriented to saving people in this wherever they are doing this work, because these fragile people might take a gun and shoot somebody and they want to do prevention. That's the whole idea of this, I hope. Okay. Or treat them or have them charged because they're antisocial or because they're dangerous or they're psychotic. So, you need to put them on medication or whatever it is. But, you know, you have to, again, think, well, is that violent radicalization or is that fragility, psychic fragility, or is it or is it an agenda that has to do with collective trauma? Like if you're anti Muslim and you decide that you're going to target all Muslims and they can't get a job and they're openly disdained and openly spit on… have you created the problem because you have a particular agenda in the society, or is it that those people are sick because they're resisting this idea?

Q: Like, for example, do you consider hate speech violence?

A: Yes, I do. Of course, I do. Just like I consider emotional abuse of children more toxic than physical abuse. And we've shown that in our studies of borderlines that emotional neglect and emotional abuse of children is far more toxic in the long run than slapping somebody once or twice. Yeah, it's far more difficult to get over… and sexual abuse goes into a whole other category. But is it toxic to talk hatefully towards a child? 100%.

(…) Without having multiple voices at the table, it is difficult to analyze complex problems.

Q: Which concepts do you consider as linked to radicalization? For example, you have talked about collective trauma.

A: Yes, I have. I mean, so if you violent radicalization, is that is that what you're asking? For example, Nazism can be linked.

I mean, look, shooting, killing Indians and saying, okay, we're going to take away your children and turn them into white people so that they forget about being indigenous. We're going to eradicate your culture. And if a lot of them die up there, we're not even going to tell you what happened to them. We're just going to keep burying them, hundreds of them. Now, is that violent radicalization on the part of the state or is that or when an Indian person resists and gets a bit, you know, bent out of shape, do I send him to a violent radicalization clinic? There's a lot of anxiety in Quebec about violent radicalization.

So, advising people that we have some ideas about what this entity is and perhaps there are steps that can be taken to intervene because I'm a clinician. Okay. So, if there are steps to be intervene, are they are they about incarceration? Are they about legal steps? Are they about preventative steps? If they're about preventive steps, are they about psychic issues? Are they about fragility? Are they about psychosis? What are they about? These are the questions that anybody who deals with violence in a family or violence towards children or violence in a community will ask themselves what were the conditions that made this particular kind of violence erupt? So, I'm going back to the Jamaican study. What were the conditions? Well, generations of breaking families and breaking attachments and cruelty beyond belief for 400 years. And then if most of those people who are in this dilemma, if you look at the size of the prisons in Jamaica, it's unbelievable. So, you had two ways of dealing with it. One is you could put them in the asylum and kill them there or you could put them in prison and kill them there. I mean, psychically kill them or literally kill them because asylums were used by the empire all over the world to kill people who were dissidents because they had radical ideas that were against the state and against colonialism.

So that would be so violent, radicalization, according to the Portuguese or the Spanish or the Dutch or the British was a very it was very straightforward. You're against the state and the empire. You need to be incarcerated because you're dangerous. So, they didn't say, let's have the psychologists come and do some prevention. You know, it was a very different agenda. But nowadays, anybody can buy a gun. If kids started to buy guns and shoot each other in schools like they are in America, the first thing you think about is who's buying the guns and why are they allowed to buy the guns? And then you have a whole bunch of people who are in the government who are standing up and saying everybody should have a gun and we shouldn't restrict the gun, because the gun is a symbol of America or some stupid thing like that. These are ideological problems. They are not only psychic; they're really related to privilege and they're really deeply related to colonialism. So how do you decolonize, how do you even begin a conversation about that? If you then go to the libraries of such schools and start throwing books out and stop people from reading and stop people from understanding their history and start controlling their history… I mean, you realize that what you're doing is creating conditions for radicalization eventually, and also conditions which take the person away from what Freud would say is essential to our health, which is being in touch with our inner world, being reflective and attuned to it.

And whether you are perpetuating a sense of belonging and all the things that are essential to attachment and bonding of the community of the family... All of this all of these conditions are being eroded when you have an ideological study, a situation where the government starts interfering - this person is good, this person is bad, this

person is against us because they're wearing a headscarf… I mean, when you get into that kind of nonsense, don't talk to me about violent radicalization. Then you're talking about sick government. You're talking about ideological tensions which need to be resolved over time with safe discourse and discussion. Where are the emotional, safe places in these societies? I think Canada still has the possibility of being a healthier society than America. I think we have more safety in discussion. I think we are not we are not burning books. We're not in the same ideological place. And our slave culture was fairly there, but it's been rendered invisible. It's just starting to become visible because of George Floyd, our terrible decimation of the indigenous people. Most people in Canada feel well, they can't talk about blackness or indigeneity. White fragility is the word some people use for it, but they can't even have that discussion with you. I'm talking about professional people. Now, if you can't allow people to embrace their history and feel safe to discuss it, and feel that it's okay to have different points of view, and some people will be this and some people, but we have something stronger than that. We have the cohesion of law. All of us are invested in safety. All of us want our children to do well, or we feel that children ought to have the right to have an education or basic things like that. So, I would be much more interested in how disadvantage and social determinants and ideological tensions are resolved in a situation where violent acting out is going up instead of coming down. I would be very interested in what all the social determinants of that are, whether they are economic, whether they are about loss, whether they are about ideological tensions, because that's such a complex area. So, I'm just asking for complexity instead of dumbing things down. And as far as recommendations, then I would be thinking about, well, if a lot of them are young, what are we doing to help schools and teachers? What are we doing to help primary care? What are we doing on the essential level that helps people be healthy and creates safe spaces for them to be vulnerable because we're not doing a good job? I can tell you if you look at the literature from 2019 till now about, say, pediatric emergency room visits, there are almost all they are all moving in the direction of psychiatry.

We don't have the manpower to look after those children. And we don't have very good solutions. And I don't see government investing in it. I don't see it. You know, in a place like Finland, for example, where there's very low rates of this kind of violence and acting out, what they did was they invested in children. They said, okay, you know, people work, usually two parents both work very often. And we need to offer those children an enriched program for a longer time. We need to give them arts and creative activities and things to develop themselves for a full day. And we need to enrich their lives while they're young. And if you do that, you will prepare them for trajectories of health and resilience. To me, that's the direction that my thinking has always gone in. I am not interested in coercion. I'm not interested

in you know, focusing on violence and radicalization as an entity by itself separated from these things. I would say, well, the discussion has to include social, historical and collective issues.

I think the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and the one in South Africa did more to respond to violent radicalization than any other kind of initiative in those societies. And after Rwanda, when there was a genocide, when the truth and reconciliation people came and they said, we have to sit in circles, we have to have safety in discussion. We have to heal communities, one community at a time. That is a direction that I think we'd have to go in. So that's those are my opinions about this. If you have a situation where you think there's fragility in the collective, then you have to look at the deepest part of how that happened and you have to think preventatively who is it and what is it that helped that formation to happen, that kind of desperation, that kind of murderous rage. And all of this stuff that goes on in the dynamic, it's a deep question, a very deep question. And I don't have an answer for it. But I'm telling you that we are failing our children. We are absolutely failing them. And I'm very upset about it, actually.

(…) After Covid, we're in a fragile time. But, you know, fragile times are full of hope. This is the most optimistic I've ever been, that society could change for the better. That's why I rant and rave so much, because I do feel that it's very important to talk to people. It's very important that the young people be empowered, that they are in charge of making a better society. And they must be given a chance. But we're not giving them a chance... And we're not helping enough young mothers.

INT N. 42

Q : Pouvez-vous décrire brièvement vos études et vos expériences professionnelles ?

R : Je m'intéresse depuis une quinzaine d'années aux croyances collectives. Pourquoi? Comment les individus peuvent adhérer à ce qu'ils vont définir eux mêmes comme des croyances. Donc je suis parti des questions liées aux superstitions, aux rumeurs, et je suis arrivé très vite aux thématiques du complot et du complotisme. Mon espèce de fil conducteur est d'essayer de comprendre comment et pourquoi les gens adhèrent à ce type de théories et comment et pourquoi parfois, il n'y adhère pas, mais il s'en revendique. C'est ce que j'évoquais hier rapidement sur l'idée de signal social et on le voit en particulier dans les formes d'extrémisme politique ou de ce qu'on pourrait appeler de la radicalisation, c'est à dire où le complotisme vient comme une espèce d'idéologie complémentaire à la vision du monde qu'ont ces personnes.

Q: Mais donc vous avez étudié Psychologie ?

R : Alors, en fait, j'ai étudié là, j'ai fait en parallèle de la sociologie et de la psychologie. Donc j'ai tout un double cursus de licence et de master en en

psychologie et en sociologie. Et après j'ai fait un doctorat en psychologie sociale qui était la discipline à l'articulation des deux. Voilà. Et ma thèse, ma thèse portait sur les comportements collectifs et en particulier les manifestations. Comment et pourquoi les gens se ralliait à ce qu'on appelait des nexus, donc des espèce d'image qui cristallisait en même temps toute une série de valeurs, d'idéologies, d'attitudes.

Q : Et c'est combien de temps que vous êtes professeur à l'Université de Rennes ?

R : Quinze ans.

Q : Comment avez-vous appris à faire ce que vous faites et avec qui?

R : Alors… c'est une bonne question. C'est compliqué ça. Je dirais que mon premier mentor, c'est mon directeur de thèse, comme beaucoup, qui s'appelait Michel Louis Rouquette, qui est un professeur de psychologie sociale, qui est maintenant malheureusement décédé et qui est celui qui m'a appris à être un artisan de la recherche. Et j'aimais beaucoup l'image qu'il donnait d'artisan, c'est à dire dans un monde qui était déjà en transformation, où on tendait vers une forme un peu industrielle de la recherche, avec un découpage des taches, une uniformisation. Lui, il m'a appris et j'y tiens beaucoup au côté artisan, c'est à dire à celui qui va passer du temps sur son objet, qui va le ciseler et qui va travailler dessus pour rendre chacun de ses objets, chacune de ses recherches uniques. C'est à dire que ce n'est pas une forme d'industrie de à la chaîne. On ne fait pas tous la même chose de la même manière. Et donc c'est ce qui m'a le plus, je dirais, le plus marqué au départ. Ça, c'est le premier point. Et puis après, comme tout chercheur, c'est toutes les rencontres qu'on peut faire qui sont des rencontres de collègues à l'étranger. Vous allez être un bon exemple. Donc, dans tous les pays où j'ai pu aller et en ayant fait mes études à Paris, j'ai eu la chance aussi de rencontrer beaucoup de personnes qui ont fait leur doctorat, qui venaient notamment du Brésil. Raphaël, un de mes meilleurs amis.

Et donc ensuite oui, toutes les rencontres, que ce soit avec des collègues ou les rencontres sur le terrain, c'est à dire avec des détenus, des détenus incarcérés pour terrorisme ou pour radicalisation. Donc, j'interviens régulièrement dans des centres pénitentiaires ou dans des prisons en France. Et donc voilà, ça, ça oriente aussi. Depuis maintenant, depuis maintenant, on est encore en 2023. Depuis six ans.

Ce sont en fait en France, on a un dispositif de de lutte contre la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent en prison, d'accord, qui consiste à mener des programmes sur un semestre, donc, par exemple de septembre à décembre ou de janvier ou de janvier à juin. D'accord. Et sur ce programme là, on va sélectionner entre cinq et dix détenus qui vont assister toutes les semaines à différents ateliers. Donc, il peut y avoir des journalistes qui viennent pour parler de leur métier. Il peut y avoir parfois des Imams qui peuvent venir. Donc moi, j'interviens dans ce cadre là et je vais les voir une, deux ou trois fois, mais par groupes. Donc ce n'est pas on n'est pas dans une relation, on n'est pas dans un travail de psychologie – pas clinique, c'est ça. On est

dans du fonctionnement de groupe. Et donc ça je le fais dans différents centres pénitentiaires en France.

Q: Merci. Pouvez vous décrire un épisode critique de votre travail ? Donc ce qui s'est passé, où étiez vous, avec qui et comment vous vous êtes senti ?

R : Euh ben je vais reprendre un exemple en prison où j'avais un petit groupe de détenus parmi ce groupe. Donc ils sont censés être volontaires pour être là, d'accord, mais comme souvent en prison, le volontariat est très discutable plus qu'ils viennent…. voilà, on leur dit qu'ils peuvent faire ce qu'ils veulent, mais s'ils ne le font pas, ça peut jouer contre eux. Donc ils étaient là et un des détenus était très à l'écart et il ne participait pas du tout. Il était dans une posture fermée, les bras croisés et vraiment très très fermé sur lui. Et moi je faisais, je discutais avec eux, je faisais ma formation, mon intervention et je ne sais pas ce que j'ai dit. Et je pense que je n'ai rien dit de particulier, mais que c'était un trop plein. Il s'est levé brusquement, il a lancé la chaise et et il m'a apostrophé. Et donc là, évidemment, tout de suite, le surveillant qui était dehors est rentré pour essayer de voir ce qui se passait. Donc j'ai dit que tout allait bien, que tout ce qui pouvait sortir. Et donc là, le détenu m'a agressé verbalement en me disant que je ne connaissais rien à ce dont je parlais, qu'est-ce que j'avais déjà vu quelqu'un se faire décapiter ? Est ce que j'avais déjà tuer quelqu'un ? Est ce que j'étais déjà allé sur un terrain de guerre ? Non. Alors pourquoi ? Comment ? Je parlais que de toute façon, moi, le petit blanc qui était ici n'avait aucune connaissance de tous ces sujets là. Et donc là, j'étais un peu déstabilisé, on va dire. Les autres détenus aussi étaient très à l'écoute de ce qui allait se passer, comment est ce que j'allais faire, comment j'allais rétablir la question.

Donc je l'ai laissé parler parce que j'ai senti qu'il avait besoin d'exprimer quelque chose, donc je ne voulais pas intervenir tout de suite. Et donc il a continué en dérivant immédiatement sur le racisme « Vous êtes blancs, forcément, votre vision, et cetera… Là, vous nous parlez, vous venez ici parce qu'on est enfermés, mais sinon dehors, vous ne seriez jamais venu me parler à moi. » Et donc c'est là où j'ai choisi de l'attraper en lui disant que j'étais d'accord avec lui, ce qui est là tout de suite déstabilisant en disant « oui, c'est vrai, dehors, je ne vous aurai jamais parlé », mais j'ai dit dehors, vous ne m'auriez jamais non plus parlé. Et donc là, j'ai commencé à expliquer que bien en réalité, ce n'était pas une question de racisme en tant que telle, c'est que qu'on va se rapprocher de gens qui sont qui nous ressemblent ou qui sont proches de nous, et que si j'étais dans la rue, dehors, ben oui, je ne serais pas allé le voir, mais parce que je ne le connais pas et pas plus que quelqu'un d'autre. Et donc ça, ça a permis aux autres membres du groupe de partir sur ce que j'ai dit, d'évoquer leur cas de racisme, pas de racisme et comment, pourquoi ? Et donc lui, ça, là, il s'est, il s'est assis et physiquement il a rapproché la chaise, il n'a plus parlé du tout, mais il a rapproché la chaise, il s'est remis dans le groupe.

Q : Et comment vous vous êtes engagé dans la prévention ?

R : Alors, je ne m'y suis pas engagé directement. Je veux dire qu'on est venu me chercher, je travaillais déjà sur le complotisme et on était à une période où il y a eu pas mal d'attentats évidemment, et où il s'agissait de prévenir la radicalisation. C'était vers 2015/2016. On est vraiment venu me chercher en me disant… « Les gens qui se radicalisent sont complotistes. Est-ce que vous pouvez venir pour faire quelque chose contre le complotisme? » On a des gens que nous avons arrêtés et qui sont en attente de jugement parfois. Est-ce que vous pouvez lutter contre leur théorie du complot? Et donc ma première réaction était de dire « non, non, je ne peux pas. Non, je ne viendrai pas ». Parce que moi, j'ai fait des études sur la compréhension des mécanismes d'adhésion aux théories du complot, mais pas de djihadistes, pas de personnes dans des idéologies extrêmes. Donc j'ai d'abord refusé. Puis le ministère de l'Intérieur, le ministère de la Justice sont revenus. Vraiment, ce serait bien. Et donc voilà, c'est ça. Et donc là, j'ai mis mes conditions en quelque sorte. D'abord, c'était des formations auprès des personnels de la justice ou des forces de l'ordre, donc formation auprès de gendarmes, formations auprès de surveillants, etc. Donc j'ai dit ça, d'accord, je vais faire ça, mais pas de détenu, pas voilà, je ne suis pas clinicien, je ne vais pas intervenir, donc ça je fais pas. Donc j'ai fait dans un premier temps plein d'interventions sur le terrain, auprès de magistrats, auprès des formations des fois, c'est quoi les théories du complot ? Comment ça marche ces mécanismes psychologiques ? Attention, la radicalisation ce n'est pas un phénomène ou en tout on en rien, c'est un processus. C'est tous les modèles que vous connaissez parfaitement l'escalier machin truc, enfin voilà. Mais auquel ils n'étaient pas vraiment… Ils ne savaient pas vraiment comment ça fonctionnait, donc expliquait un peu l'extrémisme violent, toutes ces questions là. Et puis les choses en entrainant d'autres, ils m'ont dit « oui, mais maintenant il faudrait venir avec nous en fait, discuter avec les détenus ». Et donc là j'ai dit « d'accord, mais premièrement, je ne suis pas clinicien, donc je ne ferai pas de thérapie, je ne ferai pas d'interviews en face à face, ça non ». Et deux, je ne parlerai pas de complot. Parce que si je parle de complot avec eux, ça va dériver sur le conflit israélo palestinien, ça va dériver sur les juifs, ça va et ça ne servira à rien. Donc je viens, mais pour parler des croyances ou pour parler des rumeurs parce que c'est très proche, mais c'est à côté et c'est comme ça que j'ai commencé à intervenir en prison et avec un plutôt bon accueil parce que les détenus ont des choses à dire sur les rumeurs, comment ça fonctionne. Et ça permettait en fait de montrer aussi comment fonctionnent les théories du complot », mais sans en parler. Et c'est eux mêmes qui l'évoquent souvent en me disant « oui mais ça c'est comme les complots ». Ah bon ? Pourquoi ? Comment ? Et donc c'est eux qui en parlent et comme c'est eux qui amènent la question, c'est beaucoup moins politisé. Après voilà, il y a des débats sur ça. Ensuite je ne sais pas l'importance par exemple du hasard puisque la plupart du temps ils sont évidemment très religieux, donc pour eux le hasard n'existe pas. Et comme

pour les complotistes, il n'y a pas de hasard non plus. Donc on trouve. Voilà plein de points communs, on arrive…. Ici, on peut la prendre par je crois… Oui oui, en gros je je vois 80 % de musulmans et 20 % qui sont là pour des faits liés à l'extrême droite, un néo nazi et cetera.

Q : Dans vos propres mots, et très brièvement, comment définiriez-vous la radicalisation?

R : Avec mes propres mots… C'est dur… la radicalisation... Alors déjà, je ne la définirais pas. Oui, vous voulez simple et court. Oui, c'est une extrême et c'est une forme. C'est une extrémisation de croyances, qu'elle soit politique, religieuse, sociale, quel que soit le type aboutissant à une non négociabilité de cette croyance. C'est à dire que je tiens tellement cette croyance qu'elle n'est ni discutable ni négociable. Voilà comment très simplement je la définirais.

Q : Et la violence ?

R : Et alors, justement, pour moi, la violence n'est pas automatique. La violence est le point ultime d'une forme de radicalisation, de non négociabilité, mais n'est pas automatique dans dans ce, dans dans la radicalisation.

Q : Et quels sont les conseils que vous considérez comme liés à la radicalisation ?

R : Ah oui, oui, complot évidemment, aussi morale... En fait, les personnes qui adhèrent de manière radicale à une pensée sont souvent dans une conception très morale, c'est à dire avec l'idée qu'ils ont raison et que c'est le bien contre le mal, quel que soit ce bien et quel que soit ce mal. Donc il n'y a pas, il n'y a pas une forme d'irrationalité dans la croyance. Il y a au contraire une forme de rationalité très élevée, très forte, une rationalité particulière, parce que parfois ça peut conduire effectivement à des actes de terrorisme à tuer. Voilà. Mais il y a une justification. Donc, je dirais, donc, si on prend radicalisation au milieu, on va mettre complot, complotisme, on pourrait mettre morale, qu'est ce que je pourrais mettre groupe ? Parce que les radicalités ne se forment que dans les discussions et dans les interactions. Je ne crois pas qu'un individu puisse se radicaliser seul dans son coin. Et voilà.

Q : Avez-vous déjà rencontré des personnes radicalisées au cours de votre activité ? Et si oui, pourriez-vous m'en dire plus ?

R : Juste peut être pour préciser, parce que même si j'en rencontre, je pense que je faire, je pense, je suis même sûr que les personnes que je rencontre sont des personnes qui sont soit condamnées pour des faits de terrorisme, soit en cours, en cours de jugement. Mais nous ne rencontrons jamais des personnes qui seraient hautement radicalisés ou qui seraient des têtes pensantes du terrorisme. C'est à dire on nous met face à nous des ce qu'on qualifierait de petites mains ou de premières personnes ou en gros faites bien ce que vous voulez avec eux, de toute façon ce n'est pas très grave. Par contre les services de renseignement de l'Etat et cetera vont

garder faire bien attention à celles et ceux qui seraient vraiment les plus dangereux, les plus radicalisés ou les plus terroristes entre guillemets.

Q : Comment fonctionne la collaboration politique, scientifique dans les projets où vous travaillez et quels sont les points forts et les points critiques?

R : Alors en fait, c'est la politique, les politiques qui évidemment nous ont sollicités, nous sollicitent. Seulement, il y a une différence très forte entre le temps politique et le temps scientifique. Eux ont besoin de résultats tout de suite, maintenant. Eux sont liés à leurs électeurs et à leurs électrices, donc à un vote, alors que nous, nous avons besoin de temps pour nos recherches. Nous avons besoin de temps pour nos réflexions et surtout pour ce qui concerne la France. Nous sommes fonctionnaires donc nous ne sommes pas liés à nos résultats. Je me garderais mon poste, que j'obtienne des résultats ou pas. Alors que l'homme ou la femme politique sont liés à leurs résultats. Si ça ne marche pas, ils s'en vont. Donc c'est un premier élément qui est un élément de friction, parce que les attentes ne sont pas les mêmes qu'en plus dans la recherche, on est habitué à ne pas avoir forcément de réponse et à aller chercher quand les hommes ou les femmes politiques arrivent souvent avec des réponses pré établies, en nous disant vous devez faire ça pour obtenir ce que je veux. Mettre les étrangers dehors, faire ceci ou cela, et c'est leur point de départ. Donc les discussions, les échanges sont souvent tendus. Ma position à moi est de respecter une espèce d'éthique ou de déontologie. C'est à dire c'est à dire de ne pas courir après les politiques et de ne pas courir après leur financement. En France, on a un système qui bouge beaucoup, avec des partis qui bougent souvent et je pense que la meilleure position à tenir est celle d'être un scientifique et donc d'être reconnu, d'être reconnu pour ça. Ça veut dire que parfois le gouvernement en place n'apprécie pas forcément ce qu'on fait. Tant pis, En fait, on continue et parfois le gouvernement apprécie plus ce qu'on fait. Et donc voilà, pour le dire concrètement, les projets financés qu'on pourrait avoir sont malheureusement dépendants des politiques. Mais ça me semble important de ne pas modifier en fait ces travaux pour pouvoir prétendre à des financements qui iraient dans le sens d'une je ne sais pas, il faut fermer les frontières, il faut contrôler encore plus les étrangers.

Q : Est ce qu'il y a quelque chose que vous aimeriez faire différemment ?

R : Alors utopie et créativité ? Alors on va partir des moins utopiques et peut être moins créatifs, mais c'est de de travailler beaucoup plus avec les personnes qui sont en contact des individus radicalisés ou en prévention de la radicalisation. En fait, comme je l'expliquais hier dans le symposium, à partir des profs et des élèves, c'est à dire qu'on nous a demandé de venir pour travailler avec les élèves et en fait on s'aperçoit que le travail avec les profs est important. Là, je pense que le travail sur le terrain, par exemple avec les acteurs de prévention de la radicalisation qui ont souvent des bons principes, des bonnes idées, mais qui parfois, en tout cas en France, n'ont pas assez de recul sur la radicalisation. Et donc je pense que voilà un

travail avec, avec les acteurs de la prévention, de la radicalisation, avec les acteurs aussi du système judiciaire classique, serait important. Ça, c'est un premier élément. Et puis le deuxième élément, mais qui serait totalement ce n'est pas utopique, c'est impossible. C'est une capacité à mettre le temps sur pause, c'est à dire le temps politique et le temps médiatique. Être capable d'arrêter le temps politique et le temps médiatique pour que les chercheurs, les scientifiques et les acteurs de terrain, actrices et acteurs de terrain puissent travailler sereinement et ne pas être dans la course à la recherche du financement, dans la course à la publication. Mais voilà, prennent du temps pour se rencontrer dans des colloques, discuter et et ne pas agir. Ce matin, je ne sais pas si vous étiez à la conférence, la première conférence où le collègue que je ne connaissais pas. Il est théologien, il est très sollicité par les médias pour réagir et je le suis aussi. Et les médias ? Souvent, ils nous disent « Je dois publier demain, cet après 12 h, 14 h ». Non, non, pause. Voilà donc une capacité, un super pouvoir. Quand j'étais petit, c'était de pouvoir mettre pause.

Q : Et quelles sont les principales capacités que vous considérez importantes à développer dans les activités de prévention primaire ?

R : Tout ce qui se fait déjà. Ça va paraître bizarre, mais je veux dire par là que je ne crois pas la création d'outils ou de dispositifs qui seraient spécifiques à la radicalisation ou qui seraient nouveaux ou créatifs ou qu'on n'aurait jamais eu. Je crois que le plus important est de continuer dans ce qui concerne la prévention primaire, de continuer tout ce que font déjà les acteurs de terrain, c'est à dire le lien social, c'est à dire la discussion, c'est à dire être sur place, c'est à dire des activités, que ce soit des activités culturelles, des activités artistiques.

La France, pendant un certain temps était très portée sur la question de la citoyenneté. La République…on a inculqué les valeurs de la République et de la citoyenneté. Oui, mais en fait comme avant. Enfin, je ne crois pas que ce soit une baguette magique. Là ils permettent de prévenir la radicalisation, ça ne préviendra pas les communautarismes, ça ne préviendra pas tous ces actes là. Donc il faut faire ce qui s'est fait déjà et ça veut dire très concrètement pour reprendre juste mon Pays, mais c'est continuer à donner de l'argent sur la prévention, quelles qu'elles soient, des discriminations, puisqu'on voit quand même dans tous les modèles de radicalisation que l'une des premières étapes, c'est quand même un sentiment de discrimination, un sentiment d'injustice. Cette injustice, elle va se retrouver. C'est dans le fait que je n'arrive pas à avoir de travail si je m'appelle Mohamed ou si je m'appelle Pierre. Et que ça, c'est quelque chose contre lequel il faut lutter. Et donc donc voilà tout et tout ce qui se fait déjà en fait.

Q : Quelle contribution la Psychologie et la psychologie sociale aussi en particulier peut donner à la prévention de la radicalisation ?

R : Les disciplines sont toutes important pour comprendre différentes entrées. Donc moi dans l'université où je suis, on a deux laboratoires de psychologie, on a un

laboratoire de psychologie dite scientifique, celle où je suis, et on a là un laboratoire de psychopathologie et psychanalyse d'orientation lacanienne que dès la. Que des lacaniens. Et qui travaille aussi d'ailleurs sur la radicalisation, notamment une collègue italienne

Mais voilà, moi, mes connaissances. Souper en France, c'est assez, comment dire, envers une opposition assez forte entre l'orientation analytique psychanalytique et la psychologie scientifique. Donc voilà, je pense que ma collègue sera plus à même de répondre à cette question sur l'intérêt ou l'approche. Je n'y connais pas suffisamment en fait pour pourvoir les éléments essentiels ou importants dans l'approche analytique.

En fait pour moi ma pour moi la psychanalyse va permettre d'interpréter mais ne permettra pas d'agir en amont ni d'expliquer. Elle permet de comprendre un phénomène un peu à la manière de la philosophie ou de la littérature. D'une certaine manière, donc, ça permet de déconstruire le phénomène, mais elle ne permettra pas de savoir agir directement sur le phénomène. Donc, en termes de prévention, ni d'expliquer le phénomène, la psychanalyse ne fait aucune expérience sur le terrain de ce type là. Et si on parle de la pulsion de mort par exemple, elle nous explique simplement que c'est présent chez tout le monde, plus ou moins, etc. Mais rien pour agir directement dessus. C'est pour ça que c'est un cadre qui me semble, moi, plus interprétatif, qui est intéressant pour comprendre. Oui, mais moi dans mes expériences de terrain, j'ai besoin de manipuler des facteurs et de voir sur quoi je peux travailler.

Int. n. 43

D: Non farò proprio tutta la struttura dell'intervista, visti i tempi stretti. Mi può raccontare brevemente il suo percorso di studi e di lavoro?
R: ok, allora… io una laurea in Psicologia clinica che ho realizzato in Italia all'Università di Palermo poi successivamente alla laurea o da parte del tirocinio per essere abilitata alla professione il percorso classico di tom italiano e poi iniziato con un dottorato il mio dottorato era sugli adolescenti autorizzati a grandi linee adolescenti autori di reato è il lavoro fatto nelle comunità e negli istituti penali minorili ed è lì che ho cominciato si cominciava a parlare di radicalizzazione nelle carceri e quindi tra qualcuno dei soggetti della mia tesi cominciava a essere su questo, anche se non è sempre a Palermo ancora il dottorato era in cui tutela tra l'università di Palermo è Paris-8 Università di Parigi e San Denise ed era anche diciamo… interdisciplinare tra virgolette, sempre nell'ambito della psicologia perché era la richiesta del mio collegio di dottorato che ci fossero rappresentati almeno due approcci, due ambiti in psicologia quindi il mio tutor con la mia partita

italiana era più di psicologia clinica e il laboratorio in cui ero affari 18 era un laboratorio di psicologia sociale villa psiche esiste ancora fuori successivamente ho lavorato un po' come psicologa continuando ad avere qualche contratto come può assegnista di ricerca o cose di questo genere in parallelo alcune cose in Italia altre in Francia alternativamente ehm fin quando poi non ho avuto due contratti un po' più lunghi come hater scelto oppure r di receptions a Parigi otto e quindi mi sono stabilmente diciamo sistemata in Francia durante questi contratti a livello di ricerca ho continuato a lavorare sulla questione diciamo della psico-criminologia in generale e sugli autori di reato in particolare ai reati violenti in particolare legati alla radicalizzazione ehm alla fine di questi due contratti di hater o lavorando per un po' come psicologa per l'amministrazione penitenziaria francese quindi con la psicologa in carcere ma su un posto ben specifico non so se ne è seguito un po' in Francia magari no, ma dopo ci sono stati gli attentati… a livello governativo ovviamente c'è stato tutto un movimento di risorse anche per cercare di contrastare questo fenomeno e quindi a livello ministero della giustizia in particolare amministrazione penitenziaria hanno creato un nuovo profilo diciamo di professione che non era lo psicologo che già esercitava in carcere ma era uno psicologo specializzato su radicalizzazione estremismo che lavorava in coppia e non con un educatore specializzato anche lui su questo tema e quindi io facevo parte di questi che si chiamavano psicologa specificatamente sulla questura di valutazione e prevenzione della radicalizzazione in carcere … la gestione della ricerca l'applicazione eccetera e quindi ero abilitata come mezzo tempo a fare questo, quindi come professore associato dal 2018 lavoro specificamente sulla questione della psico-tecnologia proprio sul laboratorio.

D: Mi diceva S. quindi che avete due realtà no lì all'università di Rennes che lavorano con la radicalizzazione. Me le spiega brevemente?

R: Allora… ci sono due il laboratori - un laboratorio che è esclusivamente di psicopatologia psicanalitica perché c'è la scuola lacaniana qui di Rennes che è molto importante, l'altro laboratorio è un laboratorio multi approccio quindi c'è un'equipe di psicologia sociale una psicologia cognitiva e quant'altro e una di psicologia clinica della quale faccio parte che però è più una prospettiva integrativa. Io sono formata sull'approccio sistemico, insomma non diciamo così… noi coordiniamo il master in psico-criminologia e quindi allora specialistica psicofisiologico e attualmente svolge ancora dei lavori in carcere, come fa anche S. – per esempio, formazione del personale dell'amministrazione penitenziaria su varie cose, su strumenti di valutazione al rischio di estremismo e radicalizzazione… di tanto in tanto faccio qualche perizia per il tribunale…

D: Con le sue parole e brevemente, come definirebbe la radicalizzazione?

R: Scelta di aderire in maniera dogmatica… credenze e di cognizioni che portano a situare l'altro come potenziale nemico di cui.. a cui opporsi. Attenzione bene che

questa è la definizione che io do di radicalizzazione che non necessariamente è radicalizzazione che porta alla violenza

D: E come definisce lei la violenza? Si dice sempre radicalizzazione che porta alla violenza… ma cosa intendiamo per violenza?

R: Quindi… la radicalizzazione diventa violenta nel momento in cui si sceglie di utilizzare dei comportamenti che attivamente o passivamente danneggiano l'altro… quindi è violenza sia l'organizzare l'attentato ma è anche discriminare le persone appartenenti a quel gruppo o fare in modo che siano meno valorizzate, meno sia in forma attiva, che in forma passiva per me è radicalizzazione che conduce alla violenza quindi includiamo in questo i discorsi di odio a partire sì e la violenza psicologica sì a tutti gli effetti violenza è incita la violenza degli altri la radicalizzazione no che non è incita alla violenza che non conduce alla violenza sarebbe quella che porta soltanto all'isolamento su se stesso nel quale io decido di praticare in un certo modo ma senza che questo abbia un impatto sull'altro.

D: E quali sono a suo avviso diciamo i punti di forza e di debolezza del lavoro dell'istituzione dove si trova? E se potesse cambiare qualcosa, che cosa cambierebbe?

R: Secondo me è troppo lavoro a compartimenti stagni sia tra le istituzioni secondo me questo genere di fenomeni non solo questo potremmo fare lo stesso discorso sulle violenze domestiche necessita di un legame molto più forte e fluido tra i diversi livelli non si può pensare che il lavoro che tu si fa in carcere sia totalmente svincolato dal lavoro che si fa nelle scuole o che si fa nelle associazioni che si occupano di re-inserimento tramite il lavoro sociale, perché si finisce per creare delle sorta di competizione tra le istituzioni su chi è competente in una materia e chi meno, e poi anche all'interno della stessa istituzione non si può pensare che certamente bisogna differenziare che in carica della valutazione che quindi tra virgolette rende conto anche al magistrato che prende le sue decisioni su questo, da chi si occupa più della cura in senso si può entrare in senso globale, perché sono due tipi di lavoro diverso… ma che i due non comunichino cosa che spesso succede che non comunichino in maniera fluida, secondo me da terreno fertile al fatto nucleare smuove barriere che rinforzano poi la credenza che ci siano cose migliori di altre modi di fare milioni di altri quindi non favorisce poi questo sistema di abbandono di utilizzo della violenza per far valere le proprie idee.

D: Mi può raccontare un attimo la storia di questi due centri?

R: A Rennes sono 23/24 anni che c'è la laurea in psico-criminologia. All'epoca era stato creato l'Institut de Criminologie, e a partire da questa fondazione, si è sviluppata sia la parte accademica, che una rete con ex-allievi che nel tempo si sono inseriti professionalmente…

D: Nell'attività di prevenzione, quali sono le capacità più importanti da promuovere?

R: Empatia, spirito critico, capacità di riconoscere le fonti di un'informazione e il legame cognizione / emozione, quindi la capacità di collegare quello che penso a quello che provo e quindi di conseguenza quello che faccio… intelligenza emotiva, chiamiamola così.

D: Mi interesserebbe sapere adesso per concludere un po' della sua opinione sull'approccio psicoanalitico. Quali concetti della psicanalisi e/o della psicologia a suo avviso possono essere utili per pensare, per comprendere la radicalizzazione?

R: ho lavorato molto sul concetto… sulla questione dell'attaccamento, perché nelle esperienze che ho potuto fare io, con le persone che ho incontrato io spesso quando si parla non solo di aver attaccamento o genitoriale, ma attaccamento in senso lato alla propria cultura alle proprie radici anche su più generazioni eccetera era proprio una défaillance a questo livello che poi lasciava quel terreno fertile su cui si venivano a innestare altre forme di legame di attaccamento, come poteva essere quella ideologica, senza che ci fosse necessariamente una reale comprensione a volte di questo aspetto ideologico, ma costruiva e diventava una base sicura che per diversi motivi a queste persone era venuta meno da qui per difficoltà più di personalità chi per difficoltà nel percorso di vita ma comunque mancava questo concetto di base sicura, di attaccamento sicuro che quindi diventava una un modo per poterla lavorare con loro… sull'identità in queste situazioni. Secondo me, a livello di psicologia, non necessariamente solo psicanalisi classica tra virgolette, questo concetto sarebbe da rimettere un po' in gioco nel lavoro sugli estremismi.

D: Nella sua esperienza ha potuto a verificare dei cambiamenti lavorando su questi aspetti?

R: Assolutamente sì, anche facendo un lavoro basato proprio la questione dell'attaccamento e il trauma, quindi con l'utilizzo del genogramma, di strumenti su questo versante, con persone detenute per terrorismo o reati annessi…

D: Ultima domanda: un commento, visto che è già tanti anni che in Francia, sull'approccio laico francese come vede lei e come percepisce i suoi effetti nel lavoro che svolge in carcere^

R: la questione della laicité in carcere viene discussa molto frequentemente, perché spesso viene fraintesa con "non abbiamo il diritto di praticare le nostre credenze o dimostrarle"… spesso in carcere questa cosa viene accentata dal fatto che le persone tendono a raggrupparsi anche in funzione di queste credenze e quindi diventa subito molto visibile non lo so perché restare su una radicalizzazione islamica del momento della preghiera o il periodo del Ramadam. Nel momento in cui si vado ad applicare un po' la cosa, dicendo che in realtà non è il non poter mostrare le sue credenze maree di lasciare lo spazio sufficiente per cui tutti possano costruire le proprie allo stesso modo, immediatamente le tensioni si abbassano, quindi laicità come libertà di ognuno di poter mostrare sufficientemente le proprie credenze senza

impattare sulla libertà degli altri… visto in questo modo, a livello istituzionale in ambito carcerario passa un po' meglio…

La questione è molto critica per esempio rispetto alla scuola… con il Québec per dire ci sono delle differenze sostanziali - la questione del potere o meno portare il velo nei luoghi pubblici istituzionali oppure che ne so… le persone che sono titolari della funzione pubblica, non hanno diritto di utilizzare eventualmente il velo in qualsiasi sua forma… con le ovvie difficoltà che costituiscono… questo implica… nel momento in cui per esempio c'è l'altro che hai in ciondolo con un enorme crocifisso magari passa un po' più inosservato e viene considerato ornamentale e non ostentazione di culto, allora che immediatamente il velo viene considerato ostentare un culto e quindi no la visita nelle istituzioni pubbliche… in quei contesti lì, crea molta più tensione. In ambito universitario meno, perché essendo maggiorenni… impatta eventualmente noi, noi non potremmo eventualmente farlo, ma gli studenti hanno la libertà di farlo, quindi crea molta meno polemica sulla fascia degli studenti rispetto alle scuole… e in ambito penitenziario, dipendente da come viene posta la questione - come "avete il diritto di… purché questo non diventi un ostacolo a che gli altri facciano la stessa cosa" allora funziona… quando diventa un "no allora nessuno lo fa…" si creano tensioni. In realtà, lo strumento in sé a me sembra sensato e l'applicazione come quasi sempre avviene che creiamo poi negli istituti… i primi essenziali ci sono dei luoghi di culto sì ci sono dei luoghi dei tempi e tutti i culti sono rappresentati tranne quelli eventualmente per i quali non si trova un rappresentante…

(…) in diversi luoghi dove ho lavorato c'era impulso anche dei testimoni di Geova o altre confessioni da considerare anche se a volte erano proprio minoritarie come quantità di persone come affettivi di persone che partecipavano, ma erano tutti ugualmente rappresentati e se c'era una richiesta di avere una fascia oraria per il culto x, nel momento in cui all'esterno si trovava un rappresentante che potesse venire ad animare il momento del culto era sistematicamente accettata non c'erano difficoltà laddove voleva problema è molto più nella gestione del quotidiano lo so le persone di confessione islamica sceglievano il menu vegetariano, perché non esiste un menù senza gli alimenti vietati da quindi sceglievano il menu vegetariano diciamo per compensazione perché era quello che si adeguava di più per evitare gli alimenti che non possono mangiare per una questione religiosa ma quindi si privavano di tante cose che in realtà avrebbero potuto utilizzare ma non c'era una soluzione di compromesso e quindi questo poteva creare in alcuni momenti delle tensioni… ma era più nella gestione della cosa quotidiana che la rappresentanza del culto i tempi perché lì c'era molta equità nelle cose che erano organizzate…

Int. n. 44
P: Poderias me contar brevemente a tua trajetoria de estudos e trabalho?

R: Primeiro eu fui fazer História e fiz a graduação em licenciatura na puc em Minas Gerais. depois eu fui estudar antropologia e aí eu fiz na época eu podia escolher várias áreas trabalhar em vários setores, então eu trabalhei um pouco no museu nacional com o Roberto ... trabalhei em brasília com antropologia cultural... e a minha área foi de trabalhar principalmente estudo comparativo de mitologia, então me interessava por contingência quando eu tava estudando história e me interessava muito cultura popular e fui entrando na área de cultura popular de folclore... aí eu percebi que havia muita proximidade entre o que eu estudava na história, na cultura grega, com o que eu percebia nas culturas afro-brasileiras, por exemplo na religião do candomblé. e aí eu resolvi trabalhar com isso, fazer o estudo comparativo. a partir daí é que eu percebi que a antropologia podia ser útil para minha atual profissão, no campo da educação, não como mais simplesmente na história com matéria e tal, mas como educador... e aí começa esse processo. comecei a trabalhar na universidade federal, na faculdade de nutrição e farmacia... ensinava comunicação e desenvolvimento de comunidade, que era destinado principalmente aos alunos que estavam em fase final de formação - como que eles podiam atuar nas comunidades... e trabalhava com o pessoal da área das ciências sociais com a questão da cultura popular tradicional, comunidade e tal... foi o momento em que eu percebi que eu precisava de ir além da universidade... além do trabalho bem acadêmico, fechado em si mesmo, e comecei a questionar aquele processo... e até que houve a fase de rompimento, quando eu percebi que a universidade queria professores para ensinar; eu queria ser educador que pudesse aprender... tive que sair desse lugar, percebi que eu estava no lugar errado.

nessa área da cultura popular, da antropologia eu percebi que canalizava nessa direção, na busca de um outro caminho que não fosse o caminho fechado acadêmico.... e aí quando eu sai, eu percebi que eu precisava criar um outro espaço... criei o cpcd há 39 anos. é uma instituição de aprendizagem onde essas questões da cultura da educação, dessas coisas todas fazem parte desse processo e desenvolvimento comunitário e aprendizagem... é a isso que eu me dedico.

P: No meu âmbito de pesquisa, que é a prevenção do extremismo violento, da polarização, da radicalização... pensando nisso, gostaria de saber a tua opinião sobre o trabalho do Paulo Freire e em que modo pode ser útil nesse percurso?

R: Paulo Freire propôs uma radicalização, no sentido da origem da palavra... e as raízes né.. aprender o outro na sua intereza e fazer da cultura do outro da sua matéria-prima, de terra... dali partiu processo de transformação de educação, de alfabetização primeiro, depois de aprendizagem, depois de politização, depois de compromisso ético, humano... nisso eu acho que ele foi fundamental, para mim é uma questão de profundidade, de raiz... então é nesse aspecto eu acho que todo pensamento da filosofia freirana ela trabalha com uma lógica, que é a lógica da busca do ser humano cada vez melhor mais solidário, mais completo, mais

amoroso... mais é... mais inteiro mas não é um indivíduo isolado, é o todo, como é que se pode ser para todo mundo então essa noção política não é que ele traz, incorpora do bem estar para todos né e a educação pode ser algo para todo mundo, para nós... ela tem que ser acolhedora, tem que ser generosa... e ele questiona todas essas formas de opressão, até do oprimido que vira opressor... oprimidos também podem reproduzir... o que sempre foi né autoritária, de cima para baixo, que foi seletivo, excludente etc. então eu acho que quando ele fala na pedagogia do oprimido, de quem é esse oprimido em um lugar que tava que que ele tem como como é capacidade de luta de resistência né a esse modelo de opressão é exatamente a cultura né naquilo que se baseia, que é sua origem, a sua socialidade, o seu ambiente, onde ele constrói... criar um laço que é dele, dessa cultura.

Ele trabalhava com a questão da educação popular, no sentido de pensar esses grupos oprimidos que eles pudessem dar um salto e fazer a revolução do conhecimento, a partir da sua cultura e também tivesse um impacto na revolução política e aí de um lado ficou muito essa questão... assim, em determinado momento a gente trabalhava na educação, falava assim "bom, nós trabalhamos com educação popular, que era para fazer frente a essa educação elitista, autoritária, acadêmica... é outra educação, que não fazia parte do calendário nem da linha de pensamento de atuação das escolas...

A ideia de Freire acho era de ir nas raízes dessa cultura popular tradicional , que tem a sua força que se mantém através dos tempos e como é que isso pode ser gerador de transformação, porque o mundo possa ser melhor é para todos então isso sem o processo de ser aceito pelo inclusão dessa cultura nos processos formativos na escola de maneira geral... que pudesse a partir daí você fazer você sair da pedagogia do oprimido e vai passar pela pedagogia da esperança, você vai chegar na pedagogia da autonomia, mas é um processo... não da exclusão, mas é da inclusão permanente.

A forma como isso foi sendo não só entendido, traduzido, interpretado por todos né seja uma linha mais à esquerda ou mais à direita... é começar a questionar e dar outros adjetivos né, quer dizer o que aconteceu nos últimos anos, quando se pensava que ele era defensor de todas as questões de esquerda e comunista, e socialista... essa coisa toda né de sectarização do pensamento não faz parte do trabalho dele, mas da forma como as pessoas quiseram entender.

Paulo Freire nunca entrou na escola, nós nunca vemos na universidade, nos curso de formação a presença da freiriana... quando você estudava taxonomia lá na no curso de formação de licenciatura, se falava de estudioso americano, nunca de Freire. ele entrou pelo lado não pela porta da frente. e foi de fora para dentro, não surgiu dentro da universidade, dentro da academia.

Freire é lido, discutido, mas sempre meio marginalizado ainda.

P: A minha a minha primeira formação foi em Letras no Brasil, na Ufrgs... e eu fui começar a ler a obra do paulo freire aqui há poucos anos atrás, porque no brasil eu nunca tinha lido, nunca ninguém tinha me ensinado sobre paulo freire, nunca ninguém tinha discutido sobre freire nas aulas que eu tive no brasil. lendo sobre a vida dele, eu comecei a pensar... mas se o golpe de 64 não tivesse acontecido, o paulo freire teria mudado não só o brasil mas toda a história da américa latina, não?

R: Realmente foi um corte... no processo que mostrava toda essa potencialidade, essa capacidade de alcance... e como é que essa questão podia depois interferir no sistema formal... a gente percebe também que era um negócio interessante, que quando os militares criaram um mobral e deixou de ter esse pensamento amplo, forte, pra virar método... foi um processo de reducionismo tão grande, que depois se viu que diziam que iriam trabalhar com alfabetização, as pessoas ficavam pegando a cartilha, todo mundo tava trabalhando ainda alfabetização a partir de tijolo, entendeu a palavra geradora do tijolo na mesma produção, perdendo esse sentido mais amplo e eu acho que esse foi um problema. Para Freire, a educação era um instrumento de transformação, não é uma questão simplesmente de um jeito de trabalhar a construção de linguagem, de palavras, mas é que aquilo fazia parte do dia a dia das pessoas, e é como todas as outras decorrentes dessa palavra geradora.

Se reduzido a método de alfabetização, ela não tem esse alcance transformador... eu lembro que eu tive algumas oportunidades de estar com ele. uma delas foi em poços de caldas, quando eu fazia parte de um grupo que foi chamado pela prefeitura de poços de caldas. eles queriam fazer um programa chamado "analfabetismo zero", que foi um grande movimento municipal e ele era o padrinho. tínhamos reuniões e a gente e a primeira questão que ele falou é o seguinte: olha, por favor, não fica adotando o que eu falei, o que eu fiz... quero que você descubra um outro jeito de fazer. então foi muito interessante, porque eu lembro que quando a gente foi trabalhar a formação das equipes e trabalhar com quais eram as possibilidades de trabalhar essa questão da alfabetização, uma das coisas mais interessantes foi que nós fomos atrás dessas pessoas, para tentar identificar aonde que elas estavam e o que que era importante para elas. a gente percebeu por exemplo, qur várias senhoras, inclusive mulheres ricas, mães de políticos, etc eram analfabetas e tinham muita vergonha disso. então queriam ser alfabetizadas em casa, não em grupo na comunidade. eram muito religiosas, mas elas não conseguiam ler a bíblia. elas enganavam direitinho, porque conheciam os canticos de cor. elas queriam aprender a ler para ler a bíblia... então qual era o nosso instrumento? o nosso tijolo... a gente usava a própria leitura da bíblia.

Eu trabalhei alguns anos depois em belo horizonte com um processo aprendido com freire. a gente usava como matéria, nosso livro de didático, os cartazes que eram colocados dentro dos ônibus... as orientações, pequenas coisas... eu lembro que

tinha uma última coluna que se chamava "gentileza urbana", onde eram escritas pequenas regras, como ceder o lugar às pessoas mais velhas, segurar criança no colo, etc. aquela palagra, "gentileza", todo mundo conhecia... e partiamos daí.

A outra questão que também marcou muito da presença com o paulo freire foi que ele foi dar um curso na unicamp. na époc,a eu tinha participado com carlos rodrigues brandão de uma pesquisa no sul de minas e a gente tinha ficado maravilhados com um depoimento riquíssimo de uma lavrador sobre educação. como é que ele, que não aprendeu a ler e escrever, como é que ele vinha com o mundo da leitura, e o depoimento dele o brandão escreveu num texto falando cícero souza e nós transformamos esse esse texto chamado "ciçologia", porque era uma filosofia de vida, de quem trabalhou sempre, a vida inteira, na enxada acha uma caneta muito pesada entendeu então era muito complicado ir até a escola... e eu lembro que esse texto o brandão colocou à disposição... e o freire chegou no curso e falou que o curso dele ia ser baseado naquele texto de três páginas... porque ele nunca tinha lido uma coisa tão nteressante, que é tão transformadora como pensamento inovador.

P: Gostaria de te pedir um último comentário, sobre sobre a situação atual do Brasil e o próximo futuro

R: A questão das comemorações que foram feitas mais recentemente da morte paulo freire, essas coisas todas... desde o início do governo bolsonaro, uma dessas questões que vem falando era detirar mesmo paulo freire da escola, que é comunismo, era colocar o coronel ustra, essa comparação de freire como símbolo da esquerda ubversiva... então foi puxado como demônio, foi uma questão que afetou muitos governadores, que inclusive começaram a discutir para mudar nome de escola... em vários lugares, bolsonaristas eles queriam tirar o nome de escola dedicada a freire... e isso levantou do outro lado da academia, na esquerda os partidos políticos, para a necessidade de defendê-lo. de uma certa forma o bolsonarismo, que tentou atacar o pensamento do freire, deu atenção a ele porque muitos andavam adormecidos... porque a esquerda também não falava mais sobre ele, então foi trazidonovamente para a discussão. a quantidade de seminários, a quantidade de palestras, de exposições que ocorreram... então acho que isso trouxe a necessidade mais de aprofundar nisso e entender freire nessa dimensão mais profunda, não simplesmente como um método.

Inclusive Freire é muito util hoje - a lógica dele estaria batendo de frente à educação com essa tecnologia exacerbada... há esse movimento agora mais recente, de resgatar e discutir Paulo Freire....também para discutir uma educação no sentido desse lado humanitário, ambientalista, eu acho que tem muito essa essa pegada né da defesa do meio ambiente, da questão do planeta e tal eu acho que é por onde paulo freire ainda se mostra também muito presente e como potencial muito grande - de mostrar caminhos, opções.

Int. n. 45

P: Poderias me descrever o teu percurso de estudos e de trabalho?

R: Sou de 1954, nasci em Ribeirão Preto (São Paulo). Me mudei para a capital cedo, depois estudei psicologia em São Caetano, fiz mestrado sobre memória na Puc-sp, formação em psicanálise na frança e doutorado na Usp.

Decidi fazer pesquisa sobre o racismo quando estava tratando um paciente que havia perdido parte da massa encefálica num acidente. ele perdeu a memória imediata, ele tinha dificuldade, mas tinha muita memória passada. era uma pessoa que havia perdido tudo, era um alto executivo que de repente em função do acidente havia perdido o cargo, os afetos, tudo. um belo dia que estava com muita raiva, muito bravo, porque lembrava algumas coisas e outres não. ele tava muito bravo e ele queria me agredir né... e ele começa a ser tão agressivo, dizendo para mim "você sabia que os negros não podiam sentar nos ônibus dos estados unidos se tivesse alguém branco em pé..." obviamente o ataque dele era direto a mim, e a partir daquele momento eu pensei: meu doutorado vai ser em função dessa questão, como essa questão de uma pessoa que tinha perdido a memória imediata mas se lembrava disso... se lembrava do racismo. no final da sessão ele me pediu desculpas e ele disse "mas eu queria agredir você, eu me lembro que nós vivemos num país que é racista... e eu já fui racista... hoje com o seu trabalho eu quero pensar sobre isso, eu quero conversar com você a respeito disso... e assim foi. nós conversamos muito, então eu resolvi fazer o doutorado que tivesse uma questão para pensar: a questão meta psicológica do racismo. como que funcionava o racismo, quais as configurações psíquicas o racismo produzia para mim e aí a partir da minha experiência clínica eu começei a trabalhar essa questão. Comecei a trabalhar essa questão não só porque é uma questão que me toca pessoalmente, enquanto mulher negra, mas eu queria entender o que se passava a nivel meta-psicológico. ou seja, o que acontece nesse processo de formação do sujeito. Aí eu escrevi um trabalho de tese que a princípio se chamava "a cor do inconsciente", mas minha orientadora na época não aprovou. Foi mudado então para "significações do corpo negro". Foi uma sugestão dela, porque ela achava que !a cor do inconsciente" iria criar muita polêmica. ela dizia "nós vamos arrumar uma encrenca com os psicanalistas se a gente colocar esse titulo". Mais de 20 anos depois, publiquei o trabalho e dei o titulo original, com o subitulo sugerido pela professora.

P: Uma das principais perguntas que eu gostaria de fazer é baseada nas críticas que se fazem à psicanálise, enquanto etnocêntrica. Freud ele era um homem branco europeu que queria universalizar as experiências humanas, como se todo mundo

tivesse experiência como os europeus e como branco. o criticos dizem também que tem muito pouco na obra dele sobre sobre política, sobre os traumas coletivos, sobre o trauma conectado à colonização e à escravidão. eu gostaria de saber a tua opinião

R: Eu respeito essas criticas, mas não estou de acordo. a psicanálise é um instrumento importante para a gente refletir e trabalhar o psíquico. Eu acho complexo, é um universo ao qual eu pertenço e gosto muito. Tem um movimento cada vez mais forte de popularização da psicanálise. Freud chegou a pensar as clínicas públicas, como seria trabalhar com clínicas de psicanálise de fácil acesso a todos. com a chegada de Lacan e pos-Lacan, a sociedade de psicanálise se fechou bastante... realmente virou um movimento elitista, mas eu vejo que na contramão desse elitismo, também já se popularizou tanto que aqui a gente tem um trabalho importante na clínica pública, no serviço publico.

Eu não penso que deveria ter uma teoria específica para pensar o ser humano – cada disciplina dá a sua contribuição. no brasil fala muito em fazer uma psicologia preta... a psicanálise é a psicanálise, é um instrumento de leitura do funcionamento psiquico do ser humano. eu penso que seja importante que seja uma teoria para pensar a condição humana em geral, as especificidades são enfrentadas ao interno do percurso analitico.

A critica sobre o eleitismo é real; no entanto há também um movimento contrário, que tenta questionar e pensar diferente.

P: E o que tu pensa desse conceito de trauma conectado à colonização e à escravidão?

R: A colonização com certeza foi traumática, para que a colonização se desse da forma em que ela se deu, ela desconsiderou a humanidade daqueles que foram escravizados. a escravização dos negros não foi a unica escravização na historia da humanidade... desconhecer a humanidade dos ecravizados permitia toda a violencia possivel e imaginavel. foi um rpocesso violentissimo para os escravizados – no brasil principalmente os negros... tentou-se escravizar os indios, mas não deu certo. na verdade agora nós chamamos os povos originários (visto que a palavra "indio" é associada ao incapacitado) quando chegaram os colonizadores, eles tinham uma identificação com o solo com o lugar, né, uma cultura que acontecia neste lugar... os negros são trazidos da áfrica, eles são arrancados da sua terra original, são brutalizados já no transporte, porque era uma forma de ir desconstruindo a humanidade e a cultura deles... eles não vinham de uma só região - um navio negreiro como se chamavam (a maior companhia de tráfico de escravos era inglesa). eles tinham um propósito de colocar.... uma uma tática, digamos uma técnica de colocar juntos negros de diferentes tribos, que portanto não falavam a mesma língua, não tinhas a mesma cultura, os mesmos costumes, etc... isso ja croava uma rivalidade entre eles, isso não permitia que eles fizessem uma unidade... para poder para fazer um motim, por exemplo, né.. eles não se reconheciam um aos

outros... isso é o narcisismo das pequenas diferenças.o tráfico já vergava o negro na sua condição humana: desumanizava, animalizava.. nós temos aqui no brasil um estudo feito por um médico francês chamado louis conti, aonde eles fazem uma observação natural né do grande de juros negros e ele justifica que os negros eram serem semi-umanos, eles não são capacidades de aprendizado, não tinham tinha necessidade de formar familia, não tinham uma relação de moralidade não sentiam dores... portanto podiam ser castigados... e eram pessoas naturalmente com propensão ao alcolismo. isso é um estudo que está na biblioteca nacional, inclusive cito no meu livro. esse estudo serviu inclusive de amparo para medicina até os dias de hoje – ele era um médico... então isso tem efeito até hoje... por exemplo, no sistema de saude do estado, as mulheres negras recebem menos anestesia como partoriente do que as mulheres brancas, porque a ideia é de que o negro não sente dor fisica. para qualquer procedimento se aplica menos anestesia no negro do que no branco. são conceitos que permaneceram, a brutalização do negro foi sempre uma uma forma da manutenção do racismo. hoje o racismo ele compõe o tecido social... ele está na língua né então ele não é algo que você diferentemente do que aconteceu em outros países... em qualquer país onde o negro foi escravizado, ele foi também desnaturalizado, ele deixou de ser o ser humano para ser um semi-humano que podia ser explorado. E isso serviu para manter a perversa fantasia de superioridade dos brancos.

Obviamente isso vai produzir uma configuração psíquica completamente diferent, para os negros e para os brancos. hoje há uma proposta de discussão do racismo na qual eu acho que se levará décadas e décadas - você não desconstrói um tecido tão facilmente assim, uma sociedade que foi fundada e baseada no racismo, no trabalho escravo... nas periferias e os doentes mentais... durante muitos anos, antes da luta contra os manicomios... durante muitos anos, haviam os dispensários , os manicômios do estado e o manicômio tinha sua maior população entre os negros. e não foi um processo aleatorio. Todo o processo de escravização foi um processo também de enlouquecimento da população negra. para não se pensar...

A população negra no Brasil ela psicotisa e e ela sofre mais com problema mentais do que os brancos, por causa de todas essas dinamicas, o negro não tem um lugar, o negro não pode manter o seu processo identificatorio saudavel, porque se identifica com o medo, com a angustia e com o desejo dos pais de brancura... então a identidade negra é um processo sempre de construção e deconstrução, simultaneamente. por isso que há algo que beira o enlouquecimento. porque você tem permanentemente essa tensão.. por exemplo, eu sou uma psicanalista conhecida, reconhecida, professora doutora pela universidade de são paulo, moro num bairro de classe média alta ,tenho o meu consultório nesse bairro.. às sextas-feiras eu coloco o branco, visto branco por uma questão étnica, cultural, religiosa.. subindo para o meu consultório, estou no elevador e uma senhora me pergunta:

"você pode me indicar uma babá?" porque estava de branco.... ela me viu babá, mas não me viu psicanalista, professora, doutora. então, você tem permanentemente esse processo de desconstrução do que te identifica na vida, como pessoa, como ser humano... permanentemente, por exemplo, uma outra ocasião: eu fui comprar uma cadeira para o meu consultório numa rua famosa aqui em são paulo chamada de teodoro e sampaio que vende móveis. quando eu entrei na loja, tinha um casal comprando, uma loja enorme, tinha um casal comprando e a bolsa da senhora estava no sofá. um vendedor atendendo, outro vendedor sentado.. daí de repente quando o senhor me viu, ele segurou a bolsa, o outro vendedor veio na minha direção e me perguntou "o que a senhora quer aqui?"

Naquele momento, eu era uma ladra, não uma psicanalista que foi comprar uma cadeira. então esse processo de deconstrução da identidade, que eu acho que funciona como um fator disruptivo... produz configurações muito diferentes... você tem que provar o tempo todo quem você é... e como que eu poderia provar no das duas situações que acabei de descrever, que eu sou... eu não ando com meu certificado da sociedade psicanalitica de são paulo... como eu provaria ser quem sou? para aquelas pessoas eu era uma ladra, alguém que traria um prejuizo.

P: Na sua opinião, no âmbito da minha pesquisa... então falando sobre a prevenção digamos do extremismo violento, a prevenção da radicalização, qual é o papel que fica na análise pode ter?

R: Na verdade, eu acho que a psicanalise nos ajuda a entender o modo como as relações vão se dando. nesse sentido, acho que ajuda a refletir sobre como a sociedade constroi e construi seres tão violentos. A violencia serve ao processo civilizatorio, no sentido do dominio do outro. isso é o que eu penso... a violência, ela tem como como base o domínio, ela tem como propósito o medo, e portanto a submissão do outro, quer dizer quanto mais violento uma pessoa um grupo ou uma uma tradição religiosa... mais ela consegue uma certa forma oprimir. a violência tem como função oprimir o outro. a violência é um processo... ela não serve digamos à tranquilidade da sociedade ou à possibilidade de acesso de todos, porque quem pode se defender da violência, se defende, criando muros altos, nos condominios... e os outros, a grande maioria é submetida à violência. a violência tem o propósito da dominação. Eu acho que é psicanálise nesse sentido poderia nos ensinar ou nos ajudar a entender como é que se forma o radicalizado ou o terrorista. eu acho que o terrorismo não é algo aleatório que surgiu do nada, mas tem um histórico. Atrás dos grandes desatres e das grandes violencias, voce tem um historico, um rastro de violencia. A violência ela, ela produz mais violência. a guerra por exemplo   é algo que nos assusta muito, porque é a violência pela violência. O que interrompe ou pode interromer essa violência?

O tempo todo nós vivemos... a minha geração viveu a ameaça da guerra fria... e que haveria um botão nos estados unidos, um botão na união soviética naquela ocasião

que eles podiam apertar e destruir todo mundo. Enquanto isso na verdade serviu como uma forma de equilíbrio de forças. haviam duas forças contrárias que podiam acabar com o mundo, então também a violência está a serviço desse equilíbrio de uma maneira ruim, claro que não positiva, né de uma forma muito ruim, destrutiva, mas ela é muito usada para isso né quer dizer quanto mais ogivas por exemplo no país, mais ele quer ter, né porque significa um poder de destruição muito grande e só ameaça contém boa parte de ambos os lados. Porque se os Estados Unidos resolve usar a bomba atômica agora, nesse conflito que a gente esta vendo, entre russia e ubìcrania, seria um horror, mas por que ninguém vai la?... O dificl para o Putin é de repente ter que contar com o mundo todo apoiando a ucrânia de uma certa maneira, armando a ucrania, e ele tendo que esticar esse conflito.

 A violência, a psicanalise acho que nos mostra muito isso: à medida em que você vive um contexto de violência, um contexto violento você tem grandes chances de ser também... de produzir violencia. não quer dizer que todos... por exemplo, nós os negros vivemos vivemos num esquema social de puro terror... os jovens negros não podem sair direito no sábado à noite, porque podem ser assassinados... eu não sei o quanto você tem contato com a mídia brasileira, mas há um mês atrás mais ou menos, uma ex-jpogadora de vôlei implicou o entregador de comida, ele era negro, ela tira a coleira do cachorro e começa a chicotear ele... ele não reage, porque se ele reage, poderia ser pior para ele, mas ele se vê muito humilhado... e foi uma comoção no país... mas eu acho que isso explica... não saiu ainda do inconsciente coletivo desse país o lugar do negro... o negro é esse escravo que pode ser chicoteado.

E ainda hoje, quando a polícia prende um homem negro, ele é surrado... recentemente, historicamente falando... no passado é um policial matou uma mulher negra que ele colocou o joelho no pescoço dela, como o George Floyd. Ela morreu por asfixia. essa cultura de violência em relação ao negro, ela permanece em qualquer continente do mundo, porque para onde ele para onde ele foi, ele foi escravizado.

Em termos psicanaliticos, a gente consegue entender os papéis de cada um, como cada um é afetado nesse processo do racismo. todos nós somos racistas, eu costumo dizer, a diferença é de que lugar nós estamos. O racismo em relação ao negro, faz com que ele se auto-destrua, que ele queira se auto-desconstruir para ser branco. E o racismo em relação ao branco, é destruir o negro para não perder a sua identidade racista, porque se tudo se misturar... então para fazer uma leitura mais profunda, a psicanálise nos ajuda, nos clareia nesse sentido. As consequências disso ou a disponibilidade para isso...

Dia 29 de abril eu apresentei um trabalho no congresso internacional de psicanálise, posso mandar para você... uma psicanalista branca, uma senhora de Portugal acusou um psicanalista brasileiro de ser racista. Isso dentro de um congresso da Ipa, da sociedade de psicanálise. Então...isso costuma acontecer, e aí nisso a gente vê esse

conlflito, que está emtodas as instâncias da sociedade, todas as classes... eu apresentei o meu trabalho foi muito bem acolhida, aplaudida... ele, quando foi falar na questão racial, deu uma confusão enorme... ele é um homem negro gaúcho... então acho que nesse sentido, mesmo que hajam muitos conflito, é tempo dos psicanalistas pensarem nessas diferenças - não só em relação aos negros, mas em relação aos povos originários,   os estrangeiros todos... porque os estrangeiros também sofrem muito com a discriminação. a diferença é que o estrangeiro ele ainda tem um lugar um pouco melhorado em relação ao negro, que chegou escravizado.

Mas o estrangeiro, a figura que migra, ela nunca é muito bem-vinda em qualquer sociedade em todos os tempos, porque ela trata uma cultura diferente ela traz habitos e costumes diferentes... e é difícil... o ser humano não aceita o outro tão facilmente. è uma ilusão, eu acho que o freud coloca bem isso com o narcisismo das pequenas diferenças: da nossa dificuldade em conviver com a diferença. esse conflito das diferenças é uma forma de encontrar um depositário para tudo aquilo que não é bom dentro do grupo dominante. Então, o negro vai ser o ladrão, vai ser o golpista, é o que não merece, é o desnaturalizado em relação ao branco, que é sempre a melhor pessoa possível e imaginável. è uma forma dos grupos dominantes de se manter, de dominar, porque tudo o que nesse grupo, que se mantém coeso narcisiticamente, tudo aquilo que não serve desse grupo é depositado no outro grupo.

Essas diferenças são importantes para a manutenção da hegemonia, da elite que mantém o poder. além disso, no caso do negro, a brancura é um desejo impossível de ser atingido, mas nós funcionamos nesse registro porque a sociedade perversamente nos coloca nesse registro de desejar a brancura. como o branco também deseja a brancura, a diferença é que o branco tem uma condição natural para a brancura, ser branco... e o negro não tem. entendo aqui a brancura como tudo aquilo que está na excelencia – a excelencia cientifica, a excelencia artistica, etc.

O negro biologicamente não consegue cumprir esse papel, então à medida que ele não dá conta de cumprir, ele volta para si, para destruir a marca... por isso a cor do inconsciente... a marca que o coloca como negro... e nessa destruição da marca, ele se auto-destrói. isso em qualquer cultura, foi o que aconteceu com o Michael Jackson, por exemplo.

P: E nesse momento, tu trabalha só como psicanalista ou tu tem alguma conexão com a universidade?

R: Eu tenho varias conexões com as universidades, ensino em seminarios. ensino também numa escola de formação psicanalitica.

P: Sobre a critica da psicanalise ser pouco engajada politicamente, o que podes dizer?

R: Durante muito tempo, a psicanalise no brasil serviu uma elite que não tinha interesse de se posicionar proliticamente. tanto é que tivemos um psicanalista que ficou famoso durante a dituadura, depois do o golpe de 64 porque ele trabalhava para os militares, etc. também eu acho que isso vem mudando, os psicanalistas vem se posicionado cada vez mais politicamente... eu acho que é importante sim, agora a gente tem que se posicionar...

em função da psicanálise está voltada para uma classe social digamos, abastada, uma classe social dominante... essa classe nunca questionou o proprio modo de pensar. as pessoas muito ricas, elas pairam na sociedade, elas não precisam se posicionar... e ao mesmo tempo, impõe o seu próprio padrão de vida... como a gente teve o terror, de quatro anos com o Bolsonaro aqui.

P: Mas além da classe dominante, para mim é uma coisa bem chocante assim, estando fora há tantos anos, ver como uma grande parte da população apoiou e continua apoiando quem diz coisas extremamente absurdas... para mim isso ainda é um choque...

R: Eu acho que... quando o Lula ganha pela primeira vez, em 2002, e também pela segunda vez, a gente achou que tinha passado esse extremismo de direita... mas de repente a eleição do Bolsonaro nos trouxe uma outra realidade... 50% da população apoia o Bolsonaro, mesmo ele tendo feito tudo o que ele fez, e mesmo ele sendo o bandido que ele é... ainda se apoia ele..

P: Tem a expressão, né, "fechado com Bolsonaro" ...

R: Exatamente... mesmo que ele faça toas as contravenções possiveis e imaginaveis, ele ainda é lider para muitos... o que ele representa é exatamente a eliminação dos pobres, dos negros...a violência... ele é contra as mulheres...

e aí, esse país é conservador... o que nos assustou agora, depois de 4 anos de Bolsonaro, é entender que esse país é um país conservador, totalmente conservador... não é um pais mais à esquerda, ou progressista. estamos ameaçados de que passados os quatro anos de lula, que a gente tenha que se deparar com isso novamente..

P: Ele teve quase 50% dos votos no segundo turno... e o congresso...

R: O congresso nacional é bolsonarista! O que aconteceu foi que o sistema judiciario se deu conta dos horrores que ele fez... só por isso o lula ganhou. Porque ele havia começado a destruir o sistema judiciario, a corromper a policia federal, ele corrompeu tuto...

P: Ultima pergunta: um comentario sobre o Paulo Freire

R: É bom a gente ter uma pessoa na educação como ele, pois o Paulo Freire é para nós... um grande pedagogo, educador, com ideias maravilhosas, que transformou esse pais... aqui em São Paulo, uma das estações do metrô vai se chamar Paulo Freire, mas o governador já queria tirar... nós ganhamos na justiça, porque lutamos

ganhando na justiça que o metrô chama-se talvez porque a gente quer se lembrar dele...

O Freire era visto pelos bolsonaristas como um esplendor digamos assim da esquerda. ele trouxe outra possibilidade da educação, uma possibilidade de trabalharmos com componentes daqueles que vão passar pelo processo de alfabetização e de conhecimento... da valorização do povo, com a sua cultura, com o seu lugar... o paulo freire nos deu uma cara eu acho, como povo brasileiro. a nossa cultura, o nosso modo de ser de estar, a partir de Paulo Freire, na educação mudou tudo

P: Se o golpe não tivesse acontecido, e se ele pudesse ter a concretizado todo o plano da alfabetização e já tava com o João Goulart já tinham programado o nascimento de mais de 200 círculos em todo o Brasil não só a história do Brasil, mas a história da América Latina e a história do mundo inteiro, teria sido completamente diferente, não?

R: Eu penso como você. Eles trataram de riscar o Paulo Freire, mas as ideias dele são muito fortes, as coisas muito fortes não se acabam. Eu acho que mesmo tendo passado 4 anos... digamos de terror com esse... não gosto muito de falar o nome dele... eu acho que as ideias do Paulo Freire são mais fortes. Elas são necessarias para o pais avançar. E nós retornamos na educação agora com o Lula... acredito que ele foi uma das figuras grandes desse pais, que merece ser pensado e discutido como essa grande figura que foi... que é para nos. e acho que os psicanalistas todos concordam com isso – pelo menos, a grande maioria! Os psicanalistas que são a favor da democracia. Há também quem esteja mais proximo ao b, e não combinam com a psicanálise. Afinal, Freud e a psicanalise descontroi um pouco essa coisa... sendo Freud judeu, que sofrei o que sofreu... ele tratou de pensar uma psicanálise se fosse contrária ao nazismo, ao fascismo...costumo dizer que a psicanálise é uma coisa, os psicanalistas são outra completamente diferente.

APPENDIX II – FOCUS GROUPS

FOCUS GROUP N. 1

Writing exercise n. 1: About names (They were not registered, to respect the participants' privacy. It was used only as a warm-up and to allow participants to present themselves to the others)

Writing exercise n. 2: "Radicalization"

P1: Okay, but I wrote this: It is the perception of extreme feelings and manifestation of thoughts explicitly opposite to the others known. Personally, I think it is a provocative way of describing unacceptable reactions to uncomfortable differences.

P2: For me, it depends on the subject. I give you an example. Religion is a good thing. But if it goes too much in a radical side, it's dangerous. (…) And in the negative side, if the society has no religion, it uses, it basically has no values or whatever. So, for me, it's the best way to keep it. Not too low, not too high, somewhere in between, not too much value, not zero value.

P3: Radicalization appears to be a preoccupation in Quebec, in Europe at the moment, in psychiatry. As I have lived in Montreal since 1967, my exposure to the FLQ crisis, including the murder of the government minister, etcetera, and we all know of the events of 9/11 and the impact on North America and Europe as this disturbed the fantasy that violence of radicalization was not a "here" but a "there" phenomenon. However, clearly indigenous genocide, slavery and violence, civil rights movement, the military industrial complex of Vietnam War, Malcolm X, etcetera is not as far away, but rather present historically and with discontinuities of identity and agendas of diversity within a functional democracy versus ruptures of the fabric of identity. Psychiatry has particular threads, but the political social body inequities and social tensions are implicated.

Writing exercise n. 3: Thinking about Radicalization and violent extremism, please write the following title: "If I had a magic wand…"

P1: Uh, I would give it to a child to use it. I don't believe pronto is a change, but gradual and constant work. Radicalization is just a way of focusing and tagging behaviors. If we can't live respectfully with our human behaviors, let's take actions and help the next ones to not repeat the same problems.

P3: If I had a magic wand, I'd engage children in violent neighborhoods in Jamaica in our Project Dreamer World… I would change also the violent place where I was born. Children should be actively engaged, in fact, in what make it possible to be a person in this world. What we would leave out, what we would include. So social determinants of poverty, inequity, not being a person of significance is a painful

reality that these children lived, I should say, and presented conditions for radicalization. Radicalization is a risk. It's implicated within certain internal and external conditions and deeply interested in the repair of ruptures, the conditions for resilience.

P2: I am from Libya, so I will speak from my experience… I am critical about the American government and the British government… they allow themselves to attack nations like Iraq, like Afghanistan, like Syria, like Libya, to change government for their purposes. And from what I have seen in real life, they stole the wealth, like money, gold, resources they have there. And now they've been stealing, for example, Libya. They've been stealing oil and gas since 2011 until today. And from the way they do it the to the subject, they bring a group of criminals they used to fight in Afghanistan and Iraq ... Libya today is controlled by ISIS. I cannot change it because the Americans are behind them and the British are behind them. The American and the British, they have the media, so they control what they do in the media. They make me the criminal. They make them the people who spread democracy and the good people and stop there and the way of control. So, whoever control the media is, is the one who could make people criminal, whatever radicalized group for their own purposes. So, if I had a magic wand, I would try to tell the truth no matter what, no matter what the political or economic interests are.

M: P1, do you want to share your impressions?

P1: I just don't have anything to add right now, so... I'll wait for the

M: P2?

P2: To elaborate on what was said? I think it's very powerful because it's built out of your home and your country and your roots and the terrible violence following 9/11 and the ideological issues that are going on right now are indeed a huge issue for us – it is difficult to distinguish false information from true information... My work is primarily with children and families, but I have to say that the radicalization of Quebec and its interest amongst my colleagues in radicalization here does concern me a lot. And I think about it because I think of it as a process since the 60s till now, how psychiatry starts to infiltrate these issues and start to treat this as an individual illness rather than a collective phenomenon, and therefore approaches it in a way that I find very dangerous and very difficult to actually deal with… because I think it's something that implicates all of us, which is how do we build, how do we speak truth to power? How do we build authenticity? How could we build safety, cultural safety to speak in a world that where it is not that safe to speak? It's not even safe to be different? So, I'm very interested in how we would create much safer spaces for children to actually comprehend that nobody is the same. Diversity is a huge problem in Quebec, which is very sad because this particular city, which I love very much, Montreal, was a very different city in the 60s than it is right now. And it could have been a fabulous city. It could have been the world

leader actually in diversity. And instead... it's dealing with people who look backwards at history and are preoccupied with certain issues which unfortunately determine the political agendas of the day. And that has tensions with another part of the society which is not which is building actively something that is about a healthy democracy and diversity. So these tensions are very interesting to me. How does one look at a situation where we're limiting knowledge, rewriting history, teaching a history that is not even true And it's, you know, and not promoting arts and not promoting imagination, because I think arts are extremely important in healing in such a society.

And it's not very safe to have dialogue where you have such a powerful shadow of this kind of homogeneity of ideological waves. And I feel very sad about that. I feel incredibly sad about it because I come back and forth. I really feel driven out of Quebec as somebody who had a very different point of view and was doing very, I thought, very important work in cultural psychiatry and global health. And I did not feel welcome in this society. And my family has been here for more than 100 years. So, I think it's about difference and it's about comprehending. That difference can be a gift and it's turned into a poison or a tension and distance. So, I'm very preoccupied with what the counter is to that. Like what are the conditions under which this fabulous place, which is full of potential for safety and peace and so on, how it might progress to tolerate difference and diversity rather than homogeneity and nationalism.

M: P1, she arrived in the 60s. You arrived a year and a half ago. So, can you tell can you share your impression of Montreal and think also about your realities?

P1: Sure. Um, thank you for opening this little space. I also, because I have lived in other places before, I tend to be optimistic about living somewhere else as a different person. Uh, in the same way, I can also say that probably I've never had so many conversations and small incidents since, uh, in a little, in such a short time arriving to a new place. So, somehow I agree with the feeling that was just described or the scene that you just described. I'm new to this place and I feel it's not easy to find our way here, no matter your status, no matter what your, uh, well, of course where you come from. But what for me, what should matter is like not just how different you are, but also what are you willing to contribute and not be prejudged just for whatever place you are coming from or whatever? I don't know. I don't think nobody is taking any other opportunities here, but I think there's a big tension around this, this place. I wasn't expecting it and I just wish to, uh, to try and to try to have the opportunity to, to talk more with people, which is hard, especially with Quebec people. It's really, really hard to, to keep conversations long and to kind of talk deeper into their feelings. So that's kind of an abstract of the perception that I

have here. But I wish for the well of this place and to make it make it a home, uh, sooner or later.

M: I know about your work, but they don't. Before you go [P1 had to leave early], can you just share a bit of your artist work and what you have been doing here?

P1: Well, my artist work is a mixture between teaching and making art. So, I use artistic strategies in my teaching practice to try to open or dismantle a little bit the, the hard structures of teaching and the power relationships in the in the school place. So, I'm researching on radical pedagogies and I'm researching on concepts that could be helpful like in discipline and many, many other practices that probably because they come from Latin America, basically a very oppressed place, I try to put them in action in my in my teaching and while I'm researching art education and here I'm looking forward to start activating some of these, uh, of these reflections in, in this mixture of, of teaching and artistic practice. My practice is pretty much social. So, I work collaboratively, I work in social, social spheres, public spaces as well. The core of my work is pretty much a matter of relationships. I mean, I also use studio work, but that's what social relationships is what keeps me the most in the time in art. I don't know if that was really.

M: Last thing that I ask you before you go, can you explain to them the installation that you have done here about the obstacles? It was very interesting

P1: Yeah, sure. We have this short residency for teachers and artists as well. And we made some collaborative works, especially a multimedia installation that you were able to see last Saturday. But simultaneously, each of us made some other little works and I made a work. There was a recycling, discarded materials, like office materials… it's as creative recycle, creative… and I turned them into like a blackboard. So, I painted them in with black blackboard paint and asked the participants to name an obstacle. And the pieces work to enunciate an obstacle is not a complaint, because in our discussions and experiences we face that. Exactly. It's a good point actually. Then the naming of obstacle was pretty much interpreted as a problem in our workplace or something that put us in risk or something that is uncomfortable, but not just for us, but for the whole environment. Institution, sometimes even for students. When a student hears a teaching, a teacher mentioning something that is probably not right or not working well or not working optimally, there's always a tension there. What is not working around that whole machine of education? So, I invited people to just enunciate different obstacles in a more, let's say, a more relaxed way, not seeing them as compliance, but a more as a creative moment to activate what could be an opportunity. For me, an obstacle is another material in art as it is in the classroom. So I think just another material depends how

you use it, what will be the output of that. So yeah, that was pretty much what you see in that room is, yeah, the outcomes of those, those little gestures. Yeah.

P2: I mean that he lives here and he feels what it is about Quebec that is really toxic. And it is. It's a very toxic place. This is an appallingly racist and difficult society to live in. And I'm so glad I don't live here anymore. But I love this place. I love so many people in it. And I come here to teach and it is the same stuff all the time about me.

P3: I came to Quebec in 1992. For me, the people of Quebec are very nice. Yes, but two things: the government and the workplace are the problem. It is the collective.

When you want to work, then they don't look about your degree, your education, how professional you are, your experience. They look who you are. That's right. And I have a PhD degree. Until now I could not find a proper job and the only jobs they've open to me are low-skilled ones, such as working in a restaurant.

When I was in Europe, it was different. People are open. Germany is very open. They don't care who you are. As long as you're a good person, you're not a criminal, you can find good opportunities. I think my name and my nationality are a problem here.

FOCUS GROUP N. 2

M: In which language do you prefer to speak?

P1: Well, it's obviously easier for us to talk in French, but in English we can switch sometimes. Okay, you carry on.

P2 : I don't speak French….

M: Well, we can do it in English. And just when you want to say something that doesn't come in English, switch to French. Okay? You can write also with the language that you prefer.

M: Writing exercise n. 1: About names (They were not registered, to respect the participants' privacy. It was used only as a warm-up and to allow participants to present themselves to the others)

(…)

M: Writing exercise n. 2: "Radicalization"

P3: Okay. As I said, not very scientific. Just going with the flow. Radicalization makes me think of revolution and change. Social transformation. Radical ideas are the mother of change that can make our societies more just and inclusive. We need change. However, it can be associated with violence and separate and block dialogue between different groups. What we refer to as polarization, which can in

turn create an environment where radical ideas can be easily matched with positive attitudes towards violence, thus increasing the risk of violence in our society. A violence that can be seen by some as the only way out to change the world and fight injustice. I'm talking here about radicalization and violent radicalization at a collective level or as a societal phenomenon that has repercussions on society, communities and individuals in an ecosystemic framework. Do we allow a space for radical thinking and disagreement in our societies? Are we ready for a change or are we resisting it to keep the status quo of our political systems? These are some questions that the word radicalization evokes in me. Who are we silencing? Who are we silencing and why? Whose voices do we decide to listen to? How do we prevent violence without silencing opposing and radical ideas? By using our power and our privilege?

M: Thank you.

P4: Bon… Processus d'adoption de croyances extrêmes, que se détache de la norme. En soi la radicalisation n'est pas mauvaise… la définition des idées radicales est relative.

Historiquement, la radicalisation a toujours permis les sociétés de changer. Évidemment, nos sociétés ne seraient pas où elles sont sans certains éléments radicaux. Par contre, pas toute forme de radicalisation est bonne. Les sociétés peuvent exister avec des radicaux, mais vont avoir des difficultés avec les éléments plus violents / extrémistes.

Par contre, la légitimation de la violence est un gros problème.

P2: So, mine was interesting because I was writing and then all of a sudden it was like I had a block. So, I was just like phrases. So, I hope that's okay. To me, radicalization means… it is an act of changing someone's worldview in an extreme fashion over a period of time. It doesn't mean that it happens quickly. It's small acts that change a person until they're completely isolated from their previous ways of thinking and being in the world. I imagine radicalization to be like being placed in a pot of lukewarm water. And the heat is being raised slightly over time until it's scalding hot. It's subtle, deliberate and extremely damaging. It can be very isolating, which I find to be a paradox when looking for community. Someone could be radicalized and then find themselves to be completely alone. And it comes from a need to understand the world and connect. But instead, it polarizes groups more vulnerable and more susceptible folks are more susceptible, susceptible to radicalization and adopting polarized views of the world. It creates a greater divide between groups. In-groups and outgroups… communication and understanding, or it severs communication and understanding between groups, and it breaks down. Tolerance. Online spaces can really be a birthplace for radicalization to occur because of echo chambers that are keeping groups apart and it widens the gap.

M: Okay. Thank you.

P1: Mine is quite personal… Ma première rencontre avec la radicalisation c'était en 2001. Dans ma classe on nous a annoncé qu'un avion avait frappé les tours gémelles. On en a reparlé chaque année ensuite, sans que j'y accorde beaucoup d'attention. Ma deuxième rencontre avec la radicalisation c'était au Cegep, en 2012, quand on militait contre (…). Ma troisième rencontre s'appelait féminisme… C'était radical, semble-t-il, de lutter contre les oppressions sexistes. Ma quatrième rencontre c'était à l'université, quand j'ai découvert l'IRA et son histoire qui m'ont profondément intéressé. Ma cinquième et dernière rencontre à ce jour, c'est le centre où je travail, son approche communautaire, empathique, scientifique et éducatif de la radicalisation. Qui décide de ce qui est radical, qui est radical ? Qu'est-ce que c'est être radical ? Autant des questions sans réponses finales sur lesquelles mes collègues et moi nous penchons chaque jour. Je n'ai pas de réponse à offrir, je suis moi-même radicale dans certains sens de ma vie. Je pense que nous le sommes tous et toutes un peu. A travers l'approche du centre où je travaille on fuit tous les coins de la radicalisation, de l'extrémisme et du terrorisme. On interroge les idéologies, les croyances, mais aussi les parcours de vie, les facteurs de vulnérabilités, écus de soutien. On ne fouge pas, on écoute, on apprend encore ce qu'est la radicalisation et comment prévenir ses formes violentes.

P5: Radicalisation : Qu'est-ce que c'est ? Qui peut être radical ? C'est une bonne ou une mauvaise chose ? Comment on peut la prévenir ? Quels sont les signes ? Doit-on la craindre ?

Toutes des questions auxquelles nous sommes confrontés au quotidien dans le cadre de notre travail. Ce qui est intéressant de ce concept est sa nature changeante et évolutive selon les époques, les endroits, les réalités. C'est aussi ce qui le rend « challengeant » en tant que professionnels. C'est stimulant.

Au Québec, l'approche de la prévention de cet enjeu est unique du par sa conception communautaire (autre que sécuritaire) et multisectorielle. C'est un domaine d'étude relativement récent et le travail ne fait que commencer.

La radicalisation versus la radicalisation menant à la violence…

De façon plus large les enjeux comme la polarisation sociale, la stigmatisation.

Effort de prévention sur ces enjeux (polarisation, stigmatisation) est un effort plus connu sur lesquels on peut sentir une forme de contrôle. Dans le sens que c'est plus près de nous, on connait plus ces enjeux.

Effort cumulatif de prévention. Tout le monde est concerné par ces enjeux.

Exemples qui viennent en tête quand on parle de radicalisation : A. Bissonette, Greta Tunberg, Ghandi, etc.

RMV (Radicalisation menant à la violence) vs. VMR (Violence menant à la radicalisation)

P6 : Radicalisation (menant à la violence) : un phénomène initialement considéré uniquement comme politique qui se révèle de plus en plus comme le nexus d'une panoplie de facteurs psychosociologiques tels que le bris du lien social, l'accumulation d'échecs et de colère contre les institutions sociales, certains problèmes et symptômes de santé mentale spécifiques, etc. Initialement considéré comme un phénomène de groupe, elle se manifeste

M: Writing exercise n. 3: Thinking about Radicalization and violent extremism, please write the following title: "If I had a magic wand…"

P2: Okay, so if I had a magic wand, I would have a conversation with radical leaders if safety wasn't an option. (It was like I was difficult for me to even imagine that I could do anything to get to the root of their ideologies). I would try and talk to folks who are alone in the world searching for community and explain that belonging and connection comes from love, not fear. In an effort to demystify the allure of extremism, extremist groups, I think more open dialogue would need to occur so that everyone could share their points of view and break down the divide between groups safely. Again, the magic wand would be needed here. If my wand was really magic, then let that magic make everyone engaging in dialogue. Have the space to truly listen to the other and the openness and agency to change their mind. When we break down walls, I believe we're all more similar than different. And finding shared humanity could absolutely create an opening or a pathway for healing and change. If only my magic wand could move mountains and create miracles, perhaps we could find some peace within each other. Thank you.

M: Thank you.

P1 **:** Si j'avais une baguette magique… je l'agiterais pour faire disparaitre les inégalités, celles qui oppressent, celles qui étouffent, celles qui tuent, celles qui radicalisent les esprits les plus doux, les plus pacifiques. Si j'avais une baguette magique, je l'agiterais pour faire le silence, pour que ceux et celles qui ne se voient pas, qui ne m'écoutent pas, qui ne m'entent pas puissent enfin se regarder et s'écouter. Pour que la polarisation et les conflits qui d'enracinent dans cette incompréhension mutuelle puissent se régler dans le dialogue et le respect de l'autre.

Si j'avais une baguette magique, je suppose que je voudrais qu'elle serve à prévenir, à guérir et à comprendre les formes de violence, je suppose que je financerais sans limite la recherche et le travail de prévention que mes collègues et moi faisons.

M: Merci.

P5: Si j'avais une Baguette Magique… je doublerais, je triplerais, quadruplerais (!!!) l'équipe de mon centre, les professionnels en relation d'aide de façon générale. Je multiplierais les fonds offerts aux organisations et projets visant à comprendre et

prévenir les enjeux comme la radicalisation et la haine. Je déploierais l'écoute et le soutien que l'on peut offrir avec l'accompagnement communautaire à toutes les personnes qui peuvent se sentir seules, marginalisées et jugées.

J'offrirais un moment de répit à toutes les personnes qui en font leur vocation d'aider, d'écouter, d'accompagner, d'éduquer, de chercher des solutions.

J'implanterais de l'empathie et de la tolérance, même envers ceux et celles qui la suscite moins de façon spontanée.

Bref, si j'avais une baguette magique j'abaisserais ces murs qui s'érigent devant nous et qui complique le travail auquel nous croyons tous et toutes.

P6: So I switched to English this time. If I had a magic wand…

- I would ensure that the that the field of PV draws from lessons in the field of psychology and criminology. - I would make the field slightly less interested in buzzwords and a little more in quantitative and qualitative evidence, either in producing such evidence or drawing inspiration from it.

- I would improve the trust that members of society have in the well-intended media outlets in science so that we once start again to share the same realities.

- I would ensure that the fight against oppression, discrimination and stigmatization is not only fought with words, but also with action.

- I would improve the life and social conditions of those less fortunate so that they don't find solace in violent, radical groups and ideas.

- I would ensure that all have a roof over their heads.

- I would make a friend that I lost to radicalization and mental health problems come back to our group before it is too late.

M: Thank you. Please…

P3: I've gone a bit radical in my magic tricks, but the context is that I work with adolescents in school right now. And I'm starting to work a lot on the internet. So, if I had a magic wand, I would de-plug the internet. Social media are amazing tools, powerful tools, but I'm afraid we have a hard time keeping up with the rapid evolution of technology. And this is a risk for future generations. For young people. The world is going too fast. We are not keeping up with it. Digital natives, our kids are keeping up with it more than we adults are. Of course, the internet is not the only problem for many… For many things it is actually very useful and can even be protective. Yet a lot of recruitment by extremist groups happens or starts online. Young people present some vulnerabilities because their brains are still developing. Because they are online a lot, because they suffer in a globalized world that is facing a lot of uncertainty, climate change, wars, pandemics. And I haven't had time to go on.

M: Thank you. Please…

P4: If I had a magic wand… j'essayerais de remplir le mieux les besoins de chacun et chacune. Etant donné que la radicalisation, au niveau personnel, répond à des

besoins, des besoins qui sont largement partagés par l'ensemble de l'humanité, il est nécessaire d'adresser ces besoins si l'ont veut aller au cœur de cet enjeux.

Je ne pense pas que si tous et toutes avaient leur besoin remplis, il n'y aurait plus de la radicalisation ou de radicalisation violente, mais je pense que l'on aurait…. (je peux pas lire ce que j'ai écrit !) Ensuite, je suis de l'avis qu'il y a un manque d'empathie, d'ouverture et d'esprit critique. Je trouverais une manière d'amener les gens à développer ces valeurs fondamentales. Par l'art, la littérature, la rencontre des autres cultures, la cuisine et le dialogue… je pense que l'on peut développer ces valeurs. Je crois que ces éléments vont au cœur de la radicalisation - c'est-à-dire : les besoins, l'écoute, l'empathie et l'esprit critiques. Sans être un problème à régler, on pourrait aller à sa source – c'est-à-dire l'oppression, les inégalités, la discrimination.

M: Now, I ask you to share your impressions and ideas, and maybe we can start with P3 because you have to leave?...

P3: Uh…

M: Like, you can either comment on what the others said or talk about what you're feeling or thinking…

P3: Well… I definitely want more funding too… more money, I think. Yeah, that's a that's an issue out there. If you want to do research or intervention, there's not much evidence of things that work and don't work. And you know, funding is also allocated by governments, by people that decide what to fund. So as a researcher, sometimes I get very polarized reviews of my protocols, of my funding, of my grants, and that's I mean, it speaks of the reality of things, of what we're living through, but it makes our jobs like harder and it gets sometimes even very personal. Reviewers read what we write and they can agree or disagree and they have emotional reactions. Sometimes they can even be very personal judging the the researcher. So, you know, funding is actually an issue because I think the topic also creates some resistance in the field. And this is something that we have to face… also, because where does radicalization belong? You know, you can it belongs to all. I think you need an interdisciplinary approach because, you know, you have we have mentioned a lot of sociology and psychology and general public health issues of oppression and just social justice... There's education.

So, you have all of that. You have criminology. You can have a psychiatric or health issues related to that. So, you need an interdisciplinary approach. But some disciplines are not there yet. So, it is kind of a new field and you have to find a way to communicate between different fields. And that's also another issue for funding because where do you ask for funding? And if you ask for funding to the government because like there's public safety or whatever, then how are you seeing when you actually intervene or do something because you know who's funding you shapes kind of what people think of your research and what you can or cannot do

in your research. There's… it's very delicate. So, there's that. And then I took a very, uh, primary prevention and collective, uh, reflective approach today in what I was thinking, because I work a lot in primary prevention and because I see that there's a lot of violence that can get associated with all types of radical ideologies or extremist groups out there, even among young people. So, I'm worried and I think it's time to act and we need to act fast because it's going to get worse if we don't do it. And we've been saying it for a couple of years and it has gotten worse. So, I mean, it's not like, um, that's that's a reality. And I agree also with everyone sort of put together the, this idea of an unfair societies, oppression, of suffering, which is a fundamental point to keep in mind in research and intervention on violent radicalization. And sometimes it's hard to… because we we have our radical ideas. Everyone has said, you know, we have we are in contact with some radical aspects in our lives and in our jobs. So, sometimes it's very difficult. And here I speak also as a clinician to to see the suffering on both parts that are contrasting. It's very hard to be with someone that has a radical idea that is opposed to your point of view. It's violent, but if you want to help that person, you cannot change their mind. You just have to try to find a connection on a more of a emotional level, see the suffering, see something else in that person so that you can connect and breaks kind of the isolation that often plays a role in the radicalization and radicalization process. So, these are my thoughts.

M: I understand what you say about funding, but on the other hand… I'm a bit provocative… I don't know if you realize how lucky you are here, because you have lots of funding relating to research.. (…) I understand that you would like to do more and more, but still… Wow.. you are super lucky reality because you anyway, you got lots of fundings, so you have already a lot, much more than, I don't know, another reality in which there are so much funding to projects of radicalization prevention.

P1: But there's so much to do…

M: P6, you wanted to say something?

P6 : Oh, very quickly.. Je travaillais dans la prévention de violence sexuel... et malgré, que ce soit un enjeux de société qui est très dans l'esprit de gens, c'est infernal obtenir des financements dans ce milieu-là. Depuis que je travaille dans le demain de la radicalisation violente (2017), c'est beaucoup plus facile d'obtenir des financements. The community resilience funds, the public safety… il y a une orientation très centrée sur la prévention dans les organismes gouvernementaux.

P3 : si je peux commenter ça… oui, Public Safety, mais mois je parle des fonds de recherches officiels dans les universités. Les gouvernements ont des intéresses, ils mettent des fonds pour ça, ça c'est hot topic… mais si tu as de fonds de Public

Safety… si mois je mets Public Safety à financer mes projets, les gens… c'est la même chose aux Etats Units (…)

M: I'm not sure if you had met before… (they introduce themselves, since P6 had arrived late)

(…)

P1 : C'est vrai qu'on est chanceuse d'avoir ce financement stable – ce financement-là nous permet de fonctionner au day-to-day, ça nous permet de organiser plusieurs choses, mais on doit chercher toujours des financements supplémentaires (du gouvernement, de la ville, des instituts de recherche… que ont des visions que nous impose aussi parfois une certaine conduite, d'éviter de traiter certains thèmes, faire le choses d'une certaine façon… le financement vient avec un cout. On est content d'avoir le financement stable, mas c'est pas de la chance …

P5 : Et puis, notre financement stable est le même depuis 2015. Les besoins sont plus les mêmes ; les besoins sont plus, l'accompagnement communautaire est plus ample. Au Québec nous sommes seulement trois professionnels à faire ce travail-là. Donc, on est très reconnaissant, mais reste que pour les besoins du Québec ce n'est pas suffisant.

M: P2… did you get it? (no) I'll try to translate to you, like a synthesis. They were saying that they recognize that they are lucky to have lots of fundings. But she said that it comes with a price because they get these fundings, but then they are supposed to do some things and not others, to use some terms like certain way. So, there are there are constraints.

P1: And that funding keeps us alive, but it doesn't allow us to do more and to respond to the needs that are in the field.

P2: Yes, I can see that because yeah, it has…. When you get funding, it is so narrow.

M: And the other important thing that S said is that they have the same fundings since 2015, but the work they have been doing has grown up so.

P2: Right, so and you can't change it.

P5: In order to change it, we have amazing colleagues who go and do projects, but then the time is put on the projects and not on the growing of the organization.

P1: So every time we want to do something, we have to find another way to finance it. And every time we're doing this, we're creating like another bubble with another project. So, we're not working on the main project.

P2: Yeah, yeah. So it's just like you can't ever really focus on what you're trying to do because there's like all these side things that you need an extra labor that you need to do. Yeah, that's tough.

P6: And, and if I could nuance what I said, even if maybe that some organizations are lucky in terms of research funding, in terms of society, we clearly lack funding in everything that's related to psychosocial health and mental health, etcetera. I've had acquaintances who had suicidal ideas and that have been like, your call has

been made to the police, I don't know, three, 4 or 5 times. And each time they get brought to the psychiatric and they spend two days after that and then they get a pamphlet and yeah, have a good, good luck in life. And then two months later they're back.

P2: Yeah, That's what I find so difficult is that, you know, we have to treat the root of the problem rather than the symptoms of it, you know?

P6: And to me, what I've seen and I've not seen as much as other ground practitioners, but often the radical ideas are the symptoms and not the cause. I would argue in... And when you look at the intervention practices, often de-RAD programs are kind of not really effective and frowned upon by. Those who are in these programs and the practitioners because they're like, it's hard to change people's idea. And when you just change the social context, if you… if you find the person a job, housing, just psychotherapy and everything, the radical ideas, the violent radical ideas just go out on themselves because you've treated the cause and not the symptom.

P4: And that's why we I think we all touched.

On this subject a bit like the core of the problem. Thanks. And that's why we say that like even yeah, we're really lucky to have funds and everything like that and really like, yeah, really lucky. But when we say there's so much to do because radicalization and everything, it touches on everything like and we all agree on that, I'm pretty sure. So because it touches on everything and because there's so much work to do on every level of society and personal level and everything, we could like triple our funding and still be down it still need more because that's something I personally like realize when I started working at the center and just in general that as you said, because it's so much like contextual factors that like have an effect on radicalization and just, just treating the radical ideas doesn't do anything like doesn't change the minds of anybody. You have to go to the core like the deep source of why a person like goes to these ideas. And yeah, just the work there is just immense and. Yeah.

M: Can I, uh, I like to say something a bit provocative. One person I have recently interviewed has a really critical approach on radicalization studies. This person said that radicalization studies are super ethnocentric and that we put too much on the individual and sometimes we forget the bigger picture about colonization, trauma and slavery and etcetera.

P1: I don't think it's provocative in the way that we all mentioned the structural problem of society, the oppressions, and I think we all agree on that and on the base that is very wide around the table. It is not the case like at work. We have colleagues from a lot of different places in the world and we exchange a lot on all the situations are outside of Canada and also in Canada. But I mean… Our work field is Quebec,

so obviously we're going to focus on the way radicalization is working here. But still, it's not so "white" at our center

P5: If I can add to what she is saying, is that we and I would like to hear about other fields, but at our center, we have that idea that if we take the center and put it anywhere else in the world, it doesn't make sense. It's the way it was based, is for Quebec. So, the approach and the vision of radicalization, it's in the context of Quebec - Province, where we have the social and democratic actions that are available to us. And that's why some ideas or some ways to get to those ideas are considered radical in Quebec. So, I think that's the nuance that we can bring. And I'm sure maybe at other organizations, maybe I'd like to hear how it works for you. This because it's a concept that is very discussed. And I feel like the definition of radicalization here versus in France is not the same… Versus if we go to the Middle East….

P3: Sorry, I need to go... So, I will just maybe comment on on this before before leaving about the ethnocentric. I think it's it's a reality of our Western world, if you want, in most disciplines, unfortunately. So of course, it applies to radicalization. But, you know, we are linked to the to the to the funding issue too, like governments are deciding mostly who to fund because most of the money comes from government. So, I think, you know, we can have even people that work near radicalization have this critical view. And some of us are aware, most of us, that here everyone is also I mean, so I agree also with the contextual like radicalization per se is contextual because what is violent and what is radical changes across time and context. So, also you always are taking… you have to always have this critical approach in this kind of research not to to be very careful what you say, what you say, and to contextualize whatever you say, because it's it does not apply to everyone, everywhere. And even here. We do research in Ontario, in Alberta and in Quebec. And, you know, we have to be very careful because we try to put these provinces together, but there's different realities. So, you need to take into account the different contexts and in the papers, in what you write, in the recommendations that you make, you have to nuance, because it's different realities politically and even in the same country, you know, still in Canada.

And then this critical approach, it becomes polarizing when it doesn't allow to dialogue, because I think with this critical approach is needed, but I don't see it as an opposing view, I think is the critical approach to the topic that can allow us to do a better job, to be careful about the power and how we're using it and who's like I was... I go back to what I wrote earlier, whose voice we are using and how, but it's, it's something that I worked on... I still work with the immigrant and refugee populations and, you know, I have exactly the same challenges because you risk of, you know, giving voice of or of something or of to some people rather than others, of using your power and silencing and not empowering vulnerable populations with

ideologies. And, you know, these are challenges. I think we have to keep dialogue also with people that don't believe in research on violent radicalization that can bring things to the table.

Also there is a research on radicalization in low and middle income countries, but it is very different from or in conflict areas. For instance, you know, you have all literatures that are very, very different. And in those countries, there's even people… I have students that come from low and middle income countries that are now focusing on the issue, because it's becoming more and more global, a global issue. So, I mean, it's changing rapidly. Yeah...

M: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you…. about your name. You can keep if you can give me the others.

P3: Yes. I'm not sure you can read what I wrote but no problem for you and you keeping it. Thank you very much for the nice talk. I'm sorry, but I need to go.

(…)

Thank you again. We'll be in touch.

M: I think we have said a lot. I'm very glad about this meeting. Could you give me some feedback on what how have you felt? How are you feeling?

P6: Good. Even though it was super late. Sorry again for that. Um. Uh, yeah. So, I'm not a morning person. However, that that is another reason why I'm late. Um, but even then, I usually, I'm not very sharp in the mornings and, um, just being in the group and doing the exercise actually woke me up and I really enjoyed taking part in it. And I'm also a person that has maybe an easier time structuring my ideas by writing than by talking. So having done the interview like last year with you and then being in an exercise where I first write my train of thought and then explain it, I was like, Oh, that's that is more structured. So if you thought that my previous interview was kind of muddled, that is why so, so, so I actually enjoyed having the time to think, put some points by writing. And then I.

M: Really that was my idea because in a focus group, normally there are people who will speak more and other who speak less, and people who have strong ideas and that maybe someone is shyer and kind of doesn't know if disagree with those strong ideas. B we have this time to think alone and then discuss, I think, yeah, yeah.

P6: And this good old pen and paper, I should use that more. Like it was really easy to just, I don't know, maybe it's just because I've learned like, my life doing this, but it's easier to put some ideas on paper than it is on computers. Even though I'm like.

M: I saw that M was doing something that I always do: is going back to what you have written and see and correct. And this is something that when we speak, we don't do, you know? Well, we can, but usually we speak, speak, speak, and then we don't go back. And when we are writing, I love going back to what I so I write like

a paragraph. Then I go back, read what I have written, and then go on… and then go back and go on.

P2: Yeah, that good writing is rewriting sort of idea. Yeah, I really appreciated that too. Specially because… yeah, it is first thing in the morning, so everything feels like it's a little bit slower, right? And then but with free writing, you can kind of go on a tangent and go wherever you need to go and then you can kind of clean it up after. So, I appreciated that a lot. Yeah, I really enjoyed this. I really wish I spoke French or I understood better French because I feel like that might have been more helpful in being able to contribute. So, I'm going to put that on my to do list. (…laughs) Yeah... I have a long list now. But yeah, this is great. And yeah, I, I realized that this is such a complicated topic and we really do need to have an interdisciplinary approach, because everyone is coming from different lived experiences and professional experiences. So we have to have like a wider range of specialties in order to deal with such a complex problem and deal with the root and not the symptoms. So yeah, I would love to continue these conversations. I think that just even to be able to appreciate that the complexities of the issue. Yeah. Thank you.

P4: Yeah, I can go on. It's a really fun way to do these kinds of things, like doing the, like, automatic writing and reading it back and everything like that. It's yeah, it's much more fun than just doing the, like, formal... Like, it's. I like doing interviews. That's not my point. But it's yeah, it's more like more of a game than just like, just saying like, normal interview stuff. And as you said, it's, it's really interesting to learn about the interdisciplinary approaches and different types of backgrounds and discussing with different organizations because obviously we work together, the three of us. So we know basically how we work and like our approach. There's not much not much surprises there. But it's really interesting too, and I would love to learn much more about it, how different organizations like… and universities… how they work…, how they view the topic. And how they just understand the whole thing that would be like that would be on my to do list, to just learn more about how different organizations do and how different countries do. Because I know a bit a bit about how France is doing, like prevention in quotes, because it's not prevention, but like I would love to learn more about like Italy or the rest of Europe or the rest of the world and everything like that. So yeah, it's really interesting.

M: We can put this on the agenda because I'm leaving, but we can do and now everything can be done online. Yeah, yeah. So, sure we can, we can keep on doing this. I would be very glad even if, even after I, I'm almost finished. I'm almost done with my thesis. But this is something that goes beyond.

P1: And I really enjoyed it too. We had no idea what we were going to get, like no idea at all. So, it was kind of a surprise for us. L told us "go"… But yeah, it was

fun, you know, just writing and letting your doubts go and not really wondering if it's okay, how it sounds like. I mean, yes, we go, we come up with ideaa. But I mean, it was very personal. It was more scientific. And I think it's nice to see like the personal approach of everybody on those topics, as you said, are not easy topics. And S touched a point earlier when she said that I think we kind of forget ourselves sometimes. And I mean, it is hard to work on those subjects all day. Being, reading on this all day. And we think a lot about the people who are suffering and the people who are radicalized or on their way to be. And I think we tend to not really think about ourselves that much and not really measuring how it how it can affect us.

M: Yeah, I had that really interesting interview with a psychiatrist who works at RAPS and he talked also about burning out, because he goes very deep with radicalized people. And it's very tough. And he was he was saying that he gets quite involved and I said, wait, you'll see. We'll talk in like ten years from now. Uh, yeah, because this is a really tough job. But even if you are working with prevention, still it's a difficult subject. And who works with community too, right?

P5: Uh, yes, it it's hard. We meet people who have, well, obviously, very different ideas, very different approaches to life.

P6: But it's also a human being we have in front of us, and we also go to talk to people who are incarcerated. And I find what's even and I come from criminology, too. So it's this population who is has been discarded from society. So, it's also that suffering that's there. And you it's hard sometimes to the response that we have from the outside while you're really working with those people, you're really doing that. But then you also see the human beings who are suffering even no matter what they've done, it's still human beings you have in front of you. So that's kind of something that's that's hard from the the work over not only like radicalization, but also just the social views of some people in society that don't have their place or don't belong anymore. And that's kind of hard. But also, for I think even in research, you're confronted to material and you're reading constantly about this, and it's really not an easy position to be put in. But for the the exercise, I personally found it hard, especially the first one about my name, but I felt by the third one it was it came a bit easier. And it's funny, because the third one about the magic wand is something that we do with people that we we support. So, it's kind of being put in the, the other position and it's interesting to see how I felt during this so… we do mostly individual support. So ,we ask them, like if you had a magic wand, what would you change about your life or the society? What would it include if you had like your perfect society? And it's something to to give us a bit more to work with. But it's interesting to be put in the the reverse position and see how I felt doing it. It was it natural? Did I feel like I was filtering myself or… So that was interesting to do. But I like he writing part, but I also really like speaking. So, I felt like to write. But then

after that I also have a discussion. It's something that was interesting to… other than just reading and move.

P6: Yeah.

M: Writing doesn't cost anything. Yeah, and sharing… You can share with a sister, with a brother, with your partner, you know, because reading out loud what you have just written is powerful. Now, here we have written about radicalization, but if you write about something personal, even about something bad that happens, it helps you to organize your ideas. Doing what she was doing, like going back and reading and re-reading and then reading out loud. It's like such a cathartic thing to do. I really recommend it.

FOCUS GROUP N. 3

M : Je suis psychologue et je fais une recherche doctorale à propos de la prévention de la radicalisation, de l'extrémisme violent et là, mon intérêt c'est la prévention primaire et mon case study est à propos de la Chaire Unesco. J'étais ici l'année dernière pendant 3 mois et je suis ici de nouveau pour un moi. J'ai fait déjà 2 focus groups ici à Montréal. Et bon, aujourd'hui je fais avec vous. On va commencer avec des exercisations d'écriture et après on discutera. Avez-vous quelque chose pour écrire ?

Le premier exercice est seulement un warming up. Vous écrivez « Je m'appelle… » (….)

M : Merci, maintenant je vous je vous demande un autre exercice d'écriture. Vous écrivez comme titre « Radicalisation »…. Et puis vous écrivez ce qui arrive.

(…)

M : On commence par P1…

P1 : Donc radicalisation, c'est un enjeu majeur actuellement en raison de mon engagement à la chaire Unesco prev, je m'intéresse tout particulièrement à la radicalisation dans les champs de l'extrémisme de droite et du complotisme.

M : P2?

P2: Je vais essayer de me relire. Ce n'est pas évident engendre une certaine forme de fermeture, de cloisonnement face à des pressions externes que l'on rejette. Elle peut être nécessaire, elle peut être dévastatrice, ce que l'on appelle radicalisation violente.

Constitué sans doute le l'extrême motif, une forme de radicalisation bienveillante peut-elle exister sans doute pour protéger, par exemple, un certaine forme ou protéger des totalitarismes?

M : Merci. P3 ?

P3 : Ben pour moi, la radicalisation, c'est s'enfoncer dans sa colère jusqu'à ne rien voir d'autre.

C'est tout. Donc il y a des petites radicalisations quotidiennes qui peuvent nous arriver aussi, on a des petits moments de radicalisation à tous les jours, mais y en a qui s'est des parcours peu plus soutenus.

M : Merci. P4 ?

P4 : Radicalisation : un phénomène préoccupant qui touche nos sociétés, qui peut être une force motrice du progrès où nous conduire vers l'obscurantisme? Elle appelle une convergence de nos énergies pour y faire face et soulève de nombreux défis. Elles ressemblent à l'humanité.

P2 : On dit qu'il y a… tu me touches, ça me touche profondément.

P4 : Un peu de philosophie.

M : Okay, merci à maintenant je vous demande de faire le 3e et dernier exercice : « Si j'avais une baguette magique…. » Soyez libre.

(…) Vous êtes prêtes ?

P3 : Ouais.

P2 : Si j'avais une baguette magique, je ferais en sorte que la présence de nuances de positions moins…. Chercher habite esprit du plus grand nombre, je ferais de la tolérance l'élément central du développement des sociétés. J'habiterai dans un monde où les débats, les contradictions, les oppositions ne sont pas considérées comme des menaces.

M : Merci. P4 ?

P4 : Ça, c'est pas mal.

P1 : OK alors j'ai dit, si j'avais une baguette magique, je rétablirais le dialogue avec des gens profondément enfoncés dans des idéologies destructrices, de façon à stopper le terrorisme et des conflits meurtriers qui déchirent ce que nous avons de plus précieux, notre humanité. J'en profiterai aussi pour sauver du chômage tous les membres de la chaire Unesco prev après coup.

P4 : Ouais, je viens de réaliser qu'en fait j'aurais dû écrire si j'avais une baguette magique, je l'écraserais sur la ****** de Donald Trump, mais c'est pas ça que j'ai écrit. Moi j'ai écrit comme un enfant de 4 ans, ça m'a fait du bien. Donc j'ai écrit : si j'avais une baguette magique, je rendrais les gens heureux. Pas Plus de colère, plus de haine, pas de radicalisation, juste de la bienveillance, de l'entraide, des convictions, bien sûr, des chicanes aussi, mais pas de violence ni de désespoir, pas d'injustice ni de massacre. Juste la paix, le repos et la tranquillité d'esprit de faire avancer le monde dans la bonne direction, prendre soin de nous, des autres et de notre planète, ni plus ni moins. Un rêve qui nous habite et qui chaque jour, donne la force d'avancer. Ça fait du bien d'arrêter, de s'arrêter.

M : Merci. P3 ?

P3: J'ai écrit, j'ai écrit, mais j'aime la brièveté.

Alors, si j'avais une baguette magique, tout le monde apprendrait à exprimer ses émotions négatives autrement que par la violence, parce que ça s'apprend. Les gens si écouteraient et essaieraient véritablement de se comprendre.

M : Merci. Donc, je voudrais vous écouter à propos de ça. Donc je vous je vous ai demandé de penser à propos de la radicalisation à propos du rêve, de un monde mieux et maintenant bon, discutons, non on peut Ah si vous si vous voulez faire de commentaires à propos de ce que les autres on écrit par exemple.

P4 : Moi, je trouve que ça fait vraiment du bien de faire ça, ça fait comme un petit 3 min de méditation, de pleine conscience. Là c'est très agréable.

Moi, j'aurais envie de dire en fait, on n'a pas de baguette magique et tu vois là dans le rapport qu'on est en train de rédiger. On est supposé faire des recommandations sur la prévention de la radicalisation…pour prévenir.

Fini en faisant ça, je me rends compte qu'en fait, on le sait pas bien. On a tous des grandes idées, mais en vrai…. On a aucune foutue idée…. Parce qu'on n'a pas de baguette magique. Et que tout le monde arrive avec des affaires un peu en disant on va aller parti, on va aller par-là, et cetera. Sinon, effectivement, ce qu'on a tous décrit, la plus de justice, plus de bienveillance…. S'écouter, exprimer ses émotions négatives, apprendre à se reparler ou à se parler, apprendre à se chicaner. Mais finalement, ça tient à quoi tout ça? C'est quand même un travail là-dessus depuis… Des siècles si c'est pas des millénaires, hein?

P2: Mais c'est intéressant ce que tu lui dis, puis ça à quoi ça me fait penser aussi, c'est 2 choses. Premièrement, c'est dans ce qu'on a dit est particulièrement dans les 2 dernières questions, mais encore plus dans la dernière. C'est effectivement c'est grands principes qui semblent être… qui semble nous guider, puis là je dirais nous bouder pas juste en tant que personne qui travaillons sur des questions de radicalisme ou des choses comme ça.

L'idée en tant qu'individu, si j'avais une baguette magique, je le voudrais et là… ressent une volonté de conciliation de pouvoir ça, mais ça me semble très clair. Puis ça, mais comme tu l'as dit, effectivement, c'est des grands principes vertueux. Maintenant, comment on fait pour les appliquer ? Et c'est en ce sens-là que je trouve l'exercice que propose matin être intéressant parce que ce qu'elle nous propose, c'est de le mettre en mots quelques lignes. Et là, Ben ça nous pousse à nous dire si je pouvais le faire, qu'est-ce que je ferais? … c'est d'une part sur le plan de l'exercice. Au début, c'est pour moi, c'était gênant, c'est à dire, qu'est-ce que je vais dire, qu'est-ce que je vais faire là? Et puis ça Ben ça m'a fait réfléchir par rapport à quand je discute avec des amis ou même des gens, des collègues n'importe dans plein de circonstances, qui ont un rapport avec la circonstance actuelle, quand est-ce que je m'efforce de mettre de l'avant ces principes-là, quand est-ce que je m'efforce de non seulement d'en parler, mais de les appliquer?

Et de temps en temps, quand est-ce que je le fais? Puis et quand est-ce que je ne suis pas… que je suis gêné de le faire parce qu'on va me dire que je suis soit trop philosophique, où je trouve vertueux où et là je pense qu'il y a un conflit, y a un conflit et c'est une forme de lutte, peut-être pour lutter contre une forme de radicalisation interne, pour essayer de pas faire monter ce cette gêne, cette timidité-là…

M : Ah j'ai fait, je suis en train de faire des entretiens. Maintenant que je suis ici avec des personnes de l'ethnopsychiatrie. Une critique qu'ils font à propos de la radicalisation… est que nos études sont ethnocentriques?... Et aussi que la tendance est de lire comme un phénomène individuel non collectif ?

P4 : Mais tu sais - je, je suis d'accord avec ça, je trouve que c'est toujours intéressant d'avoir une lecture critique. La radicalisation, elle est endémique dans l'histoire de l'humanité. Sauf que la question qui est toujours la même. Qu'est-ce qu'on fait pour éviter que l'histoire se répète ? Ultimement, ça reste ça la question, puis… les critiques n'ont jamais de réponse à ça.

Ils critiquent et ils ont raison, c'est très intéressant la critique, ils critiquent les courants mainstream et cetera. Mais souvent quand il faut passer pour en mode solution, pour éviter que l'histoire se répète, il y a plus, y a plus, y a plus grand monde quoi. Ou en tout cas y a pas de proposition. Alors on revient toujours encore aux fondamentaux, la justice sociale et cetera. Mais ça arrive même dans des sociétés où il y a beaucoup de justice sociale.

Et ou les plus radicaux sont pas forcément ceux qui, du reste, sont les plus discriminés en termes de justice sociale? Si on pense aux États-Unis... Quand tu vois le mouvement de la suprématie blanche, historiquement, c'est pas ceux qui sont le plus discriminés aux États-Unis, c'est ceux qui sont plutôt du côté du pouvoir et des dominants, pas des dominés donc…. Je sais pas. Moi je trouve que c'est vraiment compliqué. Je sais pas trop comment le lire, mais encore je reviens moi ce qui m'habite beaucoup dans la question de la radicalisation et le travail qu'on fait, c'est un peu le sentiment d'impuissance.

On arrive bien à documenter les phénomènes, on les comprend bien, on comprend bien les logiques sous-jacentes, mais rendues à qu'est-ce qu'on fait?

Je trouve que ce pont-là est plus est plus difficile. Les policiers savent ce qu'ils font : Ils mettent en prison les méchants… les psychologues et les psychiatres... Ils savent ce qu'ils font, ils font parler les gens, ils leur donnent des pilules. Les profs dans les écoles, ils savent ce qu'ils font, ils apprennent des connaissances. Nous on est un peu entre 2 mondes, donc moi j'ai l'impression que ce qui m'habite surtout c'est que si je faisais rien, je me sentirais pas bien.

C'est à dire le fait de rien faire quand t'es humaniste et que tu vois la société qui déraille, ça, ça te rend malheureux. Mais après le fait de faire quelque chose veut pas dire que tu sais quoi faire.

Tu t'agites, tu cours à droite à gauche, tu fais du mieux que tu peux mais au final t'as pas la compréhension, la connaissance des effets ou de la portée de tes actions, quoi?

P3 : Non mais c'est bien, mais j'ai envie de rebondir là-dessus. On y a une tension entre une des approches optimistes du social et pessimistes du social, puis des fois on a l'impression d'être dans une société de crise mais c'est surtout c'est la vision pessimiste qui prend le dessus.

Puis finalement optimiste où pessimiste. Puis là, j'ai inclus aussi les chercheurs, hein, qui qui passent leur vie à écrire des trucs, souvent ils vont prendre parti, mais ou pour un ou pour l'autre, c'est probablement à cause de leur personnalité ou la difficulté qu'ils ont mis dans leur enfance. Je ne sais trop. Puis là Ben ils ont fait, ils ont fait leur lit pour eux ils vont passer 40 ans à dire que les trucs marchent tout croche où ils vont passer 40 ans à se concentrer sur comment fonctionne un bidule. Puis elle satisfait de voir comment il fonctionne.

Mais l'approche que Da parle, qui est de toujours chercher le la baguette magique, justement? En sachant très bien qu'on la trouvera pas, mais en gardant un peu d'optimisme, ça me semble la seule façon de de d'aborder les choses. Puis effectivement, toutes les sociétés fonctionnent mal et fonctionnent bien en même temps, c'est à dire c'est pas moi, c'est une perception, ontologique, c'est que c'est un système jamais parfait, puis qui évolue, fait comment on fait pour l'aider à évoluer dans le bon sens, non pas provoquer la fin de l'histoire, mais juste éviter que tout parte en cacahuète, puis tout le monde se mette sur la ******. Pour moi, les questions de prévention de la radicalisation, c'est la qui s'inscrivent.

Je trouve aussi que le pour rebondir un peu sur ce que ce que tu dis là c'est intéressant que ce qu'on fait finalement, c'est très baudelairien comme approche, c'est à dire fouiller la boue pour essayer de le transformer en quelque chose de valable et quelque chose qui est un peu plus brillant aussi que que ce qu'on peut trouver parfois dans les profondeurs et les les, les habits de de de l'humanité qu'on étudié. Et c'est vrai que la question de de l'impuissance que soulevait David, je la, je la partage entièrement, notamment par rapport à ce que je fais, c'est à dire que quand je j'étudie des groupes terroristes.

P1 : De droite qui sont constituées en grande partie de gamins qui entre 18 et 22 ans là pour certains ce que je fais, ce que je veux dire, c'est que ce que je fais ne va pas empêcher ces gamins de de s'enrouler dans des idéologies extrémistes. Ça ne stoppera jamais, concrètement, mais par contre le fait de faire quelque chose, d'essayer de fouiller cette espèce-là, d'abysse et d'en ressortir quelque chose qui pourrait être utile justement pour d'autres personnes qui ont peut-être des accès un peu plus pratiques, qui ont une application un peu +1 peu plus directe. Ça me semble important parce que c'est aussi cette connaissance justement de la bise qui permet d'éviter de dire tomber. Et il y a une sorte aussi de position de garde-fou par la

recherche et parce qu'on est en train de faire et comme disait P1 tout à l'heure pour éviter que l'histoire se répète parfois, il faut aussi un peu regarder dans.

La bise comme disait Nietzsche et bref, voilà donc du coup, j'ai quand même réussi à caser des 2 de mes plus grandes références dans ce que je viens de dire là, mais c'est vraiment ce que je pense en termes de en termes de recherche, qui est vraiment y a vraiment ce travail-là, qui est fait?

P4 : Bien joué, Baudelaire, Nietzsche ça fait bien dans une phrase.

P2 : Hein, c'est bon, c'est bon.

P3 : Ce qui est ce qui est…Et de mon côté, j'ai pris plein de notes, là je sais pas trop ce que je vais faire de tout ça après qu'on aura discuté. Mais il y a plein de choses intéressantes. Vraiment. Mais évidemment, ça rapporte un peu. Je m'appelle d'une certaine façon, tu sais, la première question que tu vas poser et par rapport à ça, Ben qu'est-ce qu'on, qu'est-ce qu'on voit, qu'est-ce qu'on, qu'est-ce qu'on fait, moi, de mon côté…

Vraiment? Y a je me dis 23 choses, mettons dans la perspective générale globale, le monde il est complexe, des milliards et des milliards d'individus. Vouloir faire en sorte d'avoir une baguette magique et que tout le monde puisse avoir à l'esprit qu'on fait, c'est que les objectifs soient atteints. Bon c'est peine perdue, c'est des Moulins à vent alors il faut donc de mon côté y aller plus au RAS des pâquerettes. Du moins dans une qu'est-ce que je peux changer ? Et à cet égard-là, Ben il y a 2 éléments que je trouve intéressants, le premier c'est…

Quand tu parlais de la vision colonialiste d'une certaine façon, une perspective, moi je pense qu'à certains égards, cette critique-là, elle est tout à fait bonne. Ce que je veux dire et on le doit exact, et on doit s'en préoccuper, ne serait-ce aussi pour voir la conceptualisation de la radicalisation, c'est le financement de cette radicalisation. Je voudrais évidemment quand c'est le gouvernement fédéral qui financent au Canada, ils ont une direction, une certaine conception, c'est et toutes sortes de financement nous amène à aller dans une direction ou une autre, alors gardez la tête froide.

Pas évident. Alors, dans quelle mesure est-ce qu'il n'y a pas une forme de perspective ? Justement, qui correspond davantage à une hégémonie qui YZ sans doute que ça, ça demeurera toujours là? Puis l'autre élément, c'est ce que disait S, c'est sur la perspective optimiste où pessimiste. Puis ça, c'est vrai, je pense que c'est, c'est une tension qui est constante.

J'entendais M parler de quand tu travailles sur des groupes d'extrême droite, et cetera, et il m'est venu une image de gens qui travaillent sur exemple. Des images de pédophilie en ligne. Je veux dire, à un moment donné, tu dois concevoir les gens comme des tordus, ça a aucun sens et je me suis dit probablement que quand on est trop confronté à tout ce qui est tordu en termes d'extrême droite et de comportement et ce qu'on voit en ligne, moi je suis-je parle juste 5 Min sur Twitter, char de la. J'ai

comme l'impression que la planète tourne vraiment pas rond. Or c'est pas représentatif, ne serait-ce peut-être même de mon environnement, alors je pense que c'est à cet égard là je me demande… Pourra-t-on garder une certaine vision, optimiste, mais aussi une optimisme en termes de solution ?... Pour ma part, ce que j'ai opté pour, c'est 2 choses : la première, c'est travailler sur l'humour. Je trouve ça le fun, alors ça me permet de rire tout en et… Deuxièmement, Ben je focus et là je rejoins un peu je pense, c'est D qui parlait de ça un peu sur entre guillemets, les petits radicalismes, les petits, ça là trivialité, le quotidien, ce qui fait que au jour le jour, dans notre entourage, dans la vie, pour plein de raisons.

Une blague, un minimum, une vidéo de choc peut contribuer, peut-être à ce qu'on se rejoigne ou peut-être à ce qu'on se tapé sur la ******, mais c'est de comprendre pourquoi.

Et à cet égard-là, bien évidemment, je pense que c'est moi, c'est très micro. Alors des expériences pour essayer de voir ce qui marche, ce qui marche pas et essayer de raccrocher ça, ou à tout ce qui nous entouré en termes de recherche et de réflexion.

P4 : C'est ce que ça me ouais, tu sais ce que ça me suscite cette conversation qu'on est en train d'avoir, c'est qu'il y ait une recherche incroyable à faire :

Sur le profil, la disposition d'esprit des gens qui travaillent sur la radicalisation… Euh pour comprendre finalement ce qui nous pousse à bosser là-dessus, qui on est, où est-ce qu'on loge l'attention? Optimiste, pessimiste? Évidemment aller à l'intérieur de chacun de nous.

Oui, oui. Euh, je pense que ça en dit aussi beaucoup sur notre façon de regarder le monde, sur les propositions qu'on fait, sur les orientations qu'on donne dans nos recherches. Une espèce de généalogie de ce champ là ou une anthropologie, ethnologie, ethnographie de ce champ-là. Je pense que ce serait… Ce serait quelque chose de de formidable qui réglerait pas aucun problème. Probablement, mais qui nous en dirait quand même beaucoup sur nous-mêmes, sur notre façon de de de voir, de voir les choses. Parce que ce sentiment d'impuissance y a quelques études, hein, qui ont été faites là-dessus notamment.

Dans le champ des études sur le terrorisme il y a un très bon article que j'avais lu il y a quelques années, qu'il faisait un peu justement l'État du chant, mais de la discipline en tant que telle. Des études sur le terrorisme et où le mec expliqué finalement le pessimisme ambiant dans les études sur le terrorisme auprès des chercheurs, qui avait l'impression que finalement, ça n'avancerait jamais vraiment et qu'on revenait toujours au point de départ, que c'était un champ qui ne progressait pas.

Réellement et qui était un peu un peu déprimant et finalement on est passé des études sur le terrorisme, aux études sur la radicalisation puis à la prévention. Mais c'est la même filiation. C'est la même filiation, donc y a aussi toujours un peu cette

impression de de tourner en boucle. L'autre truc que je voulais dire car rien enfin si ça a à voir. Je pense aussi que comme tu disais, E, la critique de de de ce qu'on fait de la radicalisation, de la façon dont on conçoit historicisation de ce phénomène doit nous amener évidemment à relativiser les choses dans une certaine mesure. Sauf que moi il y a quand même un fantôme qui m'habite…. Les fantômes de ce qui se passe aux États-Unis.

Et ce fantôme-là, pour moi, c'est comment un peuple qui est une vieille démocratie, une grande démocratie. La moitié de ce peuple est capable, alors pas tellement d'élire un mec comme Trump parce que l'élire une première fois ça va bien tu sais pas quoi, t'as à faire trop encore mais continuer de le soutenir malgré tout, tout ce qu'il dit, tout ce qui fait les mensonges puis là il y a un rapport à la vérité, y a un rapport à la rationalité...

Il a été élu par la moitié des électeurs. Disons à peu près la grosso modo une première fois au jour d'aujourd'hui, dans les derniers sondage…

40% de de de sympathisants là qu'il faut aller, il faut faire quelque chose parce que je peux comprendre la colère. Y a bien des choses que je peux comprendre. Je peux comprendre pourquoi on mais on élit des populistes, et cetera. Mais à ce niveau-là, moi il y a quelque chose qui, avec une radicalité aussi forte que celle-là, y a quelque chose qui m'échappe.

M : Pardon, j'ai une question à vous poser… à propos du racisme au Québec ?

On m'a dit par example, que l'hôpital juif de Montréal a été créé parce que… dans les années 50, 60 (donc dans point de vue historique, c'est hier) les Juifs ne pouvaient pas travailler dans les autres hôpitaux ici et même pour étudier médecin, c'était compliqué.

P2 : C'est à dire dans un premier temps, ta question, me met mal à l'aise. (…) Alors évidemment, on aurait tendance à généraliser puis à dire, Ben, c'est une institution qui est qui est particulièrement reconnue pour être favorable, ou du moins à entretenir une image favorable de particulièrement du Québec francophone. Peut-être, mais je ne généralise pas.

Il est vrai historiquement parlant, que le Québec a un passé. Si ces mythes pour une faction de la population il y a des villages, des villes dans le nord du Québec où il y avait écrit pas de Juifs à l'entrée, tout à fait. Ce sont aussi des réalités qu'on caractérise d'autres provinces canadiennes. Par contre, il faut pas l'enterrer, il faut le regarder en face. Cette réalité-là de fermeture est habité. Cette tension là au Québec en particulier Québec francophone, qui….Ohh est toujours été tendu entre le fait d'être minoritaire dans sein d'un territoire largement anglophone, mais majoritaire à l'intérieur d'un territoire québécois. Alors évidemment, ça crée une tension, une forme de protection, une forme de crainte, une forme de peur aussi.

Peux plus jouer son rôle, notamment bien sûr, parce que à l'époque, la communauté juive est une communauté anglophone, pas francophone, alors on les voyait moins

bien comme des alliés. Alors, historiquement, ça n'explique rien, hein, mais vraiment pas, ça ne justifie pas plutôt cela, mais ça explique un peu penser en doute. Tout comme aussi sur la question autochtone, bien évidemment, ce qu'on voit à Vancouver, ce qu'on voit les, les dans les cimetières, dans les enfants, qu'on… qui ont été enterrés.

Cette réalité-là, de ce d'un Québec plus ferme, d'autant quand on entend parler en ce moment de l'immigration au Québec, de la bouche du gouvernement en place. On n'a pas tendance à y voir des éléments très positifs. Effectivement, ça vient, je pense, ternir peut-être la conception. Combien des québécoises et des Québécois? D'une ouverture, d'une tolérance et qui est là tout de même. C'est genre je pense, j'en mais je.

Je pense fort probablement que les québécois sont parmi les peuples les plus tolérants et les plus ouverts sur la planète à mon avis en termes se regarde, mais par contre, ça veut pas dire qu'ils sont parfaits, loin de là. Mais il y a un enjeu clairement en particulier sur la question de la langue qui crée une espèce de tension entre fermeture et ouverture.

P4 : Je ferai attention enfin, historiquement, y a pas eu plus d'antisémitisme. Je pense au Québec que dans le reste du Canada, là faut quand même faire attention. Là, je rappellerai même aux États-Unis, il y avait quand même des partis nazis aux États-Unis, à New York. Tu sais qu'on montre comme la ville ouverte sur l'immigration et le monde par excellence, y avait quand même des 3004, 1000, 5000 personnes qui se rassemblées avec le le. Le chef du parti nazi américain à New York même.

Donc, au moment où les bottes people de de de Juifs qui venaient de de, de de l'Allemagne et des pays de l'Est étaient en train de débarquer, les Mecs refusent que les gars descendent, même s'ils finissaient par les accueillir, donc je ferais vraiment. La comparaison là faut vraiment avoir des données qui nous permettent de faire des comparaisons, donc moi j'irais vraiment pas dans le plus ou dans le moins.

Parce que ça, je trouve que c'est toujours un drôle de. Est-ce qu'il y en a plus ici moins qu'ailleurs, et cetera? (…)

P3 : Là, mais y a une particularité sociologique québécoise qu'on peut mentionner, c'est la mainmise du clergé sur les services sociaux. Puis extrapoler ça à la sociologie du Québec, ça, je trouve ça assez grossier quand même, parce que c'était les ecclésiastiques dans leur dans leur minding, dans leur culture pratiquement fondamentaliste, qui avait pris le contrôle de toutes les services sociaux avec la complicité du gouvernement, bien sûr, mais faire le pont entre ça puis là là sociologie du Québec, c'est là où, selon moi, il y a un raccourci qui fonctionne, pas du tout.

P2 : C'est à dire que effectivement il s'assurait qu'il y a pas de juif ou qu'il y ait pas de protestant non plus qui occupent des charges alors que globalement,

politiquement, économiquement les protestants contrôlaient tout parce que faut pas oublier que pendant ce temps-là on était encore un peuple colonisé et économiquement en tout cas c'est les anglophones qui contrôlaient l'économie, mais les services sociaux. Là c'était l'Église, puis là non plus, c'était pas la société canadienne-française, c'était vraiment l'élite ecclésiastique avec leurs valeurs rétrogrades qui ont fini par prendre le bord dans une modernisation tardive ce qui était mon premier point-là réelle particularité sociologique du Québec à cet égard là, c'est d'avoir les services sociaux contrôlés par le clergé encore dans les années 50. C'est ça qui détonne. Mais selon moi, ça va être le seul élément, ou en tout cas faut pas trop extrapoler là-dessus là.

P4 : OK, tu peux le regarder ouais tu peux le regarder par exemple sur tout le débat sur la laïcité et tu sais quand le Québec essaie de pousser le principe de laïcité. Comment dans le reste du Canada, c'est vraiment perçu comme finalement quelque chose d'Anti religion, et cetera et cetera et de très nationaliste étroit. Alors on pourrait en débattre, mais la question n'est pas de dire si on est pour ou contre, mais de voir le réflexe. Mais ce que je voulais te dire, c'est que ce que nous montrent les données, parce qu'on a quand même des données de sondages, et cetera. C'est quoi nos indicateurs? Notre baromètre de l'intolérance, mettons. Quand tu regardes les sondages d'opinion, qu'est-ce que tu vois? Tu vois que le Québec est pas beaucoup plus méfiant vis-à-vis de l'immigration que le reste du Canada. Ça dépend de de certains, de certains critères que tu regardes et cetera. Mais les sondages montrent que patent là ou le Québec est plus intolérant que le reste du Canada, c'est clairement sur la religion. C'est indiscutable, donc il y a une intolérance. Les québécois, pour les raisons qui évoquaient les 2 copains tout à l'heure, les québécois sont beaucoup plus intolérants vis-à-vis de la religion que le reste du Canada. Est-ce qu'il y a des religions?

(…) C'est très clair, tous les sondages d'opinion montrent que Oh, on n'aime pas la religion, puis on se méfie, on se méfie de l'islam qui est une religion prosélyte. Le judaïsme n'est pas une religion prosélyte, c'est à dire que les québécois, une partie pardon des québécois. Mais je peux vous le dire en région, savent même pas ce que c'est qu être un juif.

(…) Au Québec et dans le reste du Canada, il n'y en a pas plus au Québec. Quand tu compares le nombre de groupes d'extrême droite, il y en a pas plus au Québec que dans le reste du Canada. Quand tu compares les insultes, les actes terroristes, y en a pas plus au Québec que dans le reste du Canada. Et quand tu compares, bah les mouvements extrémistes, c'est pareil. Là tu sais-je veux dire la réalité. Exemple aux États-Unis par rapport à la communauté noire.

P 3 : Moi je quand je le pose ces questions-là dans le cadre de mes travaux, je me rends bien compte que si on n'a pas ces indicateurs là au Québec, alors on n'a pas ces indicateurs là au Québec, de comment les attitudes sociales, politiques à l'égard

de la minorité visible, vous dites non blanche, la ou des minorités religieuses par rapport au grand, aux musulmans ou aux Juifs. Évidemment, on n'a pas, ça n'a pas beaucoup ces données là on et et on commence à essayer d'en cueillir. C'est assez récent dans l'histoire du Québec qu'on se pose cette question-là.

P 2 : Parce qu'on croyait qu'il ne faisait pas particulièrement partie de nous et et ça, c'est des gars. Là, effectivement, c'est, je pense que c'est peut-être ce choc là qui est intéressant. Maintenant, qui est souligné par ta question maintenant, comme le disait si bien P3.

P4 : Donc, le racisme systémique vis-à-vis des autochtones, c'est le gouvernement canadien aussi, peut-être même plus que le gouvernement du Québec qui a essayé. Alors, il y a eu aussi la du racisme systémique vis-à-vis des autochtones, évidemment, mais de trouver des modes de conciliation. En fait, je pense qu'on on, on se découvre un Québec qui, qui, qui ressemble finalement à bien d'autres sociétés dans le monde avec ses pardon, ombres d'intolérance, de xénophobie, d'antisémitisme, de racisme, mais on.

P1 : La question de l'antisémitisme au Québec. J'avoue que je je pourrais pas aller au-delà de ce que P4 a dit, notamment sur les statistiques par rapport au crime haineux et par rapport aux actes terroristes sur lesquels on travaille actuellement. Effectivement, on voit qu'il y a pas plus de de de d'antisémitisme au Québec que qu'ailleurs au Canada, et ça, effectivement en train de travailler dessus. Le substrat historique en fait de l'antisémitisme, c'est à dire comme on l'a dit au départ, faut se rappeler que la première émeute antisémite, premier pogrom recensé en 38 après Jésus-Christ, Alexandrie.

C'est cette premier recense d'ailleurs un immense un immense program et les tensions entre communautés juive et j'obtiens étaient déjà présentes sous Cléopâtre. Donc quasiment, s'entend, s'entend auparavant. Et la question de l'antisémitisme en fait, elle est, elle est, elle est, elle est elle de elle est Millénaire en fait. Dans les sociétés occidentales et Moyen-Orientales.

Donc poser effectivement, c'est une question d'une spécificité québécoise. Quand on pense effectivement à l'ensemble des actes antisémites et des événements antisémites en Europe au cours du Moyen-âge, de la Renaissance, pense à la réforme de Luther à la tête ciment antisémite, par exemple, Hein. C'est d'ailleurs dans certains de ses textes, il y a une voix, des premières tentatives de justifier de la déportation de certaines populations juives. (…) Ce sont effectivement ensuite des idéologies qui sont arrivées en en Amérique du Nord et qui ont fleuri à la suite. Effectivement, notamment la 2nde Guerre mondiale, même si c'était déjà présent pendant avec des leaders effectivement néonazis, très en vue, je pense à George Nikon Rockwell après la guerre mondiale qui a largement participé à la diffusion d'un antisémitisme international avec la fondation de certaines de certaines.

Certaines associations internationales donc effectivement le mettre en le mettre en relief et d'ailleurs on les théories du complot, le substrat antisémite. Il est quasiment tout le temps-là, quand on parle de Quanon, quand on parle des illuminati, l'antisémite est constamment là, quand on regarde mémoire pour servir à l'histoire du jacobinisme par là barruel. Pour quand il examiné la Révolution française? Les Juifs sont jamais très loin de la question des francs maçons et des illuminatis donc on se mette en soi. Effectivement, la spécificité québécoise. A pas vraiment d'intérêt d'un point de vue d'un point de vue historique et certainement de réalité non plus. Comme tout le monde l'a bien dit. Mieux dit que moi d'ailleurs.

P4 : (…) Que les francophones alors tout ça reste minoritaire, mais c'est 6% au Québec, 9% dans le reste du Canada, par exemple. L'adhésion aux théories du complot. Alors évidemment, ici c'est pas la question de la langue, c'est parce que tu parles en anglais que t'es plus radical qu'un mec qui parle en français, mais ça vient avec d'autres d'autres dimensions, comme par exemple et quand je te parle Anglo Franco c'est y compris au Québec. (…)

Les anglophones du Québec adhèrent davantage aux théories du complot et on et manifeste plus de sympathie à l'égard de la violence que les francophones du Québec. Alors là, t'as d'autres variables, est ce que c'est que on a plus de gens qui sont croyants par exemple? Donc ça on voit nous un lien entre le fait de dire que la religion a un impact dans ton quotidien? Cette catégorie là est surreprésentée dans les gens qui adhèrent aux théories du complot. Est-ce que c'est le sentiment de discrimination, donc les anglophones? (…)

Je pense que le Québec est peut-être est, est, est, est en train de se politiser plus tardivement que d'autres espaces géographiques aux au Canada, dans le sens où et là je reviendrai à ce que P1 disait. Il a été dépossédé de la question politique notamment par l'Église pendant très, très longtemps, et cetera. Et donc c'est cette socialisation politique peut être qui est en train de se faire. Mais ça c'est ça. Resterait à à démontrer en tout cas pour moi, le plus important c'est que les les données vraiment mettent beaucoup de nuances sur ces différences-là.

M : Bon, je voudrais j'aimerais bien continuer pendant notre heure, mais je sais bien que vous êtes très occupé donc je vous, je vous pose une dernière question sur une dernière commentaire hein, à chacun de vous. Ce que vous voulez dire très brièvement et après on finit.

P3 : C'est déjà une intuition que j'avais. Ben ça l'affirme encore plus, c'est ça va paraître un peu vintage, mais c'est l'importance des questions morales dans les discussions politiques. Puis souvent, on balaie un peu en dessous du tapis, on a l'impression qu'on a une politique juste, compétitive ou juste éthique, bien technicisée bien propre. Puis la morale, Ben ça vient, ça vient du du fond du cœur

en fait. Puis je me rends compte à quel point tu sais quand on parle de la, de la société qu'on veut, qui est celle où il y a moins de radicalisation.

Dans le fond, on parle d'orientation morale. Je me rends compte à quel point c'est des discussions qui sont disparues de l'espace public ou qu'on qu'on considère qu'il n'y a pas lieu d'être. On sait encore moins comment discuter. On a déjà de la misère à parler de politique, imaginer comment on peut parler de morale. Mais je me rends compte à quel point ça devient central dans toutes ces discussions-là. Puis, si on parle pas du cœur du vivre ensemble, y a pas de technique pour faire ça. Tu sais, quand on disait on cherche, on cherche la technique pour pour y arriver. Ben y a peut-être pas de technique hein, ça vient du fond du cœur ou alors ça vient pas?

P4 : (…) Soit leur cours en éthique et culture religieuse. C'est très bien, et cetera, mais même pas de l'éducation à la citoyenneté, faut faire de la philo, de la philo politique dès le secondaire, c'est sûr. Pardon, c'était mon commentaire sur le commentaire de P1, mais je me garde mon droit de parole quand même, hein?

M : OK, Ah oui bien sûr.

P2 : Ben, je, je vais prendre, je vais revenir sur un point de note sur lequel j'avais que pendant qu'on discutait quand on parlait de Trump, s'il vient de parler du vivre ensemble aussi, je pense qu'un des éléments aussi qui sur lequel on doit se pencher, ce que on réfléchit. On a beaucoup….
On pense beaucoup, on pense beaucoup au cynisme, par exemple au cynisme politique, à la considère, à, au renforcement, la consolidation démocratique. Toutes ces choses là et moi, je pense qu'il y a un point qui qui est très difficile en ce moment d'aborder. C'est les attitudes de des politiciens eux-mêmes elles-mêmes. Je pense que. On a un, on a un gros problème en ce moment parce que je pense que le risque c'est un espèce de cloisonnement qui est en qui a une tendance, c'est à dire longue pendant longtemps, j'ai j'étais de celui qui disait.

Ben il faut valoriser le travail des politiciens et je le suis aussi. Je pense qu'il faut continuer de valoriser le travail des politiciens, mais en même temps, je pense qu'il y a une question qui devient de plus en plus importante. C'est, il faut remettre le travail des politiciens en perspective. Il faut réfléchir le travail des politiciens. Et si on voulait arrêter de dire et d'entendre, même des politiciens eux-mêmes dire à d'autres personnes que ce qu'ils font, c'est mal. Ils, quand ils disent en disant Vous faites de la politique, ce qui a aucun sens.

C'est de pour remettre cette dimension noble, on pourrait dire d'une certaine façon cette dimension de collectivité, de sens commun.

(…) Si tu un des motifs, des fondements mêmes de l'existence de la politique, c'est à dire des des, des, des vecteurs de vivre ensemble, des conciliations de différences plutôt que des alimenteurs de tension. Et ça Ben à mon avis, c'est mal parti. Là, si on regarde ce qui se passe pas juste aux États-Unis, si on regarde la partisane de la

la moi je suis en communication politique et ce qui me préoccupe c'est vraiment ces éléments là comme on utilise les données en ligne dans les dans les partis politiques.

P1 : C'est on se demandait tout à l'heure laquelle était l'apport de la recherche par rapport à cette question d'un point de vue opérationnel, je pense que la recherche, c'est l'art de la nuance. Et une errance qui manque cruellement dans l'espace public actuellement, que ce soit effectivement au niveau politique, au niveau social, en termes de polarisation et en termes de… D'inadéquation. Et de séparation de certains mondes distincts qui ne devraient pas l'être. Euh, je pense que l'idée de la recherche et de le rôle même des chercheurs, ça serait d'apporter cette nuance dans un espace public qui en est maintenant relativement dépourvu. Sans vouloir faire un discours entre guillemets dentiste. Mais l'idée ça serait effectivement de de ramener cette nuance au cœur des au cœur des dialogues et de contribuer à un bien un bien vivre ensemble aussi plus efficace. Parce que effectivement ce qui se passe aux États-Unis qui est quand même.

Le grand laboratoire des expériences politiques religieuses est inquiétant. C'est inquiétant, c'est pas juste inquiétant parce que c'est un épiphénomène, mais c'est parce que c'est une grande vague. Les États-Unis, cette tremblement de terre à l'origine de tous les bouleversements mondiaux. La vague, on se la prend juste plus longtemps après et là on voit la mer se retirer et je sais pas exactement ce qui va nous arriver dessus et ça, ça, ça, ça, ça m'angoisse aussi un peu. Mais justement, le.

P4: (…) mais te remercier de ce meeting, c'est la d'avoir donné l'occasion de cette conversation aujourd'hui. Conversation que je trouve vraiment fortement intéressante. Bon, même si les 3 d'abord entendent mes 3, mes 3 collègues et copains ici, , on se, on se voit assez souvent quand même, donc on à l'occasion de débattre un peu de ces trucs-là.

J'ai eu la chance de les fréquenter un peu plus dans des conférences qui nous a permis aussi de sortir du travail professionnel pour se découvrir. Mais je pense que c'est important cette conversation…. Sur ce qu'on fait…. Euh sur le travail, sur le lien, sur ce qui nous unit, c'est sur quoi on converge ce sur quoi peut être, on diverge par rapport à ce qu'on fait dans la chair est important et je pense que je vais, on va probablement faire du millage sur ton idée de de de rencontre avec aussi avec l'équipe de la Chaire tu vois. Puis là, je mets ça dans l'oreille de de S., mais je pense que ça serait intéressant qu'on se trouve une journée avec toutes nos équipes…

Sans ordre du jour et si tu nous permets Marina, je pense que on piquera tes 3 premières questions. E. l'a dit, elles sont malaisantes et c'est parfait. Moi, je les aime comme ça. J'ai l'impression de plus, une question est malaisante, plus ça ça, ça brise la glace et ça permet après d'aller dans des conversations qui sont très très intéressantes. Donc c'est ça que ça a suscité en moi. Cette idée de de créer du dialogue en entre nous, on l'a beaucoup autour de projets spécifiques, mais y a quand même beaucoup de gens qu'on n'entend pas.

Souvent dans la, dans la chair, alors pas ceux qui sont là, mais plus des auxiliaires de recherche, et cetera. On connaît pas vraiment leur point de vue sur les choses. On sait pas ce qu'ils pensent, pourquoi ils sont là, ils veulent faire…. Donc ça on va le faire beaucoup plus.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2020). *The 'War on Terror', State Crime & Radicalization: A Constitutive Theory of Radicalization*. Springer Nature.

Almond, D., Currie, J., & Duque, V. (2017). *Childhood circumstances and adult outcomes: Act II* (No. w23017). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Aly, A., Taylor, E., & Karnovsky, S. (2014). Moral disengagement and building resilience to violent extremism: An education intervention. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 37(4), 369-385.

Antonelli F. (2021). *Radicalizzazione*. Milano: Mondadori Università.

Arshad-Ayaz, A., & Naseem, M. A. (2017). Creating "invited" spaces for counter-radicalization and counter-extremism education. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 11(1), 6-16.

Azqueta, A., Merino-Arribas, A. (2020) "Análisis de los Planes de Prevención de la Radicalización en Europa desde una perspectiva educativa". OBETS. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 15(2): 405-436.

Bailey, G. M., & Edwards, P. (2017). Rethinking 'radicalisation': Microradicalisations and reciprocal radicalisation as an intertwined process. *Journal for Deradicalization*, (10), 255-281.

Bains, J. (2005). Race, culture and psychiatry: A history of transcultural psychiatry. *History of Psychiatry*, 16(2), 139-154.

Baruch, B., Ling, T., Warnes, R., et Hofman, J. (2018). Evaluation in an emerging field: Developing a measurement framework for the field of counter-violent-extremism. *Evaluation*, 24(4), 475-495.

Bhui, K. S., Hicks, M. H., Lashley, M., & Jones, E. (2012). A public health approach to understanding and preventing violent radicalization. *BMC medicine*, 10(1), 1-8.

Bjørgo, T. (2013). *Strategies for preventing terrorism*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Pivot.

Blackburn, J. (2000). Understanding Paulo Freire: Reflections on the origins, concepts, and possible pitfalls of his educational approach. *Community Development Journal*, 35(1), 3-15.

Bloor M., Frankland J., Thomas M., Robson K. (2001). *Focus Groups in social research*. London, Sage Publications.

Borum, R. (2011). Radicalization into violent extremism I: A review of social science theories. *Journal of strategic security*, 4(4), 7-36.

Bramadat, P., & Dawson, L. (Eds.). (2014). *Religious radicalization and securitization in Canada and beyond*. University of Toronto Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.

Brouillette-Alarie, S., Hassan, G., Varela, W., Ousman, S., Kilinc, D., Savard, É. L., Madriaza P., Harris-Hoganb S., McCoyc J., Rousseau C., Kinge M., Venkatesh V., Borokhovskif E. & Pickup, D. (2022). Systematic Review on the Outcomes of Primary and Secondary Prevention Programs in the Field of Violent Radicalization. *Journal for Deradicalization*, (30), 117-168.

Calvino I. (2002). *Lezioni americane*. Milano: Mondadori.

Caramellino D., Melacarne C., Ducol B. Transformative Learning and Microradicalization. In: Nicolaides A., Eschenbacher S., Buergelt P., Gilpin-Jackson Y., Welch M., Misawa M. (org.) (2021). *The Palgrave Handbook on Learning for Transformation*. Palgrave.

Carignan, M.-È. & Morin, D. (2022). *Mon frère est complotiste: Comment rétablir le lien et le dialogue social*. Éditions de l'Homme.

Catarci M. Educazione, emancipazione e coscientizzazione nel pensiero pedagogico di Paulo Freire. In: V.A. Fiorucci M (a cura di), *Pedagogia e politica, in occasione dei 100 anni dalla nascita di Paulo Freire*, Pensa multimedia, Lecce, 2022, pp. 21-34.

Clarke, V., Braun, V., & Hayfield, N. (2015). Thematic analysis. *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*, 222-248.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). Planning educational research. *Research methods in education*.

Cohen, S. J. (2019). The unconscious in terror: An overview of psychoanalytic contributions to the psychology of terrorism and violent radicalization. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 16(4), 216-228.

Crenshaw, M. (1981). The causes of terrorism. *Comparative politics*, 13(4), 379-399.

Creswell, J. W., & Tashakkori, A. (2007). Differing perspectives on mixed methods research. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 1(4), 303-308.

Creswell, J. W., & Garrett, A. L. (2008). The "movement" of mixed methods research and the role of educators. *South African journal of education*, 28(3), pp. 321-333.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Creswell, J. W., & Hirose, M. (2019). Mixed methods and survey research in family medicine and community health. *Family Medicine and Community Health*, 7(2).

Dal Magro, R., Pozzebon, M., & Schutel, S. (2020). Enriching the intersection of service and transformative learning with Freirean ideas: The case of a critical experiential learning programme in Brazil. *Management Learning*, 51(5), 579-597.

Dapkus, M. A. (1985). A thematic analysis of the experience of time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(2), 408.

da Silva Coelho, A., & Malafatti, F. (2021). Paulo Freire e o cristianismo da libertação: contribuição do conceito de visão social de mundo. *Práxis Educativa* (Brasil), 16, 1-16.

Delille, E. (2017). De la psychiatrie exotique aux réseaux universitaires de psychiatrie culturelle: pour une histoire de l'ethnopsychiatrie comme corpus de savoirs en période de transition (1945–1965). In: Ellenberger H (ed. Delille E), *Ethno-psychiatrie*. Lyon: ENS Éditions, 9–115.

Delille, E., & Crozier, I. (2018). Historicizing transcultural psychiatry: people, epistemic objects, networks, and practices. *History of Psychiatry*, 29(3), 257-262.

della Porta D. (2018) Radicalization: A Relational Perspective. *Annu. Rev. Political Sci*. 21:461–74.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.

Dewey, J. (1929). *The sources of a science of education*. Horace Liveright.

Doosje, B., Moghaddam, F. M., Kruglanski, A. W., De Wolf, A., Mann, L., & Feddes, A. R. (2016). Terrorism, radicalization and de-radicalization. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 11, 79-84.

Dullo, E. (2014). Paulo Freire, o testemunho e a pedagogia católica: a ação histórica contra o fatalismo. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 29, 49-61.

Etchezahar, E. D., & Brussino, S. A. (2013). Psychological perspectives in the study of authoritarianism. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences* 5(3), 495-521.

Fabbri, L., & Romano, A. (2021). Processi di radicalizzazione e prospettive trasformative. *Educational Reflective Practices*. 1-Special, 8-20. https://doi.org/10.3280/erp1-special-2021oa12448

Fabbri, L. & Melacarne, C. (eds.). (2023). *Understanding Radicalization in Everyday Life*. McGraw-Hill.

Fenwick, T. J. (2000). Expanding conceptions of experiential learning: A review of the five contemporary perspectives on cognition. *Adult education quarterly*, 50(4), 243-272.

Freire, P. (2013). *Pedagogia do oprimido*. Epub, Paz e Terra.

Freire, P. (2015). *Educação como prática de liberdade*. Epub, Paz e Terra.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogia da indignação: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos*. Unesp, 2000.

Freitas, R. (2012). HEINE, H. Heine, hein? Poeta dos contrários. Trad. André Vallias. São Paulo: Perspectiva/Goethe-Institut, 2011. *Princípios: Revista de Filosofia*, 19(31), 363-367.

Freud S. (1988a) *Más alla del principio del placer*. Vol. XVIII. Obras Completas, Buenos Aires: Amorrortu editores.

Freud, S. (1988b). *Conferencias de introducción a la psicoanálisis*, Vol. XV. Obras Completas, Buenos Aires: Amorrortu editores.

Freud, S. (1988c). *El Mal Estar en la Cultura*, Vol. XXI, Obras Completas. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu Editores.

Freud S. (2014). *O homem Moisés e a Religião Monoteísta*. Porto Alegre: L&PM Editores.

Gadotti, M. (Ed.). (1996). *PAULO FREIRE: Uma biobibliografia*. Cortez Editora.

Gaspar, H. A., Daase, C., Deitelhoff, N., Junk, J., & Sold, M. (2020). Radicalization and political violence–challenges of conceptualizing and researching origins, processes and politics of illiberal beliefs. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV)*, *14*, 1-18.

Gay, P. (1989). *Freud: una vida de nuestro tiempo*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Hardy, K. (2018). Comparing theories of radicalisation with countering violent extremism policy. *Journal for Deradicalization*, v. 15.

Harris-Hogan S., Barrelle K. & Smith D. (2019). The role of schools and education in countering violent extremism (CVE): applying lessons from Western countries to Australian CVE policy, *Oxford Review of Education*, 45:6, 731.

Holton, G. J. (1973). *Thematic origins of scientific thought: Kepler to Einstein*. Harvard University Press.

Inannello, N., Lo Cricchio, M. G., Musso, P., Grattagliano, I., Inguaglia, I. & Lo Coco, A. (2023). Radicalization in Correctional Systems: A Scoping Review of the Literature Evaluating the Effectiveness of Preventing and Countering Interventions. *Journal for Deradicalization*, 34, 177-210.

Jämte, J., & Ellefsen, R. (2020). Countering extremism (s): Differences in local prevention of left-wing, right-wing and Islamist extremism. *Journal for deradicalization*, (24), 191-231.

Kernberg, O. F. (2003). Sanctioned social violence: A psychoanalytic view. Part II. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 84(4), 953-968.

Khosrokhavar, F. (2017). *Radicalization: Why some people choose the path of violence*. New Press.

King M and Taylor DM. (2011). The Radicalization of Homegrown Jihadists: A Review of Theoretical Models and Social Psychological Evidence. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 23: 602–22.

Kirmayer, L. J., Rousseau, C., & Guzder, J. (2014). Introduction: the place of culture in mental health services. *Cultural consultation: Encountering the other in mental health care*, 1-20. DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-7615-3_1

Kirmayer, L. J., & Jarvis, G. E. (2019). Culturally responsive services as a path to equity in mental healthcare. *HealthcarePapers*, 18(2), 11-23.

Kohan, W. (2019). *Paulo Freire mais do que nunca: uma biografia filosófica*. Vestigio.

Kundnani, A. (2012). Radicalisation: the journey of a concept. *Race & Class*, 54(2), 3-25.

Koomen, V, & Van der Pligt, J. (2016). *The Psychology of Radicalization and Terrorism*. Routledge.

Kruglanski, A. W., Gelfand, M. J., Bélanger, J. J., Sheveland, A., Hetiarachchi, M., & Gunaratna, R. (2014). The psychology of radicalization and deradicalization: How significance quest impacts violent extremism. *Political Psychology*, 35, 69-93.

Kuusisto, A., Gearon, L. F., Benjamin, S., & Koirikivi, P. M. (2021). Re-Conceptualizing Radicalization: The Educational Research Context of Counter-Extremism Through the Prism of Worldviews and Value Learning. *Religious Diversity at School* (pp. 123-137). Springer VS, Wiesbaden.

Laplanche, J., & Pontalis, J. B. (2018). *The language of psychoanalysis*. Routledge.

Laqueur, W. (2004). The terrorism to come. *Policy Review*, 126, 49-64.

Ledwith, M. (2001), Community work as critical pedagogy: re-envisioning Freire and Gramsci. *Community development journal*, Vol. 36(3), pp. 171-182.

Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., & Sablynski, C. J. (1999). Qualitative research in organizational and vocational psychology, 1979-1999. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 55(2), 161-187.

Levy, N. 2000. Charles Taylor on overcoming incommensurability. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 26:47–61.

Lis, A., Mazzeschi, C., & Zennaro, A. (2002). *La Psicoanalisi. Un percorso concettuale fra tradizione e attività*. Roma: Carocci.

Lucisano, P., & Salerni, A. (2002). *Metodologia della ricerca in educazione e formazione*. Roma: Carocci.

Malthaner S, Lindekilde L. (2017). Analyzing pathways of lone-actor radicalisation. A relational approach. In: *Constructions of Terrorism. An Interdisciplinary Approach to Research and Policy*, ed. M Stohl, R Burchill, SH Eglund, pp. 163–80. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Malthaner, S. (2017). Radicalization: The evolution of an analytical paradigm. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociol*ogie, 58(3), 369-401.

Markin, R. D. (2013). Mentalization-based psychotherapy interventions with mothers-to-be. *Psychotherapy*, Vol. 50: 360-365.

McCauley, C., & Moskalenko, S. (2008). Mechanisms of political radicalization: Pathways toward terrorism. *Terrorism and political violence*, 20(3), 415-433.

McCauley, C., & Moskalenko, S. (2012). Recent US Thinking About Terrorism and Counterterrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 22(4), 224–245.

Meringolo, P. (2020). Theoretical background of violent radicalisation. Research and interventions from different perspectives. *Preventing Violent Radicalisation in Europe: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 3-20.

Mezirow J. (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moghaddam, F. M. (2005). The staircase to terrorism: A psychological exploration. *American psychologist*, 60(2), 161.

Moghaddam, F. M. (2018). Mutual radicalization: How groups and nations drive each other to extremes. *American Psychological Association*.

Moyano, M., Kruglanski, A. W., & Trujillo, H. M. (2022). Processes of radicalization, violent extremism and terrorism (Procesos de radicalización, extremismo violento y terrorismo). *International Journal of Social Psychology*, 1-12.

Mrazek P. & Haggerty R.P. (ed.) (1994). *Reducing Risks for Mental Disorders: Frontiers for Preventive Intervention Research*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Murphy Paul, A. (2010). *Origins: how the nine months before birth shape the rest of our lives*. New York: Free Press.

Nagda, B. R. A., Gurin, P., & Lopez, G. E. (2003). Transformative pedagogy for democracy and social justice. *Race, ethnicity and education*, 6(2), 165-191.

Nelson, B.J. & Venkatesh, V. (2023). Social pedagogy in the information age: Creating reflexive inclusivity to combat social media-fueled narcissism and solipsism. In: *Anti-Disinformation Pedagogy: Understanding the Power of Manipulative Narratives and What We Can Do About it*. Ed. David Castillo & Bradley J. Nelson. Hispanic Issues.

Neumann P., Kleinmann S.(2013) How Rigorous Is Radicalization Research?, *Democracy and Security*, 9:4, 360-382.

Nogueira, I. B. (2021) *A cor do inconsciente: significações do corpo negro*. Editora Perspectiva S/A.

Novelli, M. (2017). Education and countering violent extremism: Western logics from south to north? Compare: A Journal Of Comparative & International Education, 47(6), 835-851.

Orefice, C. (2022) Problematizzare il mondo, ridare la parola, favorire i processi di trasformazione sociale. I perché di un numero monografico su Paulo Freire. *Educational Reflexive Practices*, N. 1.

Osmani S. & Sen A. (2003). The hidden penalties of gender inequality: fetal origins of ill-health. *Economics and Human Biology*, 105–121.

Perry, B., & Scrivens, R. (2018). A climate for hate? An exploration of the right-wing extremist landscape in Canada. *Critical Criminology*, 26, 169-187.

Piasecka, S. (2019). Performing PREVENT: anti-extremist theatre-in-education in the service of UK counter-terrorism, a Freirean analysis. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 12:4, 715-734.

Pistone, I., Eriksson, E., Beckman, U., Mattson, C., & Sager, M. (2019). A scoping review of interventions for preventing and countering violent extremism: Current status and implications for future research. *Journal for deradicalization*, (19), 1-84.

Pontalis, J. B. (1991). *Perder de vista: da fantasia de recuperação do objeto perdido*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.

Rahimi, S., & Graumans, R. (2015). Reconsidering the relationship between integration and radicalization. Journal for Deradicalization, (5), 28-62.

Richards, J. (2017). *Extremism, radicalization and security: An identity theory approach*. Springer.

Roudinesco, É. (2016). *Freud: In his time and ours*. Harvard University Press.

Rousseau, C., Hassan, G., & Oulhote, Y. (2017). And if there were another way out? Questioning the prevalent radicalization models. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 108, e633-e635.

Rousseau, C., Aggarwal, N. K., & Kirmayer, L. J. (2021). Radicalization to violence: A view from cultural psychiatry. Transcultural psychiatry, 58(5), 603-615.

Sabic-El-Rayess, A. (2020). Epistemological shifts in knowledge and education in Islam: A new perspective on the emergence of radicalization amongst Muslims. International Journal of Educational Development, 73, 102148.

Sabic-El-Rayess, A. (2021). How do people radicalize? International Journal of Educational Development, 87, 102499.

Sabic-El-Rayess, A. (2023). Ending Educational Displacement. Bosnian Studies: Perspectives from an Emerging Field, 123.

Sabic-El-Rayess, A., & Marsick, V. (2021). Transformative Learning and Extremism. In J. Walker, G. Maestrini, & S. Smythe (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Adult Education in Global Times Conference*, pp. 636-638. Ottawa: Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education (CASAE).

Sageman M. (2008). *Leaderless Jihad: terror networks in the twenty-first century*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Saleebey D.S.W. & Scanlon E. (2005) Is a Critical Pedagogy for the Profession of Social Work Possible? *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 25:3-4, 1-18.

Sas, M., Ponnet, K., Reniers, G., & Hardyns, W. (2020). The role of education in the prevention of radicalization and violent extremism in developing countries. *Sustainability*, 12(6), 2320.

Schmid, A. P. (2013), *Radicalisation, de-radicalisation, counter-radicalisation: A conceptual discussion and literature review*. In «ICCT Research Paper», *97*(1).

Schmidt C., Joff, G. & Davar E. (2005) The Psychology of Political Extremism. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 18(1), 151-172.

Schuurman, B. (2020). Research on terrorism: A review of data, methods, and authorship. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 32(5).

Sedgwick, M. (2010). The concept of radicalization as a source of confusion. *Terrorism and political violence*, 22(4), 479-494.

Shaull, R. (1972). Introduction to Freire, P. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Penguin Books.

Shirazi, R. (2017). When schooling becomes a tactic of security: Educating to counter 'extremism'. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*. 11(1), 2-5.

Silber, M. & Bhatt A. (2007). *Radicalization in the West. The Homegrown Threat.* New York: New York Police Department Intelligence Division.

Silke A. (2008) Research on Terrorism. In: Chen H., Reid E., Sinai J., Silke A., Ganor B. (eds) Terrorism Informatics. *Integrated Series in Information Systems*, vol 18. Springer, Boston, MA.

Silverman, D., & Gobo, G. (2008). *Manuale di ricerca sociale e qualitativa* (Edizione italiana ed., Manuali universitari Sociologia). Roma: Carocci.

Sjøen, M. M., & Jore, S. H. (2019). Preventing extremism through education: Exploring impacts and implications of counter-radicalisation efforts. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 40(3), 269-283.

Spaaij, R. & Jeanes, R. (2013) Education for social change? A Freirean critique of sport for development and peace, Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 18:4, 442-457.

Speckhard, A. (2007). De-legitimizing terrorism: Creative engagement and understanding of the psycho-social and political processes involved in ideological support for terrorism. *Democracy and Security*, 3(3), 251-277.

Stephens, W., Sieckelinck, S., & Boutellier, H. (2021). Preventing Violent Extremism: A Review of the Literature. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 44:4, 346-361.

Taylor, E., Taylor, P.C., Karnovsky, S., Aly, A., & Taylor, N. (2017). "Beyond Bali": a transformative education approach for developing community resilience to violent extremism. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37:2, 193-204.

Thomas, P. (2020). Britain's Prevent strategy: Always changing, always the same? In J. Busher & L. Jerome (Eds.), *The Prevent duty in education: Impact, enactment and implications* (pp. 11-31). Palgrave Macmillan.

Trinchero, R. (2004). *I metodi della ricerca educativa*. Roma. GLF editori Laterza.

Tulli, F. (2012). *Strumenti per le organizzazioni*. Milano, Franco Angeli.

Upton, M., & Grossman, M. (2019). The Dury's Out: Participatory drama and applied theatre processes as ways of addressing radicalized thinking–a pilot study. *Applied Theatre Research*, 7(1), 51-66.

Vidino, L., & Brandon, J. (2012). *Countering Radicalization in Europe*. London: The International Centre for the Study of Radicalization and Political Violence (ICSR).

Wallerstein, N., & Bernstein, E. (1988). Empowerment education: Freire's ideas adapted to health education. *Health education quarterly*, 15(4), 379-394.

Watkins, K. E., Marsick, V. J., & de Álava, M. F. (2014). Evaluating informal learning in the workplace. *Promoting, assessing, recognizing and certifying lifelong learning: International perspectives and practices*, 59-77.

Weine, S., Horgan, J., Robertson, C., Loue, S., Mohamed, A., & Noor, S. (2009). Community and family approaches to combating the radicalization and

recruitment of Somali-American youth and young adults: A psychosocial perspective. *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict*, 2, 181–200.

Wilner, A, & Dubouloz, C.J. (2015). Homegrown terrorism and transformative learning: an interdisciplinary approach to understanding radicalization. *Global Change, Peace, and Security*. 22(1), 33–51.

Wimelius, M. E., Eriksson, M., Kinsman, J., Strandh, V., & Ghazinour, M. (2018). What is local resilience against radicalization and how can it be promoted? A multidisciplinary literature review. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 1-18.

Winter, D. G., & McClelland, D. C. (1978). Thematic analysis: An empirically derived measure of the effects of liberal arts education. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(1), 8.

Wintrob, R. (2013). Reflections on current research and future challenges in cultural psychiatry. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 50(6), 765-768.