

---

# Family Support

Supporting families confronted with violent  
radicalisation: a guide to inspire



---

# Family Support

Supporting families confronted with violent  
radicalisation: a guide to inspire

---

---

## COLOPHON

### **Family Support. Supporting families confronted with violent radicalisation: a guide to inspire**

This publication is also available in Dutch: Family Support. Gezinsondersteuning bij geweldadige radicalisering: een inspiratiegids

This publication is also available in French: Family Support. Soutenir les familles confrontées à la radicalisation violente : guide des pratiques

A co-edition published by the King Baudouin Foundation  
Rue Brederode 21  
1000 Brussels

And the Directorate General Security & Prevention (Ministry of the Interior), with support of the European Commission.

#### AUTHOR(S)

Kim Lecoyer, Researcher at the Centre of Expertise in Family Studies, Odisee Hogeschool  
Hassan Bousetta, Researcher at the FNRS and member of the CEDEM, Université de Liège  
Mégane Dethier, Researcher at the CEDEM, Université de Liège

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE

Maarten De Waele, Radicalisation and polarisation project collaborator, VVSG  
Toria Ficette, Regional Polarisation-Radicalisation Coordinator, Bruxelles Prévention et Sécurité  
Karin Heremans, Policy coordinator, Prevention radicalisation and polarisation GO! & co-chair RAN education  
Alice Jaspert, Research director, CAPREV

#### TRANSLATION

Liz Harrison

#### COORDINATION FOR THE KING BAUDOUIIN FOUNDATION

Françoise Pissart, Director  
Fabrice de Kerchove, Senior project coordinator  
Alenka Le Compte, Project coordinator  
Cassandre Fraenkel, Project & knowledge manager

#### GRAPHIC DESIGN

Karakters, Gent

#### LAYOUT

Karakters, Gent

Manufast-ABP asbl, a sheltered workshop  
This publication can be downloaded free of charge from our website [www.kbs-frb.be](http://www.kbs-frb.be)  
A printed version of this electronic publication can be ordered (free of charge) on our website [www.kbs-frb.be](http://www.kbs-frb.be)

#### LEGAL DEPOSIT

D/2848/2019/01

#### ORDER NUMBER

3628

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>Foreword</b> .....  | 7  |
| <b>Executive Summary</b> .....   | 9  |
| <b>Résumé</b> .....  | 10 |
| <b>Samenvatting</b> .....  | 11 |
| <b>1. Background and introduction</b> .....  | 13 |
| <b>2. Supporting families confronted with violent radicalisation: exploration of and feedback from the field</b> ..... | 17 |
| a. Development of the guide .....  | 18 |
| b. A guide that analyses, informs and inspires .....   | 20 |
| c. Identifying support practices provided to families confronted with radicalisation .....                             | 21 |
| d. Towards a common vocabulary .....   | 23 |
| e. The structure of this guide .....   | 25 |
| <b>3. The overall dynamic of support practices for families confronted with violent radicalisation</b> .....           | 27 |
| a. Introduction .....  | 28 |
| b. A relatively new field of action .....  | 29 |
| c. A heterogeneous landscape of initiatives and actors .....   | 30 |
| d. Regional dynamics of practices (Flanders, Wallonie, Brussels) .....   | 30 |
| <b>4. Strategies and basic principles of intervention to support families</b> .....                                    | 33 |
| a. Introduction .....  | 34 |
| b. Territories pertinent to intervention: priority given to local level .....  | 34 |
| c. Levels of prevention: a preponderance of primary prevention .....   | 35 |
| d. Group approaches and individualized support practices .....   | 38 |
| e. Project objectives: a wide range of operating logics .....  | 40 |
| f. Practice methodologies : a wide variety of approaches .....   | 41 |
| <b>5. Weaknesses, concerns and points of attention</b> .....   | 47 |
| a. Introduction .....  | 48 |
| b. Actors' hesitations and uncertainties .....   | 48 |
| c. The need for specialised care .....   | 49 |
| d. The match between families' needs and actors' training .....  | 50 |
| e. Building, maintaining and retaining trust .....   | 50 |
| f. Confidentiality and the management of professional secrecy .....  | 52 |
| g. Accessibility .....   | 54 |
| h. Issues of coordination and multidisciplinary collaboration .....  | 54 |
| i. Limits to the approach by levels of prevention .....  | 55 |
| j. Preventing radicalisation and strengthening social cohesion: an unstable balance between both .....                 | 56 |
| <b>6. Recommendations</b> .....  | 57 |
| a. Improving knowledge and strengthening the competencies of field actors .....  | 58 |
| b. Building, maintaining and retaining trust with families .....   | 59 |
| c. Improving the accessibility of institutions .....   | 60 |
| d. Improving coordination and establishing a mapping of networks and field operators .....                             | 60 |
| e. Optimizing the allocation of resources and implementing a culture and procedures of evaluation .....                | 61 |
| <b>Appendix: glossary</b> .....  | 62 |
| <b>Bibliography</b> .....  | 63 |

---



## FOREWORD

Most of the families faced with violent radicalisation are prey to questions and confusion. Often, they know neither who to turn to for help, nor to which competent services they can go for support and guidance. Yet the families play an important role in the fight against indoctrination and recruitment by violent extremist groups. Families are well placed to register the first signs of a process of recruitment and to listen to and advise young people facing doubts and disillusionment. Furthermore, in addition to prevention and support, the challenges raised - as much with the families as with actors in the field - now relate to questions of reintegration and the monitoring of foreign fighters who have returned home and their children.

At the time when numerous young people were leaving for war zones and there was indoctrination of others who were prevented from leaving, it was not just the families that felt distraught when faced with the emergence of violent radicalisation. Both the not-for-profit sector and actors in the security chain had to rapidly familiarise themselves with this new phenomenon. Considerable efforts have been made since then to strengthen the capacities and competencies of the actors concerned, but there remain unfulfilled needs in terms of coordination and the sharing of expertise.

It is on the basis of these observations that the Family Support Project was initiated by the Belgian Ministry of the Interior's Directorate-General for Security and Prevention, with support from the European Commission. The King Baudouin Foundation was appointed to coordinate this initiative, in collaboration with partners from the academic world and civil society.

The ambition of this project was to conduct a situational analysis regarding the support given to families confronted with violent radicalisation, to contribute to and strengthen existing know-how and expertise, to encourage the exchange of information, to share promising practices and to strengthen the implementation of such practices at local and national level.

To achieve these aims, the following activities were undertaken during the last 24 months:

- The implementation of a **National Family Support Network**, comprising actors from the security chain and organisations involved in providing support for the families. This network aims to share information, knowledge and practices among the actors involved across various localities, structures and responsibilities. The Network met twice.
- The creation of a **platform** of experts, whose objective was to provide tailor-made consultancy to members of the National Family Support Network, as well as to government bodies and civil society. The experts, who came both from the field and the academic world, provided valuable input to thinking about priority issues such as the accessibility of support services for the families, the development of competencies, the territorial dissemination of practices and lastly the coordination of the various actors.

- The organisation of **training modules**, focused on an intercultural approach, for front-line actors in direct contact with families and those confronted with violent radicalisation.
- The publication of a **mapping of practices** offering some form of support to families confronted with radicalisation in Belgium<sup>1</sup> and the present guide.
- The organisation of a closing **conference**, which aimed to share the results of the Family Support project.

This guide represents the culmination of the Family Support Project. It provides an in-depth analysis of the practices identified in the mapping and integrates the lessons learned from the other phases of the project described above. In a field in which knowledge is still being constructed, it is important to have information that is based on practice, to assemble this, analyse and share it. Such is the ambition of this guide which, in addition to identifying a certain number of problem areas and points for attention, also sets out advice and recommendation for actors in the field and decision makers. We hope that this guide will be a source of inspiration for all of those interested in, or concerned by, the subject of support for families confronted by violent radicalisation.

The Directorate-General for Security and Prevention and the King Baudouin Foundation would like to express their very grateful thanks to the researchers from the Centre for the Study of Ethnicity and Migration at the University of Liege and the Odisee Higher Institute for Family Sciences for the pertinence of their work. Our thanks also go to the members of the Review Committee and to our numerous partners (researchers, trainers and experts), who participated in implementing the various phases of the Family Support Project.

*Directorate-General for Security and Prevention*

*King Baudouin Foundation*

---

<sup>1</sup> Family Support. Cartographie des pratiques de soutien aux familles confrontées à la radicalisation violente, 2018, (Mapping of support practices for families confronted with violent radicalisation) <https://www.kbs-frb.be/fr/Activities/Publications/2018/Family-Support> of <https://www.besafe.be/nl/veiligheidstemas/radicalisme>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This guide deals with the support given to families confronted with violent radicalisation, either actual or potential, of one of their members. The objective is to provide, for actors in the field, political decision makers and any others interested in the subject, an analysis and reflexions based on feedback concerning experience in the field.

Today, the central role played by social welfare actors in preventing polarisation and radicalisation is widely recognised in Belgium. The fact that the families of those in a situation of violent radicalisation need specific support is also widely recognised by the international community. Support for the families is not only crucial from the point of view of prevention and security, it is also the case from the point of view of an approach centred on the families in crisis for whom it is imperative to give specialised forms of support.

There is still relatively little precise knowledge about the subject of « good » practices to help these families. The number of publications relating to violent radicalisation has increased significantly in recent years, both in Belgium and internationally, yet within this ever-expanding literature there is little information available for those who would like to learn more about the specific support to provide for the families. However, in the field itself there is considerable knowledge and know-how based on practice, which it is useful to try to regroup, analyse and share. This is what we have tried to do in this guide, which we hope will be a source of inspiration for all of those interested in the subject of support for families confronted with violent radicalisation.

This guide covers five main sections. After an introduction covering the objectives and methodology, we have set out our main observations regarding the general dynamics at work in the field. We then analyse in greater detail the strategies and basic principles on which the practices and projects we observed were based. This is followed by an analysis in which we have tried to identify considerations and weaknesses. In the last section we set out a series of recommendations

## RÉSUMÉ

Ce guide traite des pratiques du soutien aux familles confrontées à la radicalisation violente, réelle ou potentielle, d'un de leurs membres. Il a pour objectif d'offrir aux acteurs de terrains, aux décideurs politiques et aux personnes intéressées une analyse et des réflexions au départ d'un retour d'expériences de terrain.

Le rôle central joué par les acteurs de l'aide sociale en vue de prévenir la polarisation et la radicalisation est aujourd'hui bien reconnu en Belgique. Le fait que les familles de personnes en situation de radicalisation violente ont besoin d'un accompagnement spécifique est aujourd'hui reconnu également par la communauté internationale. Le soutien aux familles n'est pas seulement crucial du point de vue de la logique de la prévention et de la sécurité. Il l'est aussi du point de vue d'une approche centrée sur les familles en crise auxquelles il est impératif d'apporter des formes de soutien spécialisées.

Il existe encore peu de connaissance précise au sujet des « bonnes » pratiques pour aider ces familles. Le nombre de publications sur la radicalisation violente n'a pourtant cessé de croître ces dernières années tant en Belgique qu'au niveau international. Toutefois, à l'intérieur de cette littérature en plein essor, d'informations sont disponibles pour ceux qui veulent en connaître davantage sur le soutien spécifique à accorder aux familles. On trouve pourtant sur le terrain un savoir et des connaissances fondés sur la pratique, qu'il est utile de tenter de regrouper, analyser et partager. C'est en quelque sorte ce que nous proposons à travers ce guide, que nous espérons être une source d'inspiration pour tous celles et ceux qui s'intéressent à la thématique du soutien aux familles confrontées à la radicalisation violente.

Ce guide est structuré en cinq grandes parties. Après le rappel des objectifs et de la méthode, nous établissons quelques grands constats concernant l'état des dynamiques générales à l'œuvre sur le terrain. Ensuite, nous analysons plus en détail les stratégies et principes de base sur lesquels se fondent les pratiques et projets observés. A partir de là, une démarche d'analyse est esquissée en vue d'identifier quelques points d'attention et faiblesses. Dans la dernière partie, nous formulons une série de recommandations.

## SAMENVATTING

Deze gids over de ondersteuning van gezinnen van personen in situatie van (potentiële) gewelddadige radicalisering' biedt werkveldactoren, beleidsmakers en al wie interesse heeft in dit thema een analyse en reflectie aan op basis van een aantal belangrijke praktijkvoorbeelden op dit vlak.

De belangrijke rol die weggelegd is voor actoren uit de sociale, zorg- en welzijnssector bij het voorkomen van polarisering en radicalisering in brede zin wordt tegenwoordig duidelijk erkend. Ook het feit dat er voor gezinnen van personen in (potentiële) situaties van radicalisering een gerichte begeleiding noodzakelijk is wordt intussen erkend door de internationale gemeenschap. Een dergelijke gezinsondersteuning is niet alleen cruciaal vanuit een preventie- en veiligheidslogica, het is uiteraard ook los daarvan van groot belang gezinnen die zich in een crisissituatie bevinden een min of meer gespecialiseerde ondersteuning te bieden.

Er bestaat nog weinig precieze kennis over (succesvolle) praktijken om families van geradicaliseerde en/of radicaliserende personen te steunen. Het aantal academische of meer publieksgerichte publicaties over gewelddadige radicalisering, in België en op het internationale niveau neemt voortdurend toe. Maar binnen dit snel evoluerend en steeds groeiend vakdomein bestaat nog uiterst weinig informatie voor wie meer wil weten over de ondersteuning van families. Daarom bundelt en analyseert deze 'praktijkengids' de kennis, ervaringsdeskundigheid en praktijken van werkveldactoren in Brussel, Vlaanderen en Wallonië die één of andere vorm van ondersteuning bieden aan gezinnen die geconfronteerd worden of werden met de gewelddadige radicalisering van een gezinslid. Deze publicatie hoopt een inspiratiebron te kunnen zijn voor allen die geïnteresseerd zijn in deze thematiek, in het bijzonder praktijkactoren die hun eigen praktijken wensen te verrijken.

Deze gids bestaat uit vijf grote delen. Na een inleidend overzicht van de doelstellingen en methodologie van het project 'Family Support' waarin deze publicatie kadert, wordt er eerst dieper ingegaan op enkele belangrijke bevindingen inzake algemene dynamieken van het werkveld. Vervolgens worden de strategieën en basisprincipes waarop de geanalyseerde praktijken en projecten steunen beschreven. Daarna volgt een analytische schets van enkele aandachtspunten en kwetsbaarheden. In het laatste deel formuleren de auteurs een reeks aanbevelingen voor beleidsmakers en projectdragers.



---

Part 1.

# Background and introduction

The phenomenon of violent extremism has grown considerably at global level since the beginning of the 21st century.<sup>2</sup> Acts associated with extreme violence are inspired by a wide range of ideologies ranging from religious extremism to nationalist extreme-right movements and cover separatist, anti-capitalist, anarchist and other movements. These ideologies have in common a rejection of, or wish to break with, a society that is democratic, pluralist and open; they are also often characterised by glorification of the supremacy of a particular group or ideology.

Within this context, the phenomenon of radicalisation, often viewed as part of a prior process potentially leading to extreme acts of violence, is of increasing concern to citizens and political decision-makers in Europe as elsewhere. Furthermore, the growing phenomenon of polarisation<sup>3</sup> in our societies is also worrying, notably because of the risk linked to radicalisation. Policies for preventing radicalisation tend to include strategies of preventing polarisation, given that seeing the world in a binary fashion of “them” against “us” provides fertile ground for the development of violent radicalisation. Polarisation and radicalisation in fact constitute two dynamics that mutually feed and reinforce each other. Large-scale investments in social cohesion and ‘living together’ at local level result from the same logic.

At international level, there is increased recognition of the important role that actors in the sectors of well-being, (mental) health and social work may play in the prevention of polarisation and radicalisation in the broadest sense (Zannoni *et al.*, 2008; RAN, 2017).<sup>4</sup> The need to pay particular attention to supporting the families of radicalised individuals or those at risk of radicalisation is increasingly recognised. Such interest is inspired not only by a logic of preventing security risks; it is also justified by the ‘simple’ preoccupation of providing adequate help to families who are in a situation of crisis and who need more or less specialised help.

Knowledge relating to radicalisation and violent extremism is part of an abundant body of expertise that is growing apace. However, within this ever-expanding field, we have little precise knowledge about the practices of support for the families, nor of their effectiveness. Violent radicalisation has been the subject of a growing number of publications, either academic or destined for the general public, in Belgium and internationally,<sup>5</sup> yet little information is available for those wishing to know more

---

2 See the 2017 Global Terrorism Index 2017: <http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2017/11/Global-Terrorism-Index-2017.pdf> (Consulted 1 October 2018).

3 Polarisation can be defined as « the strengthening of opposition between people or groups in society that leads, or may lead, to an increase in tensions between these people or groups and lead to security risks. » Cf. Ponsaers P., Deruyver B., Easton M. & Verhage A. (2011), « Polarisation et radicalisation: une approche préventive intégrale », UGent-DGSP, SPF Intérieur, January 2011, p.12

4 As part of the RAN (Radicalisation Awareness Network), a working group (RAN Health & Social Care) was set up in 2016, starting from the observation of the importance of involving actors from the social and health sectors as part of detecting and preventing radicalisation.

5 At international level, see for instance the publications of Dalgaard-Nielsen (2010), Butt and Tuck (2014), Schmid (2016) and Vidino and Brandon (2012). For Belgium, see for example the publications of Colaert (2017), Ponsaers *et al.* (2010) and the work of Dallemagne *et al.* (2016).

about supporting families confronted with radicalisation in their midst<sup>6</sup>. This was the main reason to focus on this topic in this guide.

In Belgium, as abroad, support practices specifically for families confronted with violent radicalisation within the family are relatively recent and thus offer little hindsight. Moreover, very few of them rely on evidence-based publications or scientific research. Nevertheless, in the field there is both know-how and practice-based knowledge, which it is useful to collect, analyse and share. This is what we set out to provide in this guide, in the hope that it will be a source of inspiration for all those interested in the subject of providing support for families confronted with violent extremism.

### **The Family Support Project**

This guide is part of the much wider Family Support Project. The latter is an initiative of the Federal Interior Ministry's Directorate-General Security and Prevention (Direction Générale Sécurité et Prévention), in collaboration with the King Baudouin Foundation and supported by the European Commission. The partners in the project set out to provide an analysis of the current situation and contribute to expanding existing knowledge and expertise, encourage an exchange of information and the sharing of promising practices and to implement these at local and national level.

Specifically, the Family Support Project covers the following activities:

- the implementation of a National Family Support Network of actors in the chain of prevention and security and organisations involved in providing family support. This network aims to share information, knowledge and practices among the various actors working in different areas and structures and with different competencies;
- the creation of a Family Support platform of experts, whose objective is to provide tailor-made consultancy to members of the Family Support Network as well as to government bodies and civil society;
- the organisation of training modules for frontline actors who are in direct contact with those confronted with violent radicalisation and their families;
- the establishment of a mapping that aims to identify the actors and projects in the field that are currently providing support to families;
- the production of this guide
- the organisation of a conference to present the results of the Family Support Project.

---

<sup>6</sup> Among the rare documentary resources dealing with the question are the King Baudouin Foundation publication (King Baudouin Foundation, 2016) and the publications of Spalek (2016) and Gielen (2015).



---

Part 2.

## Supporting families confronted with violent radicalisation: exploration of and feedback from the field

This guide<sup>7</sup> constitutes a logical continuation of the mapping of support practices that was previously carried out.<sup>8</sup> The guide presents a more detailed analysis of the practices included in the mapping.<sup>9</sup>

This report does not, however, have the ambition of evaluating the projects identified in the mapping. Not only would this be beyond the aim and scope of the Family Support Project; it would moreover necessitate evaluation criteria applicable to all of the projects and initiatives, whilst also taking account of their diversity and the considerable variations observed in local situations.

The scope of the present guide is more limited. It ambitions to share feedback from the field in the form of an analysis of the data gathered throughout the Family Support Project.<sup>10</sup> This guide sets out to do what might be described as ‘referring back’ some thoughts to the actors in the field. The aim is to offer a number of analytical perspectives, to disseminate a maximum amount of useful information to actors in the field and to provide a source of inspiration for initiators of new projects or leaders of existing projects.

#### **a. Development of the guide**

The preceding phase of the project consisted of producing a mapping of practices and projects existing in the field. This involved presenting the initial findings of a field research that was both descriptive and exploratory. It aimed essentially at identifying « who does what » in the area and set out to provide an overview that would enable better identification of the actors in the field and their practices. The results of this research were presented to the Family Support National Network during a meeting in Brussels,

---

7 The authors would like to express their gratitude to Fabrice de Kerchove, Maarten De Waele, Estelle Cartiaux, Kathleen Emmery, Toria Ficette, Rabbeha Hadri, Alice Jaspart, Alenka Le Compte and Sarah Zaytouni for their attentive proofreading and valuable advice. Special thanks are due to the King Baudouin Foundation and to the Belgian Federal Ministry of the Interior (Directorate General Security & Prevention) for their wise advice throughout the Family Support Project and their dedicated involvement in coordinating the project. Finally, we should like to thank our colleagues at the Centre d’Etudes de l’Ethnicité et des Migrations (CEDEM) at the University of Liege and the Centre for family Studies (Kenniscentrum Gezinswetenschappen) of Odisee University College, and in particular Kathleen Emmery, for her support, expertise and expert advice throughout the project.

8 See: [https://www.besafe.be/sites/default/files/2018-05/family\\_support\\_-\\_cartographie\\_0.pdf](https://www.besafe.be/sites/default/files/2018-05/family_support_-_cartographie_0.pdf). The mapping can also be found on the King Baudouin Foundation’s website: <https://www.kbs-frb.be/fr/Activities/Publications/2018/Family-Support>.

9 The mapping represents a ‘photograph’, at a given moment, of an ensemble of support practices for families faced with violent radicalisation. For a detailed description of the methodology, please see pages 8 - 12. It would obviously be useful if these data were updated in the future and presented in the form of a dynamic database that could be used to search for examples of practices according to various criteria. Unfortunately, this lies outside the scope and ambition of the Family Support Project and is not therefore foreseen in the short term.

10 The main aim of the initial mapping was to identify, as exhaustively as possible, the projects and initiatives that provide support for families confronted with violent radicalisation across the entire Belgian territory and to provide a descriptive overview of all of the projects so identified, based on a pre-determined analysis grid. The data were gathered through soliciting documents and from interviews conducted with a wide range of actors in the field. The final mapping represents 37 ‘project sheets’ established on this basis. For a detailed description of the methodology, please see pages 8 - 12 of the aforementioned document.

on 23 November 2017, and also appeared in a publication on the website of the Federal Ministry of the Interior<sup>11</sup> as well as on the King Baudouin Foundation's website<sup>12</sup>.

The mapping provides an overview of the initiatives, projects and practices that provide support to families faced with violent radicalisation. The objective was to identify the various actors working in this developing field, to enable the actors to get to know each other better, to encourage the exchange of experience and know-how and to create conditions that would favour the potential development of new partnerships wherever appropriate.

The fieldwork conducted in order to establish the mapping constituted an important basis for the work of analysis and reflexion that forms the core of this guide. It involved documentary data collection, a study of the literature and a number of interviews with key actors in the field.<sup>13</sup>

Establishing a platform of Family Support Project experts also permitted the authors of this report to exchange thoughts with specialists in the field. This platform was set up on 9 November 2017, with the aim of providing tailor-made consultancy for the National Family Support Network<sup>14</sup>.

During the meeting of 23 November, 2017, the National Family Support Network asked the Experts' Platform to provide their expertise on three particular topics in relation to the support of families confronted with radicalisation:

- the accessibility of institutions;
- strengthening competencies and the territorial dissemination of positive practices;
- and the coordination and definition of a chain of responsibility.

---

11 [https://www.besafe.be/sites/default/files/2018-05/family\\_support\\_-\\_cartographie\\_0.pdf](https://www.besafe.be/sites/default/files/2018-05/family_support_-_cartographie_0.pdf)

12 <https://www.kbs-frb.be/fr/Activities/Publications/2018/Family-Support>

13 In the French-speaking region of Belgium, 262 towns and municipalities as well as their so-called 'Social Action Centre' were contacted, and 100 associations, comprising youth centres, Regional Integration Centres, Family Planning Associations, etc. All law centres, as well as regional government bodies such as the Walloon Region, the Brussels-Capital Region, the COCOF (Community Council of the Francophones in Brussels) and the German-speaking Community were also contacted. 24 pertinent interviews were finally carried out, which led to 17 detailed 'project sheets'. In the Dutch-speaking region, a more targeted mailing was sent out to a list of actors who had been identified (beforehand or during the research), on the basis of the Flemish Government's action plan, on calls for projects announced by the King Baudouin Foundation and other relevant sources. 14 in-depth interviews and some ten e-mail and/or telephone contacts finally yielded 20 detailed 'project sheets'.

14 This platform comprised 11 Dutch-speaking experts and 9 French-speaking experts selected from the following sectors: the voluntary associative sector; family mediation, social, psychological etc. support; university lecturers; public institutions and legal professions. The experts' platform produced working papers written on the three themes previously identified: the accessibility of institutions, strengthening competencies and territorial dissemination of positive practices, and the coordination and definition of the chain of responsibility.

The resulting experts' notes have also provided a source of information that the authors of this guide have been able to mobilise<sup>15</sup>. Moreover, the authors have also been able to discuss with Dutch- and French-speaking trainers in charge of the Family Support training courses.<sup>16</sup> This integrated way of working has not only enabled credible and trustworthy data to be gathered; it has also facilitated the synthesis of lessons learned from the various parts of the Family Support Project (mapping, training, experts' platform, discussions within the National Network).

Despite a meticulous data collection method, certain limits were nevertheless encountered. In the French-speaking area, an approach using a very large e-mailing adopted, which resulted in a relatively large non-response rate (cf. Mapping, p. 9). In the Dutch-speaking region, the selection of respondents was conducted in a more targeted manner, which resulted in a higher response rate. Cross-analysis of data from different sources reduces the risk of ignoring important projects, but the mapping cannot pretend to be exhaustive.

It should also be noted that support practices and projects for families faced with violent radicalisation often fall within a new sector of public policy within which communication is not always optimal. It is a sensitive field which is undergoing rapid development. Some projects or initiatives may have passed under the researchers' radar precisely because of the fast-moving aspect of the problem and the delicate nature of the subject. Sometimes, identification may also prove difficult because projects are not always flagged up using the explicit terms of 'prevention of radicalisation', even when they are aimed directly at this. A phenomenon of fear among the actors, but also sometimes a certain lassitude generated by the 'over-solicitation' of actors in the field, may also have led to practices possibly going unnoticed.

#### **b. A guide that analyses, informs and inspires**

The objective of any guide to practices is to improve the quality and efficacy of the interventions of project actors and leaders. The approach involves disseminating knowledge acquired from practice so that others can benefit from it. The final aim of the exercise is to enable knowledge, methods and tools to be shared and integrated into the professional practice of the widest number of people.

#### **Why not a 'good practices' guide?**

The notion of 'good practice' presupposes the idea of a preliminary and systematic evaluation. The idea of a guide involves allowing practices to converge towards quality standards and reducing inappropriate or ineffective interventions. In this regard, a 'guide to good practices' is identical to an 'inspiration', as it involves making strategies of intervention converge. An inspirational guide is careful however not to inhibit experi-

---

15 The authors would like to express their thanks for contributions from Khadija Aznag, Jamal El Boujddaini, Saliha Ben Ali, Mohammed Benhaddou, Ilse De Block, Stef De Coene, Lana de Pelecijn, Maarten De Waele, Bram De Witte, Toria Ficette, Alice Jaspert, Sarah Zaytouni, Fabienne Glowacz, Nabila Mazouz, Abdessami Salmi, Eric Vandermussele and Ilyas Zarhoni.

16 This training was given by a team from the CBAI (Brussels Centre for Intercultural Action) in the French-speaking area and by a team from Touter for the Dutch-speaking area.

mentation and innovation. It is for this reason that we prefer to speak simply of a ‘guide to inspire’, which helps prevent us from making unfounded value judgements about rigorous evaluations and avoids potential stigmatisation of new or exploratory approaches.

#### **What is the difference between an inspirational guide and an evaluation?**

This guide does not propose an evaluation of the projects identified in the mapping. It does not provide further evaluation of public policies concerning support for families confronted with violent radicalisation. Conducting an evaluation or an impact study for these various projects would, without doubt, be useful, but this is an objective that reaches far beyond the ambitions of this guide.

As we shall see, practices with very similar or identical objectives are developed by different actors, within different contexts, responding to different operating logics. Whilst we made an effort to regroup various approaches and methods in a number of categories, the local character of many initiatives, developed within a specific context, that fact that actors belong to more than one sector, as well as the history and particular origin of each of the projects meant that it was extremely difficult, or even impossible, to make comparisons between projects. Consequently, evaluating them within a perspective of efficacy or efficiency<sup>17</sup>, would obviously be even more difficult, particularly given that the notion of efficiency is strongly linked to the goals underlying each of the projects. As will be seen below, the aims of the projects and initiatives vary considerably.

Without having the pretention to offer a formal study of the impact of the various projects, this guide nevertheless has as its objective to share ‘feedback from the field’ in the form of a more in-depth, qualitative analysis of the practices and relationships that exist between the actors. We hope that this qualitative analysis and the critical reflexions that accompany it will enable actors in the field to feel inspired by certain practice examples. This guide identifies a number of problems and key issues and it formulates a series of recommendations. In this sense, it is above all intended as a guide and a source of inspiration that is offered to practitioners.

### **c. Identifying support practices provided to families confronted with violent radicalisation**

One of the main difficulties when speaking about support for families of those concerned by radicalisation relates to the definition and conceptualisation of the notion of ‘family’. Another major difficulty concerns the use of the concepts of radicalisation, violent radicalisation and/or violent extremism and other related terms.

#### **What is a family?**

From the point of view of terminology, the word ‘family’ is a vast term that can cover a whole series of actors and relations who are more or less close or distant. The family can

---

<sup>17</sup> Amy-Jane Gielen (2015) rightly indicates that what ‘works’ depends on the precise nature of the intervention (its nature, the institutional framework, the type of actors, the locality, the level of risk and the target group) and that, in function of the context, different mechanisms can produce beneficial effects.

cover ties of biological parenting, be linked to adoption or relate to emotional or social relationships. Moreover, the conception of family depends on the cultural and social context in which the social actors find themselves. In other words, the components of any given society will not always have the same understanding of what a family is.<sup>18</sup> Despite the fact that it is not easy to define the concept of ‘family’<sup>19</sup>, a certain definition of what we consider here as pertinent types of support for families would nevertheless seem to be indispensable. For this reason, we shall therefore begin with a definition of the ‘family’.

A family can be defined as ‘a household that presents as its principal characteristics the constitution of an association of individuals who are united through transgenerational ties and interdependency’ (Luyten, Van Crombrugge, & Emmery, 2017, p. 23). To be able to speak about a ‘family’, there must therefore be at least one (grand-)parent and a child. There are different types of family and any one person can be a member of several families, either simultaneously or consecutively. The constituent elements of a family are parenthood,<sup>20</sup> which is usually combined with partnership<sup>21</sup> (Luyten et al., 2017, p. 23).

### **Which practices are understood to be support practices for families faced with violent radicalisation?**

In order to demarcate the contours of support practices for families faced with violent radicalisation that were included in the initial mapping, we followed the definition of family as given above. Parenthood, which we take to include both biological and social ties, has a central place in this definition of the family and in support for families. This happens to be a very judicious point of departure within the framework of mapping support practices for families faced with violent radicalisation, given that the actors involved also often focus on the central role of the relationship between parents and youngsters who have been, or are in the process of becoming, radicalised. Putting the accent on the presence of at least one generation excludes the (numerous) initiatives that are addressed only to young people. Nevertheless, initiatives that target youngsters and their family network in the wider sense are, in contrast, very pertinent within the framework of this mapping and the resulting guide. Therefore, it does also include support initiatives for families that involve siblings.

---

18 Spalek, B (2016). Radicalisation, de-radicalisation and counter-radicalisation in relation to families: Key challenges for research, policy and practices. *Security Journal*, 29(1), 39 - 52.

19 In many languages there is only one generic term to designate the family and this can cover the household, the nuclear family, the family unit or the extended family.

20 The notion of parenthood refers to the ‘function of being a parent’ in the widest sense. This may include parenting that is biological, adoptive, social (composite families, single parents), co-parenting (‘part-time’), foster parenting and parenting through donation and surrogacy (donation of sperm, eggs and gestation for others).

21 The notion of partnership refers to the relationship between parents, whatever its form (married or unmarried, cohabiting or not), and forming a composite family or not. The relationship between ex-partners who have had children together is also a form of partnership. Partnership and parenting are not necessarily linked.

This definition of families influences the practices that we consider as practices of ‘support for families’<sup>22</sup>: practices of support for parenting, that is support that is very accessible and at several levels, addressing the (grand-)parents within the framework of bringing up their children and adolescents; (preventive) practices of family support, that is a wider provision, aimed at promoting the wellbeing of families with children or adolescents (wider support for families within their context, both materially and in relation to various services, of reinforcing family and social networks, providing relationship support for the parental couple etc., as well as practices focused on children and young people that implicate the participation of the parents and/or the family).

We have used the definition given above to draw the contours of the field of research for mapping practices, but inversely, in our work on the ground we provided no preliminary definition. In the field, we deliberately left the concept of family, as well as that of support for families, open so as to allow the actors we contacted to define these themselves. In fact, within the framework of a mapping project such as this, there were two possible strategies to identify the families: one, which was objective and based on a conventional definition, and a second that was subjective, based on the actors’ own spontaneous comprehension. Given the narrowness of the field of support for families faced with radicalisation, we felt it was pertinent not to impose a definition from above, but rather to allow actors on the ground to explain how they themselves define support for families.

#### **d. Towards a common vocabulary**

Concepts linked to the prevention of radicalisation and terrorism are the subject of numerous debates in academic circles. Actors in the field are equally confronted by this diversity of concepts and their use.

Within this context, marked by a heterogeneity of practices and strategies for actors in the field, a first step in the direction of a convergence of practices involves favouring the use of a common language.

#### **What is violent radicalisation?**

Despite widespread use of the term ‘radicalisation’, there is no general consensus regarding its definition in the scientific literature. This is overall in line with the fact that the notion of ‘radicalisation’ refers to ‘a growing readiness to pursue and support far-reaching changes in society that conflict with, or pose a direct threat to, the existing

---

22 We allowed ourselves to be inspired by the Flemish decree relating to the organisation of preventive support for families, dated 9/11/2013 ([www.huizenvanhetkind.be/hk/img/decreetprevgezinsond.pdf](http://www.huizenvanhetkind.be/hk/img/decreetprevgezinsond.pdf)). In the French-speaking region, questions concerning support for parenting and support for families in the wider sense, are part of a normative context that is structured by various laws and regulations. This normative framework does not, therefore, contain any definition of the term ‘support for parenting’ or the family, unlike the aforementioned Flemish decree. The *Office de la Naissance et de l’Enfance* (Office for Births and Childhood, or ONE), together with the *Direction générale de l’aide à la jeunesse* (Directorate-General for Support of Young People) and the *Délégué général aux droits de l’enfant* (Directorate-General for the Rights of Children) have, nevertheless, developed a ‘reference parental support document’ destined for ‘professionals in the Wallonia-Brussels Federation working with children’. (2012).

order' (Dalgaard-Nielsen, 2010, p. 798). Radicalisation thus refers to a 'process of developing extreme beliefs and ideologies'.<sup>23</sup> Unlike fundamentalism, radicalisation does not refer specifically to a religious dimension. The term 'violent radicalisation' applies when radical ideas are accompanied by a desire to support or directly engage in violent acts. Prevention therefore aims at preventing the appearance of a process of radicalisation or of arresting its development. The term 'counter-radicalisation' generally refers to an ensemble of measures of prevention and radicalisation.<sup>24</sup>

Alongside the scientific literature, there is also multifaceted use of the notion of radicalisation by actors in the field. Definitions proposed on the ground, implicitly or explicitly, sometimes emphasise violent radicalisation and sometimes a wider concept of radicalisation that may or may not imply menace and/or the use of violence (Lacroix, 2018; Veldhuis & Staun, 2009). Conceptions that see radicalisation as a linear process, in which violence is the result of a gradual or more sudden adoption of an extreme ideology, sit alongside more complex explanatory models that underline the non-linear nature of the process of radicalisation. As a result, the term 'radicalisation' can cover extremely different realities in function of who is using them. It is for this reason that we shall use the term of violent extremism or violent radicalism. It is important to stress that ideology and action are not necessarily linked and that, as noted by the mayors of the cities of Mechelen, Antwerp, Vilvorde and Maaseik (Somers, De Wever, Bonte, & Creemers, 2013), radicalisation is not necessarily problematical as such.

As for the definition of the family and support practices for the family, no definition of (violent) radicalisation was imposed on the actors in the field we met; each was left free to specify the conception of (prevention of) radicalisation with which he/she worked. Furthermore, within the framework of this guide, we have opted to use the term violent radicalisation rather than that of violent extremism, since this appeared to better echo the terms employed by actors in the field themselves.

### **How to differentiate between radicalisation and other related phenomena?**

There are many other terms associated with the prevention of violent radicalisation. The term 'de-radicalisation' has a more limited scope of application since it presupposes that there was radicalisation beforehand.<sup>25</sup> This term relates to a rupture with violence as a mode of action as well as a break with the ideology that underpins it. The term 'disengagement' on the other hand, relates to a break with violence as a mode of action, but without necessarily seeking separation from the ideology that underpins it. (Toutin 2018).

---

23 «... that question the statut quo and reject compromise.» (Borum, 2011; cited and translated by Lamghari, 2015)

24 The field of counter-radicalisation is subdivided into several typologies and this is done differently by different authors. For some, prevention covers only a part of the measures aimed at preventing radicalisation, notably only cases where radicalisation has not yet happened. The measures of counter-radicalisation relating to cases of radicalisation are thus qualified as 'repression' or 'intervention' in function of the type of measure. Others speak of primary, secondary or tertiary 'prevention' (see p.24) to cover the entirety of such measures.

25 It should be noted that some people use the term in a wider sense as a synonym for 'counter-radicalisation' and include purely preventive measures.

Over the last few years, radicalisation and its prevention have been strongly focused on the question of jihadism or, in other words, radicalisation that mobilises a frame of reference linked to Islam. This guide does not consider such focus as a predetermining framework or a priori necessity. However, the practices, reality and feedback from the field obliged us to focus more on this dimension. We were able to observe that, for certain actors, focusing on jihadist Islamist radicalisation was a deliberate choice of specialisation, although this was not generally the case. Support forms for families confronted with radicalisation regardless of the type of underlying ideology were also met among actors in the field. No instances of specialized support for other forms of radicalisation (right-wing extremism for instance) could be identified at this point.

In the remainder of this guide, we use the wording and definitions that most frequently emerged from the actors themselves. To provide an indicative framework for readers, we have nevertheless provided a glossary of terms in the appendix of this report, which offers definitions based on the literature.

**e. The structure of this guide**

This guide comprises five main sections. After the reminder of the objectives and methodology of the Family Support Project that was given in the present chapter, we have set out a number of observations relating to the overall dynamics at work in the field. We then analyse in greater detail the strategies and basic principles on which are based the practices and projects we observed. This is followed by an analytical part designed to identify key points and weaknesses. In the last part, we have formulated a series of recommendations.



---

Part 3.

## The overall dynamic of support practices for families confronted with violent radicalisation

### a. Introduction

Among the ensemble of strategies aimed at combating radicalisation that can lead to extreme behaviour, the positive role that families can play is increasingly and regularly underlined. Families are the most direct environment and in the closest proximity to people concerned by the problem and they are also often the most emotionally-charged framework. The European Union's *Radicalisation Awareness Network*, which is in charge of the prevention of radicalisation, identifies support for families as one of the seven key fields of intervention in a strategy of prevention (RAN 2017: 12, 257).

It is often the families themselves who are the first victims of radicalisation of one of their members. They thus also play a key role in the response to bring to the phenomenon. Whilst families can contribute to the success of strategies and programmes of prevention or the output of processes of radicalisation and adherence to extreme ideologies, they can nevertheless also play, either consciously or unconsciously, a more ambivalent role.

A family may badly evaluate the risks concerning one of its members or react in an inadequate manner. In certain isolated cases, radical attitudes and/or ideologies can account for the entire family unit's adhesion. The academic literature has therefore examined the scope of the preventive role of families and the ambiguity felt by some actors in the field regarding the status of parents and of families more generally. The literature fails to formulate, unambiguous conclusions about the role of parents in the process of radicalisation and/or de-radicalisation of their children (Sieckelinck & de Winter, 2015; Sikkens, Sieckelinck, van San, & de Winter, 2017; Sikkens, van San, Sieckelinck, & de Winter, 2017, 2018). The research coordinated by Sieckelinck and de Winter among the families of radicalised persons shows that parents' reactions are varied. Some try to fight the situation, others ignore or discuss it, whilst yet others provoke and/or encourage radicalisation. These findings in no way diminish the importance nor the legitimacy of the work of support by the families. On the contrary, the authors of the aforementioned report recommend working more with parents and families to develop appropriate responses.

The issue of supporting the families is not limited to the prevention of radicalisation: it also extends to later phases. When an individual concerned by radicalisation takes a further step, such as engaging in combat abroad, as was seen in the departures from Belgium to Syria and Iraq, the role of the families can continue to be essential. Disengagement and managing the return of these individuals requires the development of an overall and multidisciplinary approach<sup>26</sup> that is still largely missing today.

Improving the practices of support for families confronted with radicalisation implies answering a string of complex and related questions: What is a family? Who are the members and how far does the family reach? What types of extreme thinking or acts should be foreseen? In other words, how to limit and distinguish radicalisation, violent

---

26 The notion of a 'Multi-agency approach' used in the English-language literature, refers to interdisciplinary collaboration involving the law, the social sector and the client(s).

radicalisation and terrorism? What is support action for the families? What should be its scope, its approach, its objectives, the framework for intervention?

Even though we do not pretend to offer ready-made responses to all of these questions, we nevertheless proposed some reflexions in the mapping<sup>27</sup>. Our objective here will rather be to try to see how actors in the field answer these questions. This part of the guide will therefore have as its objective to set out a series of accounts on the subject of the practices and projects of support for families that have undergone this experience in Belgium. It is an overview of the lessons drawn from practices identified and studied during the establishment of the mapping.

#### **b. A relatively new field of action**

Operational practices relating to support for families confronted with radicalisation are a relatively new field of activity. It is also a very dynamic field, in permanent movement and undergoing rapid development. It is a field located at the intersection of various sectors of activity, which function according to rather different basic principles. The problem is one that is undertaken as much by specialised actors developing specific methods as by more generalist actors (who develop methods that may or may not be specific). Within the framework of mapping the practices, we observe family and youth support professionals<sup>28</sup> side by side with, for example, officials from the field of prevention in towns and communes – a function in itself extremely heterogeneous and whose content tends to vary widely from one place to another. Some projects are also born out of citizens' initiatives, sometimes involving parents who have themselves been confronted with violent radicalisation in their families.

For some, specialising in the particular problem of radicalisation has been a new challenge; for others, the novelty lay more in the fact of turning to caring for families confronted with violent radicalisation. Whatever the context, all have been through, or are currently experiencing, a phase of experimentation, of research or development of methodologies that are adapted to the challenges of radicalisation as it is presented to them.

The actors, the conditions for projects to emerge and the resources allocated to family support are varied. In certain instances, it is the government or bodies dependent on government that have taken the initiative. In other cases, it is private associations that have committed to this new space in an effort to meet highly felt needs. In some instances, private resources have been mobilised to address an urgent situation, whilst at other times public funds have facilitated an intervention. Sometimes, working with beneficiaries has been able to benefit from established relationships with the families concerned or with vulnerable target groups. This has notably been the case of associations with expertise in the field of intercultural relations. Such work undoubtedly constitutes an important advantage in establishing a relationship of trust. Elsewhere,

—  
<sup>27</sup> See mapping pages 5 to 8.

<sup>28</sup> What is referred to as 'integrale jeugdhulp' (integrated youth support) in Flanders.

developing a relationship with the target families has been initiated at the request of the government (at local or higher level), or in response to a call for projects.

### **c. A heterogeneous landscape of initiatives and actors**

The mapping exercise conducted beforehand enabled the heterogeneous nature of initiatives and actors to be appreciated, especially regarding the degree of specialisation of the projects and the actors' level of professionalism. Support for families has often appeared as a non-codified practice of social support resulting from requests and requirements in the field. For a certain number of small-scale local associations, working with the families is often undertaken on the basis of a particular and one-off request. Somewhat coincidentally, social workers and volunteers try their best to help the people in need. It is often, therefore, a question of voluntary devotion, work undertaken 'in addition' to the rest of the person's voluntary or professional engagements. For such organisms, it is thus difficult to find financial support that might alleviate such additional hours spent in this new type of support.

Help for the families may remain at this stage of development, but more often than not, it becomes more specialised, codified and professional. Such professionalization takes place both empirically, in function of the cases dealt with, but also accompanied by training. Whilst the training in which social workers participate enables them to confront new knowledge and exchange information with their colleagues about their practices, professionalisation also develops through their experimentation, evaluation, re-evaluation and recalibration of the methods tested.

There are numerous private organisations looking to develop their expertise by replying to calls for projects that enable them to receive specific subsidies. In this new field of radicalisation, it is important to take into account these small local structures, which are often closer to the people but which sometimes have difficulties in becoming more professional. Receiving subsidies does not always enable specific jobs to be created for social workers that would ensure a transition towards greater professionalisation.

In short, certain initiatives come directly from towns and communes, generally via prevention services or departments; others emanate from various institutional actors in different sectors of activity. Lastly, some initiatives come from private associations, which may or may not be in receipt of government subsidies. Project leaders thus come from a number of sectors, including notably the medical, social and psychological sectors, the youth support sector, the childhood and young people sector and support for families and parenting, as well as the socio-cultural sector.

### **d. Regional dynamics of practices (Flanders, Wallonia, Brussels)**

The mapping shows the existence of a regional dynamic of practices. The practices and projects of family support should therefore be analysed in function of these regional specificities. In the first instance, these are the reflection of the fact that, in recent years, Brussels and Flanders have been more directly confronted by cases of youth radicalisation leading to violence and departures to combat zones abroad than has Wallonia. The federal structure of Belgium and the autonomy of the communities and regions

regarding support for people, prevention and security constitute the second important factor influencing this regional dynamic and differentiation. In particular, the differing structure in the fields of public policy and the territorialisation of the social sector differentiate the institutional landscape of Flanders, Wallonia and Brussels.

In Flanders, an action plan has defined the role of the various authorities regarding the prevention of violent radicalisation. This notably covers actors in the sector of well-being and support for young people. Support for families constitutes a specific focal point within the framework of this plan.<sup>29</sup>

As a general consideration, there are proportionately more organisations in Flanders that formulate a specific provision of support for families and this is often presented as a complement to a more overall provision. This support is, moreover, often provided by people who have had previous experience and expertise in supporting families in general (parenting support and/or support for the family context as part of comprehensive help for young people). Such previous expertise relating to issues other than violent radicalisation has most often required additional training to overcome the initial reticence and hesitation of certain workers and to enable them to apply their previous expertise in this new context.

Civil society appears to play a more important role in Flanders than in Wallonia. This is to be considered in relation to the institutional landscape mentioned earlier, which is more structured in a top-down manner, on the basis of various regional decrees that organise, for instance, the sector of integral youth support or that of parenting support, and foresees the related financing for each sector. In that context, an offer of service born out of an (urgent) locally-perceived need can sometimes be integrated into an existing structure and consequently become permanent. Projects undertaken exclusively by private associations outside these subsidised structures usually depend on their own financial resources or on specific calls for projects and thus may have a more uncertain future.

Flemish towns and communes often play a role of governance and coordination and work in partnership with other local actors to provide a local offer that can answer the needs of parents and family members. As a result, the role of prevention officers in towns and communes in Flanders often consists of ‘activating’, at local level, an offer of more or less specialised service that already exists and/or is structured in function of the competences set out in an existing decree, which regulates the relevant sector(s), sometimes on the basis of so-called ‘regular’ financial resources, but sometimes also by

---

<sup>29</sup> Point 13 of the plan foresees the involvement of and support for the parents, the family and friends and mentions, among other things, support for those groups of people who experience the same difficulties, integrated into children’s homes, with aid from a telephone helpline and on Internet via the *Opvoedingslijn* (Upbringing Line), for questions relating to a young person’s upbringing that parents, family, friends and acquaintances might ask regarding radicalisation. As far as parental support is concerned, a central role is devolved to *Kind en Gezin* (Child and Family), including via children’s homes and all of the bodies covered by youth support (general social support centres, centres providing support for pupils and the well-being of young people) within the framework, of course, of regular arrangements.

unblocking ‘exceptional’ funds. It is, moreover, not exceptional within this framework, for partnerships to be established with ‘non-traditional’ actors, such as (minority) cultural associations or religious leaders, who operate as community officers standing close to the target group of families. The financing of such ‘non-traditional’ actors, and in particular that of parent associations, however remains a sensitive subject.

In French-speaking areas, most of the projects identified are led by government agencies. Associations represent one third of the structures identified. Among projects undertaken by the commune in Wallonia, a certain number are subsidised by the project *Amélioration du vivre ensemble et prévention du radicalisme* (Improving living together and preventing radicalism). However, an analysis of the latter’s coverage shows that it often concerns radicalisation only very indirectly and in reality focuses on prevention in the wider sense.

As far as voluntary associations are concerned, these are relatively little represented in proportion to the other public or semi-public structures. Certain associations<sup>30</sup> have ventured into specific projects of support for families affected by radicalisation after having been active in more general family support work, i.e. in contexts other than that of radicalisation.

---

<sup>30</sup> See, for instance, the Egregoros association in the mapping, pages 56-57

---

Part 4.

## Strategies and basic principles of intervention to support families

### a. Introduction

This section of the guide analyses the various approaches to support encountered in the field and proposes to categorise them according to different dimensions. We describe, among other things, the issue of inaccessibility and territories that are pertinent to intervention. We then address the logic of the levels of prevention within which family support projects operate. Practices may also be differentiated according to the type of support offered: individual support versus group approaches. Finally, we try to identify some of the underlying objectives of projects, initiatives, and practices.

### b. Territories pertinent to intervention: priority given to local level

Most of the structures identified, in Flanders, Wallonia and Brussels, operate at local level. It is most often the commune that is considered as pertinent to intervention. Nevertheless, several actors reported that they were capable of assuming care for families beyond their normal territory if there was no other equivalent structure capable of doing so. Interventions outside the communes are mainly by organisations set up by regional and (linguistic) community government such as the CAPREV and the CREA<sup>31</sup> in the Wallonia-Brussels Federation, which are today working to establish themselves as the key reference, according to our observations in the field.

The **CAPREV** (Wallonia-Brussels Federation) provides professional listening and personalised, multidisciplinary support to anyone who is indirectly concerned by radicalisation or violent extremism (including the families, close friends and professionals), as well as to those who are directly concerned by or engaged in, or about to be engaged in a process of violent radicalisation, or moving away from it. Care is personalised and has as its objective social reintegration and support for disengagement. This type of support may be implemented voluntarily or as part of the conditions of a judicial mandate.

For further information: <https://extremismes-violents.cfwb.be/>

This stronger representation at local level can be interpreted as the reflection of a similarly local phenomenon.<sup>32</sup> It seems more relevant for project leaders to respond to the phenomenon of support for families confronted with radicalisation by targeting their local environment rather than widening their intervention to a zone whose population they do not know. Local action enables them to build levels of trust with the inhabitants and with other associations, with whom they can exchange information and good practices, as well as implementing joint projects. This way of working is all the more relevant for supporting the families too.

31 CAPREV: Centre d'Aide et de Prise en charge de toute personne concernée par les Extrémismes et Radicalismes Violents (Centre for help and support for persons concerned by Extremism and Violent Radicalism). CREA: Centre de Ressources et d'appui (Centre for Resources and Support) See websites: <https://extremismes-violents.cfwb.be/>.

32 'All radicalisation is local' according to Rik Coolsaet (2016).

The prevention of radicalisation and support for families confronted with this phenomenon concerns the whole of Belgium. For reasons related to the mobilisation of certain groups, such as Sharia4Belgium on the Brussels-Mechelen-Antwerp axis for instance, some towns or communities may be more concerned than others. It is hardly surprising to note that it is in the cities where projects and practices are the most developed. Local government in smaller communes is often ill-equipped to offer appropriate preventive responses. They are, however, very aware of the diffuse nature of the risk of violent radicalisation. In a certain number of cases observed in the mapping, one sees a tendency to integrate concern about prevention of radicalisation into a more general policy of social cohesion.

**Project R** has been developed by the **Cocon-Vilvoorde** association. It provides, on the one hand, specialised support to the families and/or young people and, on the other hand, a local model of cooperation based on the provision of support for families and young people. Initially, working with the families was limited to the commune of Vilvorde, but in 2017, the area covered was widened to (Brussels-) Hal-Vilvorde. The aim was to develop interdisciplinary synergy between the professional partners working in the Vilvorde zone, based on a harmonised and dynamic approach to radicalisation. There was also a wish to develop knowledge on subjects relating to radicalisation, the families and young people at risk and to share experience with other support actors.

For further information: [www.cocon-vilvoorde.be](http://www.cocon-vilvoorde.be)

### c. Levels of prevention: a preponderance of primary prevention

Numerous actors in the field of prevention of radicalisation make use of a prevention typology<sup>33</sup> that distinguishes primary (or general) prevention, which is addressed to the general population, from forms of prevention that are more targeted. Secondary (or targeted) prevention addresses individuals or groups considered to be vulnerable or 'at risk', whilst tertiary (or curative) prevention concerns individuals who have already been radicalised or are in the process of being radicalised. These forms of prevention correspond to a scale of risk.<sup>34</sup>

Not all of the practices taken from the mapping are (explicitly) placed under the common denominator of preventing radicalisation. More important still, the initiatives listed are not necessarily preventive in the strict sense of the term, given that they fulfil different situations from that of prevention. That is to say that their *raison d'être* is not necessarily and/or exclusively dictated by the objective of preventing and/or stopping radicalisation. This nevertheless in no way diminishes the preventive effects that such

33 See for example Centre de Prévention de la Radicalisation menant à la violence de Montréal: <https://inforadical.org>. The Federal Interior Ministry uses the same typology in its *Guide des initiatives et outils locaux à destination des acteurs de terrain* (SPF Intérieur 2018).

34 When we consider prevention as part of a continuum, we find, prior to (primary) prevention, general policy lines that focus on prevention and we again see remedial approaches at the other extreme. Goris, Parrain, Bursens, D., Melis, B., & Vettenburg, N. (2008). Prévention générale: concepten, kaders en wenselijke preventie. WELZIJNSGIDS (MECHELEN), (69), 109-126.

initiatives may have on the problem of radicalisation. Nevertheless, classification of the types of prevention applicable to radicalisation can, in large part, be extended to these practices.

Primary prevention “seeks to target, early on, the causes and general factors (individual, interpersonal, community, societal, social) that might be the source of the dynamics of radicalisation leading to violence, whatever their form.” (SPF Intérieur 2018, p.10). Within the context of the mapping of support practices for families confronted with radicalisation, primary prevention can cover broad realities that are specific to the context of each institution and its target group. This can sometimes take the form of raising awareness about multiculturalism and social cohesion among the general public, thus including the families. Theatre productions on the theme of radicalisation for example have also been widely used (such as performances on the subject of radicalisation by the Forumtheater), as well as projects offering the production and distribution of videos that raise awareness of, and give information about, radicalisation (such as the video capsules *Rien à faire, rien à perdre* (Nothing to do, nothing to lose)).

These realities translate and reflect the level of acuity of needs that exist in the field. In fact, when an operator applies to receive a subsidy in relation to the prevention of radicalisation, this person is not necessarily confronted with existing requests for support of an individual or family. We observe that in Wallonia, numerous operatives work to create a context of prevention without having proven experience with those directly concerned or the families.

Primary prevention may, as we can see, take the form of help that is not directly targeted towards radicalisation, but whose effects can help prevent radicalisation. Some organisations have chosen, often at the request of their public, to set up discussion workshops or training around a particular theme. This involves creating awareness of the process of radicalisation as a reflection of some disturbance in the system. This refers to considering the process of radicalisation as the reflection of a breakdown in the system. In this way, one acts not only on the most obvious symptoms, but also on more specific aspects that are of help in better managing the relationship with the young person. For example, it may be discussion groups on how to better communicate with a young adolescent, or computer courses to learn how to use the tools that the youngster him/herself uses. Such approaches enable the family to have a better relationship with the young person and react more effectively when there are difficulties. Strengthening resilience is also a good example of primary prevention.

The **Bounce** project, developed by the Arktos association, is in line with the approach of primary prevention targeted to a wide public. The objective is to provide a favourable environment for everyone, bring people together, strengthen the powers and resilience of children and young people and raise awareness and strengthen parents and frontline actors. The target group covers all children and young people from the age of 6 to 25 (individually or via organisations, schools, communities and so forth), the parents, frontline workers and the networks; in fact, everyone working with young people. The project offers a number of tools that can be used in training workshops. Bounceyoung is for young people, whilst Bouncealong is particularly for parents and the wider circle of youngsters who have participated in the programme, with a view to raising awareness and multiplying the effects of the workshop for young people.

For further information:

[www.arktos.be](http://www.arktos.be)

[www.bounce-resilience-tools.eu/](http://www.bounce-resilience-tools.eu/)

The choice of presenting the issue of radicalisation as a *systemic* problem that affects several aspects of daily life permits prevention - and above all primary prevention - to be apprehended, without speaking about radicalisation, but whilst also reinforcing the role of the parents and their capacity to act should they be confronted with a situation of radicalisation in the future.

Insofar as secondary and tertiary prevention are concerned, this is much more targeted around the problem of radicalisation.

Secondary prevention “aims to reduce the vulnerabilities and risk factors in those groups or circles identified as being ‘at risk’ and which are more susceptible to represent fertile territories for radicalisation. It encourages activities, situations and contexts that are susceptible to favourably supporting vulnerable individuals.” (SPF Intérieur 2018 p.12).

Initiatives that target youth as a whole, and by extension their families and/or parents, viewing them as a population ‘at risk’, could be considered as secondary prevention. In this case as in others, the distinction between this and primary prevention is not always easy to make since the definition of a person ‘at risk’ can vary according to different actors. The offer of psycho-educational support for vulnerable families can also be seen as part of secondary prevention. Nevertheless, general initiatives of parenting support such as the support provided by the ‘opvoedingslijn’ (a parental helpline) are ment to be available to everyone, whatever the questions or situation of the parents, and can be said to cover primary and secondary prevention and even, in some cases, tertiary prevention.

The city of Charleroi set up the service **Ecoute Info Radicalisme** (Radicalism helpline), which covers secondary and tertiary prevention. The primary objective is to listen to those close to young people being radicalised (families, friends etc.) as well as the young people themselves.

For further information: [www.charleroi.be/info-ecoute-radicalisme](http://www.charleroi.be/info-ecoute-radicalisme)

Finally, tertiary prevention ‘aims to encourage the individual to disengage from violence and extremism, or to distance him/herself from extremist discourse or beliefs’ (SPF Intérieur 2018, p. 14). Providing support through psycho-social and family support for individuals who are in a situation of radicalisation is considered as tertiary prevention. The services providing psycho-social support do not necessarily change their approach in function of whether the family is confronted with a situation of radicalisation or another situation that makes them vulnerable.

Insofar as initiatives for the families are concerned, the distinction between primary, secondary and tertiary prevention is not always easy to make. Moreover, signalling a worrying situation in which there is a suspicion of (potential) radicalisation may in fact point to other dynamics (personal, interpersonal and/or familial, social or societal) that further complicate things. Puberty, family problems or tensions unrelated to radicalisation, or societal tensions linked to religion and Islam in particular can, for instance, all play a role. The fact remains that the mapping has shown that there are very few projects that offer (specialised) support to families where one of the members is in a situation of, or on the road to, (violent) radicalisation.

The logic of working with levels of prevention remains a reference for numerous actors in the field, but it would sometimes seem to be more pertinent to classify projects in function of other criteria. This could be, for instance according to their objectives, or the fact of working in a group or else of offering individual care instead.

The **Prevention Service in the commune of Molenbeek** uses the three levels of prevention. The method used is on a case-by-case basis and the service is adapted in function of the particular file. Care may be either direct, via the commune, or in cooperation with other associations.

When the support is direct, the objective is to re-integrate the role of the family into the life of the youngster and provide resources that will enable him/her to reintegrate into society.

For further information: [www.molenbeek.irisnet.be](http://www.molenbeek.irisnet.be)

**d. Group approaches and individualized support practices**

In all of the projects and initiatives included in the mapping, the parents and/or families belong, either directly or indirectly, to the intended target group(s). In practice, certain projects organise the care of young people concerned by radicalisation as individual cases or in group activities. Several of the structures identified organise wider activities that are not specifically for the families, but which target primary prevention through more general awareness activities and training etc. These activities for the general public are not without their use. In the first place, they reach, through concentric circles, young people, their families and friends, the social workers, teachers and so forth<sup>35</sup>. Secondly, such action may be the catalyst for the implementation of specific activities that benefit the families. It is sometimes via these initiatives that the fathers, mothers and others are motivated to come and talk about their worries concerning someone close to them.

Organisations that organise activities for families or other loved ones sometimes take the form of discussion groups or (networking) activities allowing to exchange experiences and good practices. For most of these organisations, dealing with radicalisation is fairly recent (between 1 and 3 years in general) and for some it raises a number of questions and doubts as to the method to be used for family support in this context.

Some projects focus mainly on parents or the family as the target group, whilst others have youngsters as their point of departure, whilst still working with the families as an important part of the life context of youngsters. This is sometimes done by a period of ‘double’ support, in which not just the youngster but also the parents simultaneously benefit from a coordinated support. *De Touter* and *Cocon Wilvoorde* are examples of organisations offering such ‘double’ support. In other instances, there are activities that are destined jointly for both target groups, or separate activities that are mutually complementary. Several organisations offer support that combine various types of approaches (group and individual).

The ‘**De Touter**’ association offers on the one hand meetings for families and parents affected by radicalisation (Hoedsaam project) and, on the other hand, very intensive individual support in cases of radicalisation, provided jointly by a youth counsellor and a family counsellor.

Various methods, including New Authority and Non-violent Resistance, are used by the support workers both in group work and in individual coaching sessions. The ‘De Touter’ team relies on their years of experience in fields relating to power and super-diverse and intercultural support.

For further information: [www.detouter.be](http://www.detouter.be)

—  
35 The latter are often considered as having a key role to play because they are in daily contact with the youngsters.

For most of the time, the group approach is rather that of general prevention activities. More specialised support, help or parental support tends to be more individual, with the exception of discussion groups for the parents of radicalised persons. At the present time, there exists only a very limited number of projects that can provide specialised and intensive support to the parents of radicalised youngsters (or youngsters in the process of becoming radicalised), which could be classified as (more or less intensive) ‘family’ support. Moreover, such initiatives currently have only limited geographical coverage. The group offer addressed to parents and/or other family members on the other hand is greater, and more widespread. It is however generally of a fairly preventive nature, although it also exists as complementary help for families accompanied via an individualized trajectory of support. A certain number of organisations offer several approaches. In addition to their work with parents, a number of actors also share their expertise with other organisations, social workers and workers in the field. There is currently a considerable number of training courses on the subject of radicalisation and working with families that are available to professionals working in the sector. The question, however, remains to what extent this training for frontline actors is really beneficial for the parents and families involved.

#### **e. Project objectives : a wide range of operating logics**

Those who provide support for the families work with a variety of objectives. The framework in which they work provides a better understanding for this. When intervention is the result of a ‘mandate’ derived from the implementation of a more general policy (such as well-being, youth support etc.), the objectives for radicalisation prevention and family support will be determined by this overall framework. This then leads to focus on objectives, which might for instance be centred on people’s well-being or on maintaining security for society as a whole.

In Brussels, the **SAVE Belgium** association places the emphasis on parenting. The aim of a Parenting Workshop is to provide mothers with the confidence and skills necessary to protect their children effectively from radicalisation.

During the workshop, modules cover aspects such as communication within the family, the role of the father, the role of the mother etc. The aim is to foster an exchange of good practices between the mothers and to create an intra- and extra-familial support network.

For further information: [www.savebelgium.org](http://www.savebelgium.org)

However, underlying objectives are not always made explicit. In other words, the underlying ‘theory of change’ (Lub, 2013) that guides an intervention is not always clear. Projects can focus on the context of the young people’s lives and aim, for instance, at strengthening their resilience. The underlying idea is that this notably contributes to guarding them against various factors and influences that can lead to radicalisation. In a similar logic, general psycho-educational support activities and/or parental coaching rest on the premise that supporting and strengthening the parents in their parental role

enables factors of protection to be reinforced and contributes to guarding families against risks such as that of (violent) radicalisation.

De **Opvoedingslijn** is a telephone and e-mail helpline that provides anonymous support for parents and teachers. As part of the Flemish Government's action plan for the prevention of radicalisation and polarisation, it is foreseen that this telephone support should be the first point of contact for parents regarding radicalisation, starting from the general preventive role of parental support. The team examines how the parents, other members of the family, teachers and confidential counsellors, as well as social workers, can be guided in a targeted manner.

A number of information sessions for parents have also been organised, in cooperation with organisations and/or individuals responsible for prevention, with the accent also being placed on cooperation with "non-classic" actors, such as autonomous organisations.

The objective is to better reach out to parents, raise awareness about the signs of potential radicalisation and to familiarise them with existing parental support facilities.

Initiatives may also aim at more general prevention and seek, for example, to fight polarisation through improving collective well-being and social cohesion and thus contribute to stamping out the effects of the causes and general factors that may be the source of the dynamics of radicalisation. These varied examples reveal the multitude of perspectives regarding what the 'problem' to be resolved is and 'how' it ought to be resolved.

In Verviers, **SAFER (Service d'Accompagnement des Familles et de l'Entourage en matière de Radicalisme**- the Radicalisation Support Service for Families and Persons Around) was set up in 2015. This service provides a point of contact to listen to and support anyone who is worried, or has questions directly or indirectly relating to the phenomenon of "radicalism". Special attention is paid to informing and educating the media. SAFER has recently launched a pedagogic tool destined to better equip youngsters to dealing with conspiracy theories.

For further information: [www.saferverviers.be](http://www.saferverviers.be)

#### **f. Practice methodologies: a wide variety of approaches**

The number of methodologies used is at least as great as that of the objectives and it is, in some respects, the result of this great variety of goals. On the one hand, the variety of provision can be linked to the different needs that families may have in relation to the issue of radicalisation. Parents may, for example, be in need of general information or have more precise questions in function of the situation they face. This may extend from simple anxiety resulting from the day's news, to a very worrying situation con-

cerning possible signs of radicalisation among one of their children, or even difficulties relating to the emotional departure of a child. Furthermore, their questions and needs may also be of a very different nature, including those relating to practical and/or legal aspects and questions of a religious, educational or psychological nature.

The project to prevent violent radicalisation developed by the **commune of Anderlecht** puts the accent regarding objectives on support for mothers' parenting through individual support as well as that of the family. The focus is on factors of vulnerability (difficult episodes in life, feelings of identity crisis, weak critical sense) and on factors of protection (a stable relationship environment, a critical and thoughtful mind, a strong sense of social integration...). At the collective level, the approach favours encouraging people to discuss issues, mutual help and support and the mothers sharing advice during 10-session workshops. At individual level, the support is psycho-social.

As far as the provision of a service and support that families facing (at risk of) radicalisation can call upon, various types of intervention can be identified: awareness-raising activities, theatre productions and video campaigns, hotlines and/or information services and support via chatrooms or e-mail, psycho-educational support services such as educational workshops and/or parental coaching, sometimes in support of and/or as a complement to support activities for building resilience and/or developing youngsters' cultural identity, discussion groups, which are sometimes organised by associations of parents who are themselves concerned by a child's radicalisation, as well as individual psycho-social support or therapeutic support.

Alongside this offer of services addressed directly to the parents, the mapping also includes projects linked to the coordination of services at local level and to the development of a chain of intervention, as well as the creation and distribution of pedagogic tools and/or videos. Similarly, training sessions for frontline social actors aimed at strengthening support for families have also been included in the mapping when this was a question of sharing expertise developed through practice. This training for frontline actors is mentioned as a complement to the offer for families (see De Touter for example).

The working methods adopted are obviously in function of the type of service offered. It is not possible in this guide to cover in detail the approaches of all the initiatives. Nevertheless, it seems useful to highlight in particular a number of central methodological elements that characterise the psycho-social support initiatives for families, whatever the degree of specialisation.

The methodology adopted for supporting families confronted with violent radicalisation is still often one of experimentation and questions. A certain number of actors confess to working on a 'case by case' basis, following rather versatile guidelines: listening, reassuring, getting a complete picture of the person and his/her environment, strengthening family links. The most experienced structures put in place methods based on the provision of a place to listen and the possibility of individual support where necessary.

When support is provided for a person or a family, several elements must be taken into consideration if optimal support is to be provided, such as age, gender, culture, family situation and level of education. It is also a question of establishing whether the situation is one of real radicalisation or whether there are other dimensions, such as a psychological problem. Given the particular nature of the phenomenon of radicalisation, the support methods adopted must of necessity combine or alternate with others such as clinical or social approaches. A systemic analysis is sometimes used. In this case, an initial evaluation is made of the situation, which is as precise as possible and takes into account as many elements as feasible, as well as their reciprocal influences. In this way, social workers can adapt to the situation of the person they support so as to react in the best possible way.

Several respondents agreed that maintaining communication within the family is of the utmost importance in supporting the groups concerned. Particular attention must also be given to siblings where present. In fact, when a youngster is radicalised, this usually represents an upheaval for the entire family. It is important that the social worker ensures that brothers and/or sisters also understand the situation if further trouble among the siblings is to be avoided. In fact, if the siblings believe that the situation of a brother/sister is unjust and that society is at fault, then they too are at risk of developing resentment or anger against society.

Certain approaches work (principally) from the perspective of support for the parent(s), whilst others take as the point of departure the young person in situation of radicalisation or being radicalised and the family provides the context for the youngster in question. The sector of activity obviously constitutes an important factor in this regard (support for parenting versus young people or youth support for example). Approaching the whole family may also be the goal for certain methods. Some approaches place the accent on the emotional and affective dimension. The objective is then to provide help in terms of psychological support at the level of parent-child communication. An approach that is specific to (psycho) social support involves placing the accent on the capacity of the family and the wider community (groups of peers, etc.) to fulfil the role of a providing a protective barricade against extremism (Weine *et al.*, 2009). Organisations would, however, have to accept the idea that parents and the close circle are capable of helping their child effectively under such circumstances. Some actors consider integrating the family might be delicate or even dangerous, whilst others use family figures as measures of protection and resilience (Weine *et al.*, 2009).

The approach through emotions is explicitly mentioned as a solution to indoctrination by the anthropologist Dounia Bouzar (2015). This consists of reminding the people concerned of agreeable memories in order to revive past emotions and sensations, which then reactivate their sentiments, enabling them to emerge, little by little, from indoctrination. In her work *Comment sortir de l'emprise djihadiste?* (How to get out of the jihadist grip), Dounia Bouzar (2015) sets out the details of a technique that she has developed for the Centre pour la prévention des dérives sectaires liées à l'islam (Centre for the Prevention of Sectarian Abuses linked to Islam). This method aims to help the families of radicalised people to disengage by reactivating the memories of shared affects and emotions.

Finally, we can mention systemic intervention. With this approach, it is not only the family and the radicalised young person (or person being radicalised) who are approached. Here the problem of the radicalised person is considered in a wider context: attention is given to the person, his/her history, family, school and neighbourhood. The space in which the individual moves and the people he/she meets on an everyday basis are all considered in resolving the issue. If there is a suspicion of a youngster being radicalised and a parent asks for help, the fieldworker will attempt to see what lies behind the young person's disquiet and might perhaps find a more complex family dynamic in the background (Weine *et al.*, 2009), on which work would have to begin in the first instance.

In all of the various types of interventions<sup>36</sup>, the importance of listening to the family or the parent(s) can be noted. Numerous social workers mentioned that the person comes above all to take a load off his/her mind and wants to be listened to. It is for this reason that social workers do not hesitate to devote the necessary time to listening, either face-to-face or on the telephone. After this, most of them wish to meet the person whatever happens, even if the problem does not appear to be linked to violent radicalisation. When support for the young person follows, the role of the parent is often reinforced in an effort to maintain communication with the youngster. Intra-familial communication is important: the period of adolescence is difficult in terms of communication for a young person and we live in an age in which virtual communication is central. Maintaining contact and communication with one's child is thus primordial, in the hope that one day the child will take the path of disengagement. However, such an exercise is not easy because the youngster on a pathway to radicalisation finds him/herself in a phase of rupture from the world around him/her and does not necessarily therefore wish to have contact with the close (family) circle.

---

36 These various interventions presuppose voluntary collaboration between the family and the social worker. However, some structures can intervene in a judicial capacity and be mandated by a judicial authority. In such cases, it is possible that they have to work with a family whose willingness to cooperate may vary.

**The Radicalisation Prevention Team (City of Antwerp)**

The multidisciplinary approach used by the Radicalisation Prevention Team in the City of Antwerp combines (second line) support for groups, centred on the organisations and associations that provide multiple individual social interventions for young people. This comprises on the one hand an ‘inclusive’ approach that does not specifically focus on the issue of radicalisation, and on the other hand a more specific approach that requires more intensive and specialised support. This specialised support is provided by the partner organisation De Touter (through their projects Houvast and Hoedsaam). Caseworkers in the city work principally at the levels of primary and secondary prevention, the objective being to help youngsters to reconnect with society and this via support for various aspects of life, notably the family.

[www.antwerpen.be](http://www.antwerpen.be)



---

Part 5.

## Weaknesses, concerns and points of attention

### **a. Introduction**

This section of the guide aims to identify difficulties and key questions encountered during the fieldwork. These come into play at several levels: at the conception and development of policies as much as in their implementation. In this sense, the reflexions set out here concern several levels of analysis, namely of government, those working in the field and the families and beneficiaries. It is not a matter of judging modes of intervention of one or the other, but rather of identifying the difficulties with which they are confronted and where these might be improved. The following chapter, which sets out some recommendations, tries to translate such reflexions into more or less concrete proposals for possible improvements.

The political and media construct of the radicalised young person and his/her family contribute to creating a difficult context in which to provide support for the families. Even the ambiguity of the term ‘radicalisation’ and the frequent association – as much in the specialised literature as in political and social discourse – of radical ideology with violent action, of extremism, radicalism and terrorism, as well as looking at what happens prior to a terrorist act implied by the increasing attention being given to the ‘process of radicalisation’, obviously carry potential dangers. Nevertheless, as indicated above, radicalisation is not necessarily a danger in itself. Moreover, the attention given to certain groups of young people considered ‘at risk’, as well as the focus on the so-called ‘religious’ radicalisation of Muslim youths is not without consequences.<sup>37</sup> Bonelli et Carrié (2018) rightly call for actors working in the field of prevention not to “aggravate the phenomenon they seek to combat by, for example, uselessly fabricating categories of suspects.” This particular context is obviously not unknown in certain difficulties encountered in the field of support for families confronted by violent radicalisation.

### **b. Actors’ hesitations and uncertainties**

At theoretical level, radicalisation remains a subject about which little is known. There remain numerous unknowns in the burgeoning literature about these questions (Cf. RAN 2016). Whilst academic research is still silent on numerous aspects, actors in the field cannot allow themselves to abandon their beneficiaries to their fate through lack of theoretical knowledge. Such cognitive uncertainty puts them in a difficult position. Practically, solutions must be found whilst bearing the weight of responsibility in supporting the families and/or individuals confronted with radicalisation. This leads some actors to question their own stance and choices faced with the seriousness of certain situations.

The future for this field of intervention is also a cause for concern. Some posts were created in the aftermath of terrorist-related events that struck Europe. There are fears that subsidies will not be renewed and that jobs will end up disappearing through lack of demand and/or money. Some people have also spoken about the future development of their jobs and missions. At the present time, it has been more a question of helping those families that saw someone close to them being radicalised or leaving for Syria. In the near future, however, they will perhaps be expected to take charge of families who have

---

<sup>37</sup> See, for example, the testimony of a youngster gathered as part of a research project. (Bim, undated)

a family member who has returned from Syria, with all the traumas that such returns bring. A great number of community workers feel ill-equipped to face such situations, for which they are neither ready nor trained. The entire field is currently focused on jihadist radicalisation, but some workers are now thinking about other types of radicalisation. Media attention covers only one aspect, which also orients the practices of professionals only towards Islamist radicalisation, thereby more or less obscuring other forms of radicalisation. A priori, professionals are capable of dealing with all types of violent extremism, but they are inevitably trained in function of current events. Questions thus emerge regarding the future possibility of having to take charge of people who have been radicalised in other ways. The lack of preparation and the hypothesis of having to suddenly adapt to other types of radicalisation is a source of anxiety for some actors.

### c. The need for specialised care

It is possible that families are not always aware of the fact that their child is being radicalised. Certain signs, such as no longer drinking alcohol or visiting their usual places (street, neighbourhood square etc.), new friends etc., can initially be seen as something positive. However, when parents finally realise that their child is being radicalised, they often appear powerless in this new situation and struggle to find an appropriate attitude or pertinent counter-arguments<sup>38</sup>. Some parents adopt a neutral, tolerant or even resigned attitude regarding their child's new ideas. The question here is to evaluate and measure effectively the level of danger incurred by the child. Are these harmless changes or indications of radicalisation that could, perhaps, lead to violence?<sup>39</sup> This partially explains why few parents turn towards a social structure to help them through this difficulty. However, for those parents who understand what is happening and try to remedy the situation, it can be very difficult to influence the attitudes and behaviour of their child without outside help<sup>40</sup>.

Early prevention can also come via private or public structures that set up projects for parents and/or young people in an effort to diminish youngsters' susceptibility to radical discourse and strengthen their resilience. In this regard, we encountered several communes that had implemented one or the other project thanks to financing resulting from the Walloon Government's call for projects entitled *Amélioration du vivre ensemble et prévention du radicalisme* (Improving living together and prevention of radicalism)<sup>41</sup>. This call for projects associates community life with the prevention of radicalism: the various projects resulting from the call are thus sometimes developed without a direct link to radicalisation, but rather simply involve the promotion of citizenship and multiculturalism. This echoes the observation we were able to make among the services we spoke to: they do not always feel concerned by radicalisation, but driven by the current context of security policies and fear propagated by the media, it happens that they answer such calls for projects in order to acquire additional funding, without

38 Van San, M., Sieckelinck, S. & de Winter, M. (2013). Ideals adrift: an educational approach to radicalization. *Ethics and Education*, 8(3), 276 - 289, DOI: 10.1080/17449642.2013.878100

39 Spalek, B (2016). Radicalisation, de-radicalisation and counter-radicalisation in relation to families: Key challenges for research, policy and practices. *Security Journal*, 29(1), 39 - 52

40 Op. cit.

41 <http://cohesionsociale.wallonie.be/sites/default/files/circulaire%20radicalisme.pdf>

necessarily developing activities directly related to radicalisation. Some projects therefore come from 'above' instead of coming from a need generated in the field. These structures can thus be classified as so-called 'early' prevention, although their role and activities have not fundamentally changed.

As far as jihadist-type radicalisation is concerned, the need for specialised care regularly clashes with questioning of the actors about the role that should be accorded to cultural belonging, to the Muslim religion or to religion in general. Whilst certain operators believe that the specific religious universe at the base of jihadist-type radicalisation should be taken into consideration, others have serious doubts about the usefulness of such an approach<sup>42</sup>. Not only are workers in the field ill-prepared to enter into such debates, but the young people concerned are themselves often ill-informed about religion. Furthermore, the mobilisation of tools derived from Muslim theologies to defuse proven situations of radicalisation may turn out to have little effectiveness. Radical jihadist engagement is built upon an ideologisation of the religious discourse and one of the central dimensions of this ideological packaging is precisely its questioning of dominant Muslim theology.

#### **d. The match between families' needs and actors' training**

The question of 'knowledge vs. know-how' is central to a good many questions raised when a new field of intervention is developed in social work. There is currently no professional training available to become a radicalisation 'expert' or 'advisor' and so the people in this job are very heterogeneous. Some have previous experience with helping people in vulnerable situations (sects, violence, hooliganism, drugs), whilst others have a university qualification in criminology or other social sciences. Given that most of these jobs are for new positions, created and financed within a security context, there is no ready-made road to follow. New and existing employees who are appointed to new positions are therefore ill-prepared to realize the theoretical injunctions set out in the instructions they receive. There exists training in 'radicalism', but this does not always bring the help expected and it is sometimes judged to be too theoretical or repetitive, despite its supposed diversity.

The training of community workers is developed in function of the families' needs and it is often a 'self-taught' method that prevails. On the one hand this enables very specific initiatives to emerge that 'perfectly' respond to a given problem, but on the other hand, the inherent difficulties of implementation in this field can also generate less suitable support approaches.

#### **e. Building, maintaining and retaining trust**

The relationship of trust between helping professionals and families is fostered by the guarantee of confidentiality that professional secrecy guarantees and legally protects. However, the relationship of trust has to be built beforehand.

---

42 See for example: [https://www.kbs-frb.be/-/media/Files/Bib/.../2016-PUB-3393\\_Radicalisation\\_FR.pdf](https://www.kbs-frb.be/-/media/Files/Bib/.../2016-PUB-3393_Radicalisation_FR.pdf), page 12.

The first step towards a relationship of trust is the step taken by the person who goes to a care structure. It is much easier for a structure that has been established in the neighbourhood for some years and has a good reputation among residents, to inspire confidence among its beneficiaries. A newly-established structure or service can generate mistrust. The communication strategy is therefore crucial, but here the opinions of actors in the field diverge. Whilst some favour maximum publicity about the services for families confronted with radicalisation, others prefer awareness of such services to be communicated by word of mouth.

Beyond the trust given to the social worker or other helping professionals, the issue of radicalisation remains a subject that, because of its specificities, remains one that is delicate to deal with socially. A family affected by the radicalisation of one of its members often experiences feelings of shame and unease. When the social circle is informed that a family is affected by a question of violent radicalisation, there is a risk of rejection that can impact negatively on the family.<sup>43</sup> Being received within a framework of trust is thus essential when someone takes the step of going to confide in, or ask for help from, a private or public structure.

Once contact has been established between the practitioner and the family member demanding help, the establishment of a relationship of trust begins and develops, but it must be preserved throughout the period of support. It has to be nourished by attentive listening and the availability of the helping professional. The manner in which families are approached varies from one organisation to another, but the point they have in common is that it is a point of honour for them to meet the family or person seeking aid, even if the case does not, *a priori*, seem to require intervention. After this, if a follow-up is required, all highlight the importance of listening to the families. This is a means for families to unburden the load that is bothering them and it provides the opportunity for the helping professional to establish an initial bond. Trust is indispensable, on the one hand to incite those in difficulty to step through the door, but also to understand the crux of the problem.

In fact, a problem of radicalisation may hide other underlying tensions that require further examination. Some institutions recounted cases of radicalisation that were the consequence of a family problem rather than real indoctrination. The first meeting rarely reveals the real issue. Instead, it is often during the second or third meeting that the person confides in the helping professional and reveals what is really worrying him/her. In these cases, the helping professional has to adopt a position of listener whilst still asking questions to explore in depth and try to put a finger on the situation that triggered the radicalisation. For the helping professional, good knowledge of the town and neighbourhood cannot be underestimated. One can but recommend spending time to build ties with the inhabitants and with other associations that are close to local residents. This will give a more overall view of the problem and a better understanding of the situation. If knowing the local residents is an advantage, the inverse is true too: the better the inhabitants know you, the more easily they will come to you when they have a problem.

—  
43 Op. cit.

Once trust has been established and the helping relationship is in place, the difficulties of the helping professional who provides support for the families or friends highly depend on the degree of trust in which he or she is held. Being involved in family support also means doing a balancing act, since the professional has to almost constantly (re-)evaluate the situation regarding professional secrecy. Each organisation has set up its own procedures to follow. However, almost all of them participate in the shared professional secret. Nevertheless, each situation is different and requires in-depth reflexion wherever there is a doubt about danger of the situation.

#### **f. Confidentiality and the management of professional secrecy**

Sharing information is a critical issue for structures working in the field of radicalisation. Helping professionals are subject to Article 458 of the Criminal Code<sup>44</sup> which details professional secrecy and the sanctions relating to it. Professional secrecy represents the basis of social welfare work and enables a relationship of trust and respect to be established between a welfare professionals and their clients or beneficiaries. Without this relationship of trust, it is not possible for the practitioner to conduct his/her work properly: if the beneficiary cannot tell and talk about his or her problems without being sure that the listener will not repeat them, then trust will not be established and it becomes difficult for the practitioner to help the interlocutor.

Those working in the social welfare sector apply what can be described as the ‘shared professional secret’; that is, they discuss with colleagues certain situations or cases that are more delicate. The objective is to have the opinions of others so as to adopt the best possible attitude and behaviour in a given situation<sup>45</sup>. However, in cases where the King’s Prosecutor has to be informed, it is generally not the helping professional alone who takes responsibility for this, but rather one or more superior(s).

It was in 2016, that a bill was proposed by the government, whose objective was to oblige social workers to reveal professional secrets in instances of terrorists investigations: *“This bill aims to oblige social security institutions and their personnel to communicate information relating to persons who are the subject of an investigation concerning terrorist offences to the King’s Prosecutor leading the investigation and who request this. The authors estimate that professional secrecy does not apply in the present case.”*<sup>46</sup>

This proposal provoked, and still provokes, opposition among civil society and psycho-social workers in various sectors. In fact, current developments in social policies tend to accentuate the ‘control’ aspect of the work of social workers, to the detriment of help and

—  
44 “Doctors, surgeons, health officers, pharmacists, midwives and all other persons who hold, through their status or profession, secrets entrusted to them and who, outside instances where they are called to bear witness before the law or a parliamentary commission of enquiry or where the law obliges them to make these secrets known, reveal them, will be punished with imprisonment of between eight days and six months and a fine of one hundred to five hundred euros.”

45 On professional secrecy and jurisprudence relating to shared professional secrets, see for example: [http://www.aidealajeunesse.cfwb.be/index.php?eID=tx\\_nawsecuredl&u=0&g=0&hash=984518862858403cf3809f9898981d0b-af995f72&file=fileadmin/sites/ajss/upload/ajss\\_super\\_editor/DGAJ/Documents/Colloques/Colloque\\_Deonto\\_18-2-2014/Eloge\\_de\\_la\\_deontologie-texte\\_LN\\_18\\_02\\_2014.pdf](http://www.aidealajeunesse.cfwb.be/index.php?eID=tx_nawsecuredl&u=0&g=0&hash=984518862858403cf3809f9898981d0b-af995f72&file=fileadmin/sites/ajss/upload/ajss_super_editor/DGAJ/Documents/Colloques/Colloque_Deonto_18-2-2014/Eloge_de_la_deontologie-texte_LN_18_02_2014.pdf)

46 <http://www.lachambre.be/FLWB/PDF/54/2050/54K2050001.pdf>

the values of social justice and human dignity. The latter thus find themselves stuck between their mission to help and support and the obligation to control.<sup>47</sup> We can also mention here the 2012 visits<sup>48</sup> to the communes by members of the State Security, during which they incited social workers to share information about unusual observations concerning their beneficiaries of support.

Elsewhere, in August 2015, a circular invited towns and communes to create a CSIL (Cellule de Sécurité Intégrale Locale - Comprehensive Local Security Cell). This measure was legally enshrined in the law of 30 July, 2018<sup>49</sup>. The CSIL is a platform for information exchange between various structures: social services, prevention and police services and the local authority<sup>50</sup>. Initially, there was no obligation to establish a CSIL and this explains why one did not exist in every town or commune at the time of our research. Today, the law explicitly foresees how a CSIL has to be composed and function. A guideline to the organisation of these CSILs can be found on [www.besafe.be](http://www.besafe.be)<sup>51</sup>. These bodies have as their main role to circulate information regarding prevention and reaction in a casuistic manner between the various structures integrated into the CSIL<sup>52</sup>: radicalisation is not mentioned, but “early signs” and “*Foreign Terrorist Fighters*”<sup>53</sup> are talked about. The sharing of professional secrets beyond the internal functioning of a structure is widened by integrating the services of the police and prevention. This type of collaboration can prove difficult given that the various structures required to exchange information have different priorities.

Professional secrecy and mutual trust are central to helping and supporting families but, in function of the structure, these are approached and treated in different ways. In all cases, the field actors we met were in agreement that they would not reveal things they had been told before having informed the person concerned and without having discussed the matter with their colleagues. Some seemed to be more at ease with this issue than others and had already shared some information with the police services or had persuaded a member of the family to do so. However, other structures, with a long-standing tradition of social support, seemed more reticent to denounce except in cases of absolute necessity. In most instances, organisations had not yet been faced with a sensitive case or reflected on the question of breaching professional secrecy. However, this issue remains a delicate matter and one that questions the role of the helping professional and the nature of his/her work. What is important is to instigate a system of exchange between professionals that leads to better support for the people concerned. The question of the CSILs still causes difficulties, given its objective of detection, which cannot be a key objective for actors working in socio-prevention.

47 [http://www.provincedeliege.be/sites/default/files/media/7780/expos%C3%A9\\_fran%C3%A7ois\\_istasse.pdf](http://www.provincedeliege.be/sites/default/files/media/7780/expos%C3%A9_fran%C3%A7ois_istasse.pdf)

48 <http://www.asbl-csce.be/journal/Ensemble88dossier8>

49 [http://www.ejustice.just.fgov.be/cgi\\_loi/change\\_lg.pl?language=fr&la=F&cn=2018073050&table\\_name=loi](http://www.ejustice.just.fgov.be/cgi_loi/change_lg.pl?language=fr&la=F&cn=2018073050&table_name=loi)

50 <https://www.besafe.be/fr/themes-de-securite/radicalisme/cellule-de-securite-integrale-locale>

51 <https://www.besafe.be/fr/themes-de-securite/radicalisme/cellule-de-securite-integrale-locale>

52 CSIL: Cellule de Sécurité Intégrée Locale (Comprehensive Local Security Cell).

53 See the glossary in appendix.

### **g. Accessibility**

It is crucial in supporting families that the offer available is sufficiently accessible to those who need it. The accessibility of institutions covers a number of dimensions. Firstly, it is essential that the parents or other members of the family have sufficient information about the provision of the services designated for them. Are they aware of initiatives and projects? Do they know the actors and places to which they can go for help? A lack of visibility of some initiatives can have disastrous effects. Secondly, the territorial coverage and links are very important too. The mapping showed that locally, certain communes and towns had a much richer provision than others. There are other geographic areas, by contrast, where no individual offer of follow-up is available for families confronted with radicalisation. A generic offer of support for families may in theory constitute a viable alternative. However, such an offer of individual psychological support for instance for the parents of radicalised youngsters is often related to potentially long waiting lists or constitutes a service that has to be paid for, which can then establish further barriers for people who are already in a situation of heightened vulnerability. The inequality of local services and networks means that questions of coordination and above all relay between the different actors and links in the chain of support for the families are even more important. Lastly, a point that is of importance regarding accessibility, is that of the trust that the families concerned have in the people and organisation that provide support, a point mentioned above. The relationship of trust is obviously closely linked to the management of confidentiality and professional secrecy, both of which have also been mentioned previously.

### **h. Issues of coordination and multidisciplinary collaboration**

The great variety in the provision of services for families is in itself a good thing because it is important that there are initiatives that meet a variety of needs. One difficulty, however, lies in ensuring that there is a complementary offer across the country and that families are oriented in an adequate fashion. Various actors are working on the question of coordination, with the objective of promoting a model of collaboration between different actors. In this way, a contribution can be made to providing a complementary offer that is supplementary and adequate, so that each individual and family in a state of (growing) radicalisation can be sure to benefit from an appropriate, continuous and quality journey.

During the phase of evaluating the support formulated for a family, it is essential to be able to take account of the intervention perimeter of services and existing initiatives in order to recommend the most suitable orientation. Enabling actors on the front line to orientate families towards the most adequate forms of support no doubt necessitates clarification of the role, missions and competencies of the various actors and services so as to promote collaboration based on complementarity. Field actors are not always aware of other initiatives that exist and jointly developing a mapping of available relays on the ground seemed like one way of remedying this problem. Actors on the ground, in organising efficient frontline support, need to be able to orient people in accordance with the precise needs identified and to differentiate the various levels of urgency in the support provided for the families.

One of the main difficulties encountered in the platforms of concertation and collaboration between actors in the field of prevention of radicalisation is the sharing of information. Several actors commented on a certain tension existing between the ‘security’ objectives of sharing a maximum of information and preserving the bond of trust with families and protecting professional secrecy. Some organisations have a very clear framework for how to work in such a context, whilst others seem still to be finding their way.

#### **i. Limits to the approach by levels of prevention**

The approach by levels of prevention seems to enjoy broad support. Whilst one notes a predominance of primary prevention (programs focusing on ‘living together’, social cohesion) among Francophone projects and a relatively important focus on secondary and tertiary prevention in the Dutch-speaking region, these classifications have their limits and remain subject to discussion. As already mentioned, it is not always easy in practice to distinguish between the various levels of prevention and several of the initiatives encountered concern more than one level of prevention at a time.

Alternative classifications of prevention have been proposed in the literature. Thus, Koehler (2017), proposes a typology of support initiatives for families that distinguishes on the one hand *prevention* of the target group (general, targeted or selective) - with a higher risk or vulnerability -, *repression* and *intervention*. His typology contains a second dimension, the *scale of impact*, which can be *macro* (at global, national, regional or town level), *meso* (relating to the emotional and social environment, including the family), or *micro* (at the level of the individual him/herself and perhaps involving the individual’s immediate surrounding). The practices covered in the mapping can be situated in the various sections of Koehler’s typology, by distinguishing between prevention on the one hand and intervention on the other, and being situated at the levels of micro, meso or macro. The practices of support for families confronted with violent radicalisation concern principally meso and macro prevention, as well as meso intervention (or micro when the context of the individual is involved). Prevention at macro level covers, for instance, general or ‘primary’ prevention initiatives, which are notably addressed to the families or parents; at meso level, the initiatives of preventive support for parenting can be given as an example. Meso intervention regroups the more ‘curative’ approaches addressed to families: intervention at micro level takes as its starting point the individual who has been, or is being, radicalised, whilst still working with members of the family.

Whatever the typology of prevention adopted, the very fact of trying to place family support practices in the field of prevention or counter-radicalisation, requires some prudence. In fact, the work of supporting the families, even if it is of definite preventive value, should not necessarily be construed (exclusively) as a form of prevention of radicalisation that could lead to terrorism. There is a difference between an action that has a preventive value and an action ‘of prevention’. The latter necessarily has as its (principal) objective to stop the onset or relapse of a particular problem such as radicalisation. Removing support from families confronted with radicalisation from a general policy of family support in order to approach it from a logic of prevention of radicalisation creates the danger of subordinating this policy to issues that are essentially related

to security, or at least diverting them from their first objective, which is linked to the well-being of the families and the individuals that are part of them. The same logic is true for the teaching sector. If teaching has a preventive virtue in that it has to train pupils to become responsible, active, critical and supportive citizens, the school must not be subjected to the pursuit of security objectives (Van Crombrugge, Lafrarchi, & Ponnet, 2015). Similarly, this reasoning has its importance in the youth sector and numerous street workers have denounced the risks of potential drift.<sup>54</sup>

**j. Preventing radicalisation and strengthening social cohesion: an unstable balance between both**

In the same vein, within the current political context, there is sometimes a tension between the field of general social policy (family support, youth and cultural policies etc.) and the particular attention given to specific policies of prevention and radicalisation. These still unstable links between different types of public policies can be the source of tension and obviously have repercussions on the allocation of resources too.

As an example, among the projects of communes in Wallonia, a certain number are supported via the subsidy line *Amélioration du vivre ensemble et prévention du radicalisme*. It is nevertheless observed in analysis that such projects sometimes concern radicalisation very indirectly and in fact focus on prevention in the wider sense.

This observation poses a question that is not without interest. To an extent that remains to be determined, the field of preventing radicalisation reformulates and brings together in a specific language of public policy routine practices and activities. Focusing on this theme and the increase in resources allocated by the government after the terrorist attacks in Paris and Brussels seems in effect to produce complex new interactions. Is the policy of preventing radicalisation a social policy, or is it a policy that forces social policies in a certain direction?

The problem raised here is that of delimiting the field of prevention of radicalisation. Certain actors in the field consider that nothing is more effective than improving community living and that projects should not be specifically focused on radicalisation in order to avoid the stigmatisation of certain groups. On the other hand, the end of subsidies allocated to local authorities by the Walloon Region at the end of 2017 in order to re-launch a call for projects more centred on radicalisation invites these organisations to focus their missions more on secondary or even tertiary prevention. The whole question here is to know how to better articulate approaches based on social cohesion and improving living together and those from the field of preventing radicalisation.

---

<sup>54</sup> See, for instance, the 2016 article that appeared in *Alter Echos* 'Radicalisation: le secteur jeunesse, acteur de prévention?' (Vallet, 2016).

---

Part 6.

# Recommendations

- a. Improving knowledge and strengthening the competencies of field actors**
- b. Building, maintaining and retaining trust with families**
- c. Improving the accessibility of institutions**
- d. Improving coordination and establishing a mapping of networks and field operators**
- e. Optimizing the allocation of resources and implementing a culture and procedures of evaluation**

**a. Improving knowledge and strengthening the competencies of field actors**

Training is necessary in order to help frontline actors working with families to overcome their hesitations and uncertainties in relation to their knowledge of the subject of radicalisation. By improving their knowledge, they will be assured of the pertinence of their basic competencies and be able to better measure the effects of their intervention. Particular attention must be paid to the knowledge needed to make an adequate assessment of risk. It would seem useful to list existing tools and to evaluate their usefulness in practice. Training does exist, but it is only rarely based on concrete cases and solutions. What appears to bring practical responses to the situations encountered is professional experience from the past that has been adapted to the reality of the present. The organisations that are more comfortable in facing their new missions are those that put to use their previous knowledge and know-how, but also the trust that they have built up with inhabitants over the years<sup>55</sup>.

Strengthening helping professionals' competencies must empower them to overcome a feeling of being incapable to act. This means strengthening their competencies in areas of intercultural work and raising awareness about the ambiguities linked to the very concept of radicalisation. It is often the case that relational and intercultural competencies are of considerably greater use than specialist knowledge about the theories of violent radicalisation. In addition to strengthening competencies related to risk evaluation, increasing knowledge about other initiatives and other actors in the field is essential to potentially modify an intervention or to redirect it towards a structure that can more adequately assume care.

---

<sup>55</sup> As far as the non-profit sector is concerned, the provision of training is often limited to awareness building, the nature of which may be perceived as repetitive. In the public sector, the ERAP (Ecole Régionale d'Administration Publique, the Regional School of Public Administration) and Bruxelles Prévention & Sécurité (Brussels Prevention and Security) established professional training for actors in the communes in 2016. These are calibrated in function of the professions and include practical modules led by professional fieldworkers. Teachers and street social workers, social workers from the CPAS and police community support workers can participate in these courses. Some training sessions comprise a specific module on youth and family support.

Subsidies have been unblocked and allocated by various authorities to the communes. A methodological and strategic framework is gradually being put in place, as well as evaluation procedures. However, many new posts were created in great haste and without prior support. An evaluation of the efficacy of resource allocation would be useful to analyse whether public money has been spent in the best way. Even if this observation cannot be generalised, one might suppose that, in certain instances, the choices made were guided only by urgency. New employees sometimes have to create their own job from the outset, without any real concrete model to follow. Those who succeed best are above all those who have been able to base their work on previous family support experience. Wherever possible, it is always preferable to create multidisciplinary teams that work under mutual supervision and intervision. The fact of working as a team on the same subject enables participants to share and lighten the sometimes heavy responsibility of this type of mission. Multidisciplinarity also enables people with different backgrounds to be brought together, each of whom can bring added value, thanks to their respective expertise and knowledge.

Whilst the various types of training offered to professionals in the sector (and in particular to frontline helping professionals) are necessary and useful, they do not provide a miracle solution. They complete, but in no way replace, a solid professional training. A number of negative remarks were sometimes made about the repetitive nature of such training: there are many possibilities, but the learning delivered is often repetitive or too general and this can create a feeling of stagnation. Moreover, there is a lack of concrete examples, taken from practice, of good practices. As a counter example, the training given as part of the Family Support project, received positive echoes. Here, the trainers involved people who had been confronted by real instances of the process of radicalisation, followed by 'disengagement'. All of the participants in the programme recognised the added benefit of such witnesses and underlined the importance of people participating in this type of training with experience of real case histories.

#### **b. Building, maintaining and retaining trust with families**

Creating a relationship of trust with local inhabitants, and above all with families in need, remains the key point in hoping to give support and providing support that yields its fruits.

Organisations that have not to date developed any in-depth thoughts about their approach regarding professional secrecy, and in particular shared professional secrets, must be encouraged to do so. It would seem especially apposite to share good practices regarding transparency and the management of professional secrets in order to nourish such reflexions.

Another recommendation could be addressed to matters of policy: the establishment and maintenance of a bond of trust needs time and it is important that this is taken into account in the development of policies and their corresponding budgets.

### **c. Improving the accessibility of institutions**

Enhancing the accessibility of institutions involves several aspects, including the ensuring the visibility of initiatives, territorial coverage of and links within the networks, and finally coordination and cooperation. It is above all essential that individuals and families are aware of the help that exists and the services available to them. The visibility of initiatives and the support available for families should be increased, e.g. through brochures for parents, which set out the different contact points they can approach for various types of questions and/or help. One way of improving the visibility of initiatives, both for workers in the field and for the families, could be to use the mapping document to make a dynamic tool that provides, for instance, an online database to enable projects to be located according to various criteria. This could then be consulted by workers in the field but also by the families themselves.

Secondly, it is essential to strengthen the territorial coverage and links so that there is a provision for families wherever they are located. This presents something of a contradiction, given the local nature of most of the initiatives and as a result it is worth asking, on a case-by-case basis, whether an existing local provision could be extended to a wider territory or whether certain initiatives could be replicated elsewhere.

Furthermore, the territorial network should be associated with the development of complementary and supplementary provisions, with more specialised forms only being mobilised in the event of general support being insufficient for instance, and with good coordination of initiatives and cross-referencing between actors and organisations (chains of responsibility).

Finally, good management of the relationship of trust and professional secrecy is crucial to strengthening the accessibility of provisions. This requires preserving the confidentiality of exchanges and establishing and preserving at all times communication that is as transparent as possible vis-à-vis the families (see the point above).

At the crossroads of the issue of the link between trust and accessibility, it is necessary to underline the importance of paying attention to intercultural relations and to diversity and inclusion within the services and institutions. Intercultural relations have been key in Family Support Project training and this was enthusiastically welcomed by participants as a subject that is all too often absent from training programmes and notably those relating to the prevention of radicalisation.

### **d. Improving coordination and establishing a mapping of networks and field operators**

In order to improve the overall provision of support for families confronted with radicalisation, it is important to start from the family's perspective. It is crucial that the first request for help is at least 'heard' and that the family can then be (re)directed to appropriate provision. Referral to workers who are capable of providing social support must be consequential, just as there cannot be high thresholds of accessibility to the institutions.

Insofar as the level of adequacy of an overall approach to care for the families is concerned, it is important that the various fieldworkers keep in touch with each other. It is

in this sense that the challenge of coordination, development and implementation of a multidisciplinary approach must be considered. The various actors providing care should start from their own experience and maintain the specificity of their particular role, whilst still integrating as part of an approach that is multi-actor and multidisciplinary.

Coordination poses the question about sharing information whilst respecting professional secrecy and this implies not endangering the trust built up with the families. There must be transparency between the actors and vis-à-vis the person(s) being cared for or the various members of the same family. But what information can be shared and with whom?

This work implies adjusting the expectations of the various actors within a multidisciplinary strategy whilst also maintaining clarity about each person's respective role. There must also be differentiation between coordination at the level of process (putting in place adequate provisions at local level for instance and the definition of responsibilities) and that at the level of care (determining and monitoring a precise course for a given family). Those working on individual cases are not always well-placed to work at the level of processes and vice-versa. The nature of information that has to be exchanged is also very different.

With the implementation of multi-actor approaches (either as part of the CSILs or elsewhere), comes the need to take into account the specificities of local contexts. The needs of coordination and the definition of the intervention strategy can only function within the introduction or transfer of models from one area to another.

**e. Optimizing the allocation of resources and implementing a culture and procedures of evaluation**

The sector of support for the prevention of radicalisation that is under development produces, as indicated above, some unforeseen effects. Actors who are not very specialised may be persuaded to apply for funds made available by government through calls for projects. Such effects may result in weakening the legitimacy of this entire policy.

To answer this challenge, government and workers must work to better target resources by analysing the scope and impact of projects on their environment. Targeting resources goes hand-in-hand with spreading a culture of evaluation and instigating evaluation procedures.

In order to improve the quality of interventions, it is essential to strengthen evaluation procedures. These evaluations and a systematic consideration of the evaluation data must contribute to the objective of professionalisation and the strengthening of competencies. Given the territorial differences mentioned above and the recent development of the sector, it would also be useful if comparisons were made over time, as well as at regional, national and international levels.

## APPENDIX: GLOSSARY <sup>56</sup>

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Counter-Radicalisation</b>               | The body of measures employed in the prevention of radicalisation.   |
| <b>Disengagement</b>                        | Withdrawal from violence as a means of action without withdrawal from the underlying ideology.   |
| <b>Deradicalisation</b>                     | Withdrawal from violence as a means of action as well as from the underlying ideology.   |
| <b>Jihadism</b>                             | An ideology of individuals and groups that advocate the application of Islamic law through violence.   |
| <b>Violent extremism</b>                    | Adhesion to an ideology that promotes violent extremism.   |
| <b>Foreign terrorist fighter</b>            | A person who is going to, has been to, has the intention of going to, is returning from, or has returned from an area of jihadist conflict with the objective of joining groups that organise or support terrorist activities or providing them with active or passive help. |
| <b>Polarisation</b>                         | Strengthening opposition between persons or groups in society that create or can create an increase in tensions between these persons or groups and pose risks to security.  |
| <b>Prevention</b>                           | Prevention aims to prevent the appearance of a process of radicalisation or curb its development. It generally comprises three phases: primary, secondary and tertiary prevention. <sup>57</sup>   |
| <b>Radicalisation</b>                       | A non-linear process that brings about a desire to effect profound changes in society, which are in conflict with, or pose a direct threat to, the established order.  |
| <b>Violent radicalisation</b> <sup>58</sup> | When radical ideas are accompanied by a desire to support or directly engage in violent acts.  |
| <b>Rehabilitation</b>                       | The process of resocialisation following disengagement and/or de-radicalisation.   |
| <b>Family support</b>                       | An action or project aimed at providing psychological or social aid to people close to those who have been radicalised or engaged in violent activities.   |
| <b>Terrorism</b>                            | The use of violence to achieve a political objective.  |

<sup>56</sup> The sources used for this glossary are various and taken from the publications listed in the bibliography. They have been simplified and reworked by this report's authors.

<sup>57</sup> See mapping page 6

<sup>58</sup> Dalgaard Nielsen, 2010

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aarslev, A. (2017). The Aarhus Model: the advantage of a multiagency approach in preventing radicalization and violent extremism. *Cahier Politiestudies*, 42: 205-208.
- Andersen, L. E. (2015). Terrorisme et contre- "radicalisation" : le modèle danois. *Politique étrangère*, Été(2), 173-183. <https://doi.org/10.3917/pe.152.0173>
- Attran, S. (2016). L'Etat Islamique est une révolution. Lonrai, Les Liens qui Libèrent.
- Awan, I. (2012). "I Am a Muslim Not an Extremist": How the Prevent Strategy Has Constructed a "Suspect" Community. *Politics & Policy*, 40: 1158-1185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2012.00397>
- Awan, I. (2017). Religion, Identity and "radicalisation": The Experiences of Young British Muslims of the Crises in Syria. *Journal of Muslims in Europe*, 6(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22117954-12341336>
- Bailey, G., & Edwards, P. (2017). Rethinking 'radicalisation': microradicalisations and reciprocal radicalisation as an intertwined process. *Journal for Deradicalization*, (10), 255-281.
- Belgische Senaat Sénat de Belgique (2016). Verslag over radicalisering in België. Document 6-205/1.
- Belgische Senaat Sénat de Belgique (2017). Derde tussentijds verslag over het onderdeel 'Veiligheidsarchitectuur'. Document 54 1752/008.
- Bertelsen, P. (2015). Danish preventive measures and de-"radicalization" strategies: The Aarhus model. Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, p. 241 - 253.
- Bim. (s. d.). Brusselse jongeren reizen naar Istanbul. <https://sociaal.net/analyse-xl/brusselse-jongeren-reizen-naar-istanbul/>
- Bonelli, L., & Carrié, F. (2018, septembre 1). En finir avec quelques idées reçues sur la radicalisation. <https://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/2018/09/BONELLI/59014>
- Bouzar, D. (2015). Comment sortir de l'emprise "djihadiste"? Ivry-sur-Seine, Les Editions de l'Atelier.
- Bouzar, D. (2017). Repérer les idéaux proposés par les groupes radicaux pour refaire du lien humain. *Le sociographe*, 58(2), 67-77. <https://doi.org/10.3917/graph.058.0067>
- Borum, R. (2011). Radicalization into Violent Extremism I: A Review of Social Science Theories. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 4(4), 7-36. <https://doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.4.4.1>
- Briggs, R., Fieschi, C. and Lownsbrough, H. (2006). *Bringing It Home: Community-Based Approaches to Counter-Terrorism*. London: Demos.
- Butt, R., & Tuck, H. (2014). *European Counter-Radicalisation and De-radicalisation: A Comparative Evaluation of Approaches in the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark and Germany (Cross-Country Evaluation Report)* (p. 42). Institute for Strategic Dialogue. Consulté à l'adresse [http://www.strategicdialogue.org/De-radicalisation\\_final.pdf](http://www.strategicdialogue.org/De-radicalisation_final.pdf)
- Chantepy-Touil, C. (2017). Jeunes et Islam, de la prévention des risques à la "radicalisation". *Le sociographe*, 58(2), 47-56. <https://doi.org/10.3917/graph.058.0047>
- Chevrier-Pelletier, A., & Madriaza, P. (2016). Comment s'explique la "radicalisation" violente? *Sécurité et stratégie*, 24(4), 14-21.
- Christmann, K. (2012). Preventing religious radicalisation and violent extremism: a systematic review of the research evidence. Youth Justice Board Research Report. Retrieved from <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/16198/> on 10 January 2018.
- Colaert, L. (2017). « Deradicalisering »: wetenschappelijke inzichten voor een Vlaams beleid. Brussel: Vlaams Vredesinstituut.
- Colaert, L. (ed.) (2017). *Radicalisering: complex fenomeen, ambigu beleidsconcept. 'Deradicalisering': wetenschappelijke inzichten voor een Vlaams beleid*. Brussel: Vlaams Vredesinstituut. 13-24.
- Coolsaet, R. (2016). « All radicalisation is local »: the genesis and drawbacks of an elusive concept. *Egmont Paper*, 84.
- Crettiez, X. (2016). Penser la "radicalisation". Une sociologie processuelle des variables de l'engagement violent. *Revue française de science politique*, 66(5), 709-727. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rfsp.665.0709>
- Crettiez, X. (2011). « High risk activism » : essai sur le processus de "radicalisation" violente », *Pôle Sud* 2011/1 (n° 34), p. 45-60.
- Dalgaard-Nielsen, A. (2010). Violent Radicalization in Europe: What We Know and What We Do Not Know. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 33(9), 797-814. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2010.501423>

## Bibliography

- Dallemagne, G., Matz, V., & Martens, Q. (2016). *La Belgique face au radicalisme: comprendre et agir*. Presses universitaires de Louvain.
- de Mazières, O. (2016). La prévention de la radicalisation violente : organisation de l'Etat et rôle du secteur privé. *Sécurité et stratégie*, 24(4), 5-12.
- Fize, M. (2016). *Radicalisation de la jeunesse*. Paris, Groupe Eyrolles
- Fondation Roi Baudouin. (2016). *Faire face à la radicalisation violente : le soutien aux familles*. Compte rendu des séminaires. <https://www.kbs-frb.be/fr/Virtual-Library/2016/20160413AD>
- Gielen, A.-J. (2008). *Radicalisering en identiteit: Radicale rechtse en moslimjongeren vergeleken*. Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Gielen, A.-J. (2015). Supporting families of foreign fighters. A realistic approach for measuring the effectiveness. *Journal for Deradicalization*, (2), 21-48.
- Guïbet-Lafaye, C., & Rapin, A.-J. (2017). La radicalisation. Individualisation et dépolitisation d'une notion. *Politiques de communication*, 8(1), 127-154.
- Guidère, M. (2016). Internet, haut lieu de la radicalisation. *Pouvoirs*, 158(3), 115-123. <https://doi.org/10.3917/pouv.158.0115>
- Honoré, L. (2016). L'entreprise et les managers face à la radicalisation religieuse au travail. *Management & Avenir*, 90(8), 39-59. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.090.0039>
- Honoré, L. (2016). L'entreprise et les managers face à la radicalisation religieuse au travail. *Management & Avenir*, 90(8), 39-59. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.090.0039>
- Jovelin, E. (2016). De la délinquance à la radicalisation. L'exemple de Mohamed Merah. *Hommes & Migrations*, 1315(3), 59-68.
- Koehler, D. (2017). *Understanding deradicalization: methods, tools and programs for countering violent extremism*. London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Khosrokhavar, F. (2014). *Radicalisation*. Paris, Édition de la Maison des Sciences et de l'Homme.
- Lacroix, I. (2018). Radicalisations et jeunes. *Revue de littérature*. INJEP Notes & rapports/Revue de littérature, 94.
- Lacroix, I. (2018). Radicalisations et jeunes. *Revue de littérature*. INJEP Notes & rapports/Revue de littérature, 94.
- Lamghari, Y. (2015). Jeunes. Comment ils se radicalisent. *Politique*, 89, 71-74.
- Lamote, T., & Benslama, F. (2017). La « niche écologique islamo-occidentale », matrice de la radicalisation islamiste. *Research in Psychoanalysis*, 23(1), 15a-26a.
- Leman, J. (2016). De groei naar militant, militair jihadisme. *Justice et sécurité/Justitie en Veiligheid*. 2016(4): 1-16.
- L'Heuillet, H. (2016). "radicalisation" et terrorisme. *Cités*, 66(2), 123-136. <https://doi.org/10.3917/cite.066.0123>
- Lub, V. (2013). Polarisation, radicalisation and social policy: evaluating the theories of change. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 9(2), 165-183.
- Luyten, D., Van Crombrugge, H., & Emmery, K. (Éd.). (2017). *Het gezin in Vlaanderen 2.0. Over het eigene van gezinnen en gezinsbeleid*. Antwerpen-Appeldoorn: Garant.
- Muhanna-Matar, A. (0). The limit-experience and self-de"radicalisation": the example of radical Salafi youth in Tunisia. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 0(0), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2017.1304747>
- ONE. (2012). *Pour un accompagnement réfléchi des familles. Un référentiel de soutien à la parentalité*. Bruxelles: Office de la Naissance et de l'Enfance (ONE). [http://www.one.be/uploads/tx\\_ttproducts/datasheet/Referentiel\\_soutien\\_a\\_la\\_parentalite\\_ONE.pdf](http://www.one.be/uploads/tx_ttproducts/datasheet/Referentiel_soutien_a_la_parentalite_ONE.pdf)
- Perez, F. (2016). La conversion comme acte de révolte ou comme réponse au vide idéologique ? *Histoire, monde et cultures religieuses*, 39(3), 45-54. <https://doi.org/10.3917/hmc.039.0045>
- Ponsaers, P., De Ruyver, B., Easton, M., Verhage, A., Noppe, J., Hellinckx, J., and Vande Velde, M. (2010). *Polarisering en radicalisering: een integrale preventieve aanpak*. Governance of Security, Algemene Directie Veiligheid en Preventie, FOD Binnenlandse Zaken.
- Ponsaers, P., De Ruyver, B., Easton, M., Verhage, A., Noppe, J., Hellinckx, J., & Vandeveld, M. (2010). *Polarisering en radicalisering: een integrale preventieve aanpak (Onderzoeksrapport)* (p. 199). Algemene Directie Veiligheid en Preventie FOD Binnenlandse Zaken.
- Puaud, D. (2016). Le spectre du radical islamiste. *Journal des anthropologues*, 146-147(3-4), 243-261.
- RAN. (2017). *Multi-or cross-cultural approaches to preventing polarisation and radicalisation*. In Ex Post Paper RAN H&SC meeting on Multi - or cross - cultural approaches to preventing polarisation and radicalisation. Dublin, Ireland: RAN.

- Richards, A. (2011). The problem with 'radicalization': the remit of 'Prevent' and the need to refocus on terrorism in the UK. *International Affairs*, 87(1): 143-152.
- Schmid, A. P. (2016). Research on Radicalisation: Topics and Themes, 10(3), 8.
- Seniguer, H. (2016). De quelques réflexions sur les sinuosités de la "radicalisation". *Histoire, monde et cultures religieuses*, 39(3), 13-31. <https://doi.org/10.3917/hmc.039.0013>
- Sieckelinck, S., & de Winter, M. (Éd.). (2015). *Formers and families. Transitional journeys in and out of extremism in the United Kingdom, Denmark and The Netherlands*. Den Haag: National Coordinator Security and Counterterrorism.
- Sikkens, E., Sieckelinck, S., van San, M., & de Winter, M. (2017). Parental reaction towards radicalization in young people. *Child & Family Social Work*, 22(2), 1044-1053.
- Sikkens, E., van San, M., Sieckelinck, S., & de Winter, M. (2017). Parental Influence on Radicalization and De-radicalization according to the Lived Experiences of Former Extremists and their Families. *Journal for Deradicalization*, 12, 192-226.
- Sikkens, E., van San, M., Sieckelinck, S., & de Winter, M. (2018). Parents' Perspectives on Radicalization: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(7), 2276-2284.
- Somers, B., De Wever, B., Bonte, H., & Creemers, J. (2013). *Beheersen van moslimradicalisering. Handreiking voor beleid en praktijk*.
- Spalek, B. (2016). Radicalisation, de-radicalisation and counter-radicalisation in relation to families: Key challenges for research, policy and practice. *Security Journal*, 29(1), 39-52. <https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2015.43>
- Spalek, B. (2016). Radicalisation, de-radicalisation and counter-radicalisation in relation to families: Key challenges for research, policy and practice. *Security Journal*, 29(1), 39-52.
- Toutin, T. (2018). Dé-radicalisation ou désengagement ?, *Revue 'Criminalistique'*, Vol 1 N° 3, pp 63-66.
- Vallet, C. (2016). Radicalisation : le secteur jeunesse, acteur de prévention ? *Alter Echos*, 421. Consulté à l'adresse <https://www.alterechos.be/radicalisation-le-secteur-jeunesse-acteur-de-prevention/>
- Van Crombrugge, H., Lafrarchi, N., & Ponnet, K. (2015). *Onderwijs en de preventie van radicalisering. Conceptuele voorstellen*. Tijdschrift voor Onderwijsrecht en Onderwijsbeleid, 2014(5), 25-35.
- Van San, M., Sieckelinck, S. & de Winter, M. (2013). Ideals adrift: an educational approach to radicalization. *Ethics and Education*, 8(3), 276 - 289, DOI: 10.1080/17449642.2013.878100
- Vidino, L. and Brandon, J. (2012). *Countering radicalisation in Europe*. London: International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence.
- Veldhuis, T., & Staun, J. (2009). *Islamist Radicalisation: A Root Cause Model* (p. 93). Den Haag: Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael.
- Vidino, L., & Brandon, J. (2012). *Countering Radicalization in Europe (Policy Report)* (p. 84). International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence (ICSR). Consulté à l'adresse <https://icsr.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/ICSR-Report-Countering-Radicalization-in-Europe-1.pdf>
- 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(3), 181-200.
- 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(3), 181 - 200, DOI: 10.1080/17467581003586897
- Zannoni, M., van der Varst, L., Bervoets, E., Wensveen, M., van Bolhuis, V., & van der Torre, E. (2008). *De rol van eerstelijns werkers bij het tegengaan van polarisatie en radicalisering. Van 'ogen en oren' naar 'het hart' van de aanpak*. Den Haag: COT Instituut voor Veiligheids- en Crisismanagement.



King Baudouin Foundation,  
public benefit foundation  
Rue Brederodestraat 21  
B-1000 Brussels  
info@kbs-frb.be  
T. +32-2-500 45 55

For donors resident in Belgium,  
any gift from €40 to our bank account  
IBAN: BE10 0000 0000 0404  
BIC: BPOTBEB1 is tax-deductible

## **King Baudouin Foundation** **Working together for a better society**

The King Baudouin Foundation is an independent, pluralistic foundation working at the local, regional, federal, European and international levels. We seek to change society for the better so we invest in inspiring projects and individuals. In 2014 the King Baudouin Foundation and the Funds which it administers provided 30 million euro in support to 270 individuals and 1.712 organisations for projects in the areas of poverty, health, development, civic engagement, heritage etc.

The Foundation also organises seminars, round table discussions and exhibitions, shares experience and research results through (free) publications, enters into partnerships and encourages philanthropy, working ‘through’ rather than ‘for’ the King Baudouin Foundation.

2.122 people working in our steering groups, advisory committees, management committees and independent juries make their expertise available free of charge. Their generous efforts ensure that the right choices are made on an independent, pluralistic basis.

The Foundation was set up in 1976, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of King Baudouin’s reign.

**With thanks to the Belgian National Lottery and to all donors for their valued support.**

kbs-frb.be

Subscribe to our e-news

Follow us on:     

PUB N° 3628

**Family Support**

**Supporting families confronted with violent radicalisation: a guide to inspire**