5

TRUST

TOM WILSON

Many English primary schools have a daily act of 'collective worship', more commonly referred to as an assembly. As a member of the clergy, I have often taken these, and I do my best to challenge the children to think carefully about an issue that is relevant to their lives. When it came to talking about trust, I decided the only way for them to learn what trust is would be for me to model it and for them to experience it. So, at the start of the assembly, I took out my wallet, and removed the five £20 notes that were inside. I explained I had mistakenly brought too much money with me to school and asked for a pupil to volunteer to look after it. Once I had selected my volunteer from the forest of hands which went up, I gave her the money and asked her to count it. There was some surprise at the idea of giving a pupil £100 to look after. But it started some of them thinking. That pupil sat on one side, while we continued thinking about trust as a group, using some of the classic trust game exercises, such as walking blindfolded past obstacles whilst someone else guides you, and falling backwards, while trusting that someone else will catch you. At the end of the assembly, I reminded the pupils about the money, and asked for it back. The pupil handed it over, and they all left that hall. When nearly all of them were gone,

I went to put the money back into my wallet. Without really thinking I counted it as I returned it. An eagle-eyed teacher spotted me and commented quietly to me as he left, 'If you really trusted her, you wouldn't have had to count the money, would you?'

He was right. If we really trust someone, we have no need to check up on them, no need to scrutinise what they are doing. Trust is a very strong virtue, which is difficult to obtain, but very easy to lose. When the staff and trustees of the St Philip's Centre were deciding on the values which define us, we rejected tolerance, respect and honour as possible options for this third value. Whilst they may be good in and of themselves, each of these are limited virtues, in a way that trust is not.

Do more than just tolerate, respect or honour

Tolerance, as I would define it, is a very limited virtue. An individual can be tolerated but at the same time ignored. Furthermore, and more crucially, tolerance assumes an imbalance of power, as power-holders tolerate those weaker than them. Thus Tariq Ramadan describes tolerance as 'intellectual charity on the part of the powerful' (2010, p.47). In his view, tolerance is not something to welcome, because it is of a very limited nature. He argues that we tolerate without accepting, without liking or caring for the other person. Tolerance is therefore understood as a condescending welcome of a weaker person, a conditional acceptance that perpetuates that weakened status. Luke Bretherton suggests there are three conditions necessary for tolerance. First, conduct about which one disapproves, even if only mildly. Second, the disapprover(s), who have the power to act coercively against or interfere with that of which they disapprove but chose not to. Third, the lack

of interference must result from more than acquiescence, indifference or a balance of power. Thus Bretherton argues that tolerance is effectively the powerful not wanting something to happen but choosing to let it happen anyway (2010, pp.122–6).

It is important to notice the power dynamic that both Tariq Ramadan and Luke Bretherton identify. They are both sceptical about tolerance precisely because it perpetuates an imbalance of power. If I stick to merely tolerating you, then I remain in a position of power over you. You remain weak, whilst I remain strong. A question to consider is whether I accept tolerance as a positive step because it allows me to maintain my position of power and not have my situation disrupted in any way. If I think tolerance is sufficient, is it because this allows me to maintain my power?

Although tolerance is a limited virtue, it does have a role to play. Take, for example, the 1689 British Parliament Act of Toleration, which allowed Non-conformist Christians freedom of worship. The Act was a positive first step, a way of limiting or eliminating conflict, especially conflict within the Christian world. Tolerance is to be welcomed as an initial action, a move beyond hatred, but it is no more than that. It is not a peak to ascend, but a foothill from which to climb towards peaceful co-operation and mutual self-understanding. In some situations, it can be a massive challenge to get to a point where all sides in a conflict recognise that everyone else has a right to exist. To pick one international example, if all sides in the Israel/Palestine conflict were able to agree that everyone involved had a right to exist, then this would be a cause for some celebration. In these circumstances, a grudging tolerance of an enemy would be a very positive step.

Moreover, not everyone understands tolerance negatively. For some people, words such as tolerance and respect are entirely interchangeable. A school inclusion manager once

explained to me the very positive ethos of her Anglican school as being characterised by 'the tolerance of other religions, a recognition, a strong value put on faith, and tolerance and mutual understanding, and the importance of faith'. For her, tolerance was an entirely positive virtue, with none of the negative connotations outlined above. She was, of course, a person of power within the school hierarchy, and so perhaps not the best placed to explore the nuances between tolerance, respect, honour and trust.

Some people argue in favour of respect as a virtue to promote in place of tolerance, but does respect go far enough? It is not that respect is a bad thing; the question is whether something more is needed. Respect does not necessarily take relationships much deeper than tolerance. The power dynamic is still uneven; there is still no need for close engagement. Respect can remain distant, an arm's-length virtue. The same is true for honour. We can honour someone without necessarily engaging with them. I have written elsewhere about the types of friendships Christians can develop with Muslims, and the same metaphor can be extended to all types of relationship-crossing boundaries (Wilson 2015). For real co-operation to take place, trust is the necessary virtue.

Beginning with trust

Sometimes engagement should start with establishing trust. The St Philip's Centre runs an annual encounter programme for a three-year degree course training Christian youth workers. The programme lasts two days and is part of the second-year students' module on diversity awareness. It focuses almost entirely on visits to places of worship and face-to-face encounters with people of faiths other than Christianity. For many of the participants this is their first serious engagement with people who have a sincere

religious faith that is not Christianity. Some participants are understandably nervous about the programme, feeling unsure about what they will be asked to do and in particular whether they will be expected to take part in worship which they would consider to be idolatry. For some Christians concerned to be loyal to Jesus Christ above all else, the idea of being asked to make an offering to a Hindu *murti*, or to bow to the Sikh holy scriptures (Guru Granth Sahib Ji), is a deeply unsettling notion. It is important, therefore, that the course organisers establish appropriate bonds of trust at the start of the programme, offering reassurance that participants will be asked to observe, and not participate in, worship.

Even this reassurance was not sufficient for one participant. His primary concern was his allegiance to Jesus Christ and, in his view, even entering another place of worship was unacceptable. In order to complete his degree, he had to participate in some form of engagement with someone of another faith, but he flatly refused to come on the programme organised by the St Philip's Centre. In the end a compromise was reached, whereby he visited a Muslim imam in his own home, interviewing him and talking about how he saw his role within the Muslim community. Trust had to be established for this to take place. Trust that the imam was a safe person to meet with, trust that nothing untoward would take place and trust that it was acceptable for a Christian to behave in this way. Paradoxically, this individual's refusal to participate in the standard programme actually led to a deeper one-to-one encounter, which arguably resulted in increased understanding. It is unlikely that he moved to a point of heart-to-heart trust but he did move beyond tolerance at a distance, and any progress must be celebrated as progress.

This example has utilised a trainee Christian youth worker, but the need to begin with trust does not rest

exclusively with Christians. Theologically conservative members of any faith tradition often need reassuring about the nature of any encounter before they are willing to participate in it. Some Muslim parents have concerns about their children visiting churches and other places of worship as part of their RE lessons and need to be reassured that worship will not take place. Sometimes even the children themselves share those concerns (although at other times, they are eager to go, if only as a means of rebelling against their parents). Some Hindus and Sikhs will not engage in interfaith encounter with Christians because of concerns that the real Christian agenda is about conversion. As with the example above, trust is the necessary prerequisite for meaningful encounter to take place.

At the heart of any concerns about interfaith encounter are issues of power and authority. Those who lack trust in the meeting are invariably the ones with less power in that particular context. Their lack of trust is rooted in a concern that the more powerful will abuse their power to enforce their own perspective on others. When faced with this situation it is important to work hard at establishing trust by demonstrating, through word and action, an awareness of the power dynamics and a commitment to use power appropriately. We may not be able to completely level the playing field, as some power is inherent in particular roles, but we can at least demonstrate self-awareness and a desire to mitigate against any imbalance of power.

So how do you establish trust? The first step is to recognise that trust is lacking. This can be done in a number of ways. A simple exercise at the start of a programme can be to ask people to form a 'human rainbow', indicating their position in a continuum of opinions from 'I am really looking forward to this encounter' to 'I am really dreading this encounter'. This can be done silently, to simply acknowledge the range of feelings in the room or,

if time allows and it is appropriate, people from across the spectrum of opinions can be invited to share their thoughts. These must be received without judgement; there are no right or wrong feelings before encounter takes place. What is important is to acknowledge what is, to recognise the reality of people's feelings and enable them to decide how they are going to deal with them.

It is also helpful for course leaders to explain the nature of the programme and in particular to distinguish between appropriate respect (removing shoes and covering your head when entering a gurdwara, for example) and participating in worship. For some learners, participation is important, and so receiving *Prasad* from a gurdwara or mandir helps them fully engage with the lived religious experience of those whom they are visiting. For others, this is an uncomfortable experience, which they would rather avoid. Explaining that participation is optional and that individuals can make their own choices is crucial for establishing and maintaining trust.

Ultimately trust rests on the honesty, integrity and transparency of those running the programme and the hosts in the places of worship visited. It is therefore crucial to work hard at keeping lines of communication open and active, especially when establishing ongoing working relationships with particular faith communities.

CASE STUDY 5.1: THE PREVENT STRATEGY

One area of the St Philip's Centre's work where trust is essential is our work related to the Prevent strategy, which is part of the UK government's counter-terrorism strategy. Prevent is one of the four Ps of the wider Contest strategy, the other three being Prepare, Pursue and Protect. The overall aim of Prevent is, as the name suggests, 'to reduce the threat to the UK from terrorism by stopping people becoming terrorists

or supporting terrorism' (HM Government 2015a, p.5). On one level, it is difficult to argue with this – the overwhelming majority of people are not in favour of terrorism motivated by any persuasion or of people becoming terrorists. The difficulty comes in how that aim is realised in real life.

The Contest strategy began in 2003 and has been through a number of adjustments due to governmental and ministerial changes. However, the broad thrust of the strategy has remained whether a Labour, Conservative–Liberal coalition or Conservative government has been in power. One recent revision was in 2015 with the onset of the public sector Prevent duty which mandated organisations to give due regard to the aims of Prevent. No government strategy is without its context, and the context of Prevent is that it has a very negative reputation within sections of the media and many Muslim community organisations. It is perceived as being heavy-handed and ill-informed; an excuse to introduce the surveillance state to control and reform Islam. It is blamed for criminalising Muslims (Mohammed 2015) and introducing an overly muscular liberalism (O'Toole 2015). Moreover, a former senior police official, Dal Babu, is also on record questioning the effectiveness of the current Prevent strategy (Halliday and Dodd 2015). Indeed, confidence is so low for one individual, Dr Salmann Butt, that he has taken the government to court, arguing that Prevent is an infringement of his human rights (BBC 2016d).

In 2011 the St Philip's Centre agreed to employ Leicestershire's Prevent Co-ordinator. We were invited to do so by Leicester City Council and did so in consultation with the Federation of Muslim Organisations (FMO), who at the time were the local authority's main infrastructure body for the Muslim community. The Prevent Co-ordinator is tasked with overseeing the delivery of the Prevent strategy within Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. We believe that, although legitimate questions can be raised about the detail

of the implementation of the Prevent strategy, it is preferable for the St Philip's Centre to be actively engaged in shaping the delivery of Prevent on the ground than to not be involved at all. Equally, if we are to be an interfaith organisation with nous, then ignoring or removing oneself from the debates associated with Prevent would weaken our profile. Hence, we have continued to employ the Prevent Co-ordinator until the time of writing, December 2016.

What are the particular concerns?

A number of stories are regularly used to illustrate concerns around the Prevent strategy, of which three merit particular attention. These are the 'terrorist house' story; the 'eco-terrorist' story; and the 'cucumber story'. Each illustrates the challenge of establishing appropriate bonds of trust. Advocates of Prevent argue that each story presents misinformation about the strategy, whilst opponents argue they are indicative of the flawed nature of the strategy as a whole.

The 'terrorist house' story is taken as a sign of the disproportionate nature of the Prevent duty, which is part of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 and means educational and health establishments have a statutory duty to report any concerns they have that an individual they have contact with may be in danger of committing a violent extremist act (HM Government 2015b). The 'terrorist house' story is that police visited a ten-year-old boy, who lives in Accrington in Lancashire, at home after he wrote that he lived in a 'terrorist house' in a school lesson. Apparently, this was a simple spelling mistake, and he meant to say he lived in a 'terraced house' (BBC 2016e). Critics take this as an example of the heavy-handed application of the Prevent duty in schools, suggesting that innocent mistakes are routinely treated as major security threats and otherwise

peaceful people are targeted as though they are criminals. When critics of the Prevent strategy retell this story, they rarely mention that the boy was not in fact questioned by anti-terrorist police but by community-based officers in conjunction with social services. Nor do they discuss the fact that the police were in fact acting in response to concerns being raised by the school about the boy's safety and wellbeing (Gani and Slawson 2016), since the first line in the work which included the 'terrorist house' comment was 'I hate it when my uncle hits me' (Withnall 2016). Thus a story that is told about Prevent is not actually about Prevent, despite what popular misconceptions suggest.

The 'eco-terrorist' story concerns a 14-year-old boy, who used the word 'l'ecoterrorisme' in a French lesson while discussing environmental activism. He is a Muslim and was subsequently questioned by school authorities who wanted to establish whether he had any links with so-called Islamic State or supported Islamist terrorism in any way (Dodd 2015). Whilst the school may have been over-zealous in acting on their concerns, no further action was taken, the incident has never been a Prevent referral and an attempt to initiate a judicial review alleging religious discrimination was thrown out of court (Casey 2016, p.155).

The 'cucumber' story refers to a four-year-old boy in Luton, who when asked to explain a drawing of his father cutting a cucumber described it as a 'cucker-bum', which staff heard as a 'cooker bomb' and concluded he was talking about his father making improvised explosive devices (Quinn 2016). As with the 'eco-terrorist' case mentioned above, staff at the boy's nursery did initially raise concerns but, when they contacted the authorities, they advised the nursery staff that no further action needed to be taken.

These are three of the main stories which those who oppose Prevent regularly use to argue that the whole strategy is flawed. They have gained some traction in popular

consciousness, and hence make the task of establishing trust with communities difficult, a point noted by Chief Constable Simon Cole QPM, National Police Chiefs Lead on the Prevent strategy, in a comment piece for the *Guardian* newspaper (Cole 2016). The St Philip's Centre recognises that people do have a wide variety of concerns both about government policy and also police behaviour as a whole, which are normally focused exclusively on Prevent, as this is well known to the general public. In essence, concerns centre on two areas: freedom of speech, and profiling of Muslims as presenting a particular threat.

The issue of freedom of speech is especially pertinent in educational settings. All those involved in education, whether at a primary, secondary or tertiary level, agree that the freedom to explore ideas and experiment with concepts and points of view is essential to a rounded education. This necessarily includes discussion of extremist or divisive ideas. For some people, the 'eco-terrorist' story is taken as symptomatic of a concerted drive by government to curtail freedom of expression.

So, the argument advanced by opponents of Prevent is that those engaged with implementing the Prevent strategy are using it to curtail freedom of expression. However, those who work on the strategy argue that they are in favour of freedom of speech, provided that this freedom is consistent and not abused to promote hatred of, or violence towards, any individual or group. The problem comes with implementation of the detail of the strategy. Whilst those who are familiar with the issues have a robust understanding of what constitutes acceptable speech and what does not, there are many people who work in institutions that have a statutory duty to 'have due regard for the aims of' Prevent but are poorly trained or lack the confidence to make complex and challenging decisions. For there to be greater trust, there needs to be a greater understanding of the complexity of the

issues and the process by which decisions are made. So, if anything, there is a need for more resources to be included in this area, to enable more in-depth training for all those who have a statutory duty to engage with these issues.

The second main concern is around who is targeted by the Prevent strategy. This is a particularly sensitive area. Whilst it is only a very small minority in any community who resort to violence, nevertheless there are a number of people who self-identify as Muslim who are attracted to violent acts in the name of Islam. It is not for us to determine whether someone is, or is not, a Muslim, or whether particular actions are, or are not, Islamic. Every religious tradition has the potential to be subverted to violent ends. If we take a global and a chronological view, we can soon see that many religions have been used in this way at some time. There are reports of incidents of violence by Hindus against Muslims, Christians and Sikhs in India (Staufenburg 2016), of Buddhists attacking Muslims in Burma (IRIN 2016) and Christians attacking Muslims in the Central African Republic (IRIN 2014), to give just three examples. Religion can always be subverted and used as a rationale for violence. That is not to say every religious person or community is violent. But religious faith does not preclude violence and has the potential to be subverted in the cause of violence.

In the United Kingdom in the early twenty-first century, one of the main threats of terrorism, according to the security services, comes from those who identify themselves as Muslims. In an interview, Andrew Parker, the head of MI5, listed three threats: Islamic-inspired terror, terrorism in Northern Ireland and covert action by foreign states. He added that 'My expectation is that we will find and stop most attempts at terrorism in the country', noting that his use of the caveat 'most' indicated that since the current threat level in the UK is 'severe' this meant 'there will be terrorist attacks in this country' (Johnson and MacAskill 2016). There is

also a substantial reciprocal threat from those motivated by neo-Nazi and far right ideologies. The Prevent strategy also works in tackling this threat, providing support and challenge where needed to disrupt those motivated towards violence from a far right ideology (Baldet 2016). Since a small minority within far right and Muslim groups present the main threat, it is only logical that security services are particularly focused on these two groups. However, recognition of the general area of threat does not mean any Muslim, or anyone who expresses far right views, is necessarily a threat. Those involved in Prevent work fully understand that being religiously conservative is not the same as being an extremist or indeed a violent extremist. The picture is a very complex one and, without acknowledging that complexity, trust cannot be established.

We establish trust with those whom we work with by hearing their concerns, addressing them as far as we are able to and also by talking about the nature of the threat which the Prevent strategy is trying to tackle.

What is the threat?

The Prevent strategy is one of a number of ways in which the UK government confronts violent extremism, but how do people become dangerous extremists? There are two aspects to this discussion. The first is a practical one: are there particular spaces or causal factors that should be noted? The second is more dispositional: are certain types of people more likely to be attracted? These two are closely connected but, in order to develop a logical progression of argument, we will begin with a brief discussion of online recruitment as an example of a particular space before commenting on two studies that suggest particular types of individuals may be more susceptible to recruitment.

The online space is a particularly contested one and impossible to control. The government is very well aware of the challenge of providing a positive narrative of life in the UK in the internet world. The counter-extremism strategy states their intention to 'continue to confront and challenge extremist propaganda, ensuring no space goes uncontested, including online, promoting a better alternative, and supporting those at risk of radicalisation' (HM Government 2015a, p.17).

The internet is a fertile recruiting ground for both Islamic and neo-Nazi/far right extremists. Berger (2015) discusses Daesh's (to use the Arabic description for so-called Islamic State) online recruiting strategy in some detail. He argues that there are at the time of his writing (October 2015) around 40,000 Twitter accounts actively supporting Daesh, of which around 2000 are active in English. There are numerous other social media outlets and message platforms where Daesh is also active, indicating that the true scale of the challenge is considerable. A more recent report by Daniel Milton (2016) noted that the peak of Daesh media output came in August 2015, but that they still produced 196 media outputs in August 2016.

Berger outlines the process that Daesh recruiters use. First contact may be made either by the recruit or recruiters, who engage with both radical and mainstream online Islamic networks. Once that contact has been made, a small community quickly surrounds the target, interacting with them in high-volume bursts. Some may publish 50 or 60 tweets per day, 'with some prolific users clocking over 250 on given days'. During this phase, Daesh supporters encourage the target to isolate from those who do not support Daesh. This will include other Muslims. This creates a much stronger relationship between the recruiter(s) and the target and enables them to encourage the target to shift to more private communication channels, whether the private messaging

function on Twitter or an encrypted messaging application such as WhatsApp, Kik, Surespot and Telegram. During this more private discussion, the recruiter then determines what course of action the target is most likely to take and encourages steps in that direction. Some individuals may be more likely to commit acts of terror in their own country, while others may be open to the possibility of travelling overseas, but both could potentially be of benefit to Daesh. Milton analysed 9000 Daesh media outputs in the period January 2015 to August 2016. He concluded that 48 per cent related to military issues, 20 per cent to governance of Daesh-controlled territory, 7 per cent to commercial, 7 per cent to religious matters and 19 per cent to other issues. Thus more than half of the Daesh media output in the period analysed was not related to military issues at all, and therefore violence is not the sole, or indeed main, recruiting tool used (Milton 2016, p.30).

In a briefing paper prepared for the Institute for Strategic Dialogue, Ramalingam states that the far right 'frequently communicate and operate through social media, semi-public and password-protected forums'. He adds that the potential of social media for recruitment, mobilisation and propaganda is exploited to bring a sense of comradeship and ownership of the far right movement. Ramalingam adds that a noticeable trend amongst extreme far right use of the internet has been the focus on youth, 'reflecting a youth lifestyle and employing recognisable styles, slogans and symbols'. He adds that the internet has 'vastly expanded the market niche and profitability of White Power music and has made it an important source of international income for extreme right movements' (Ramalingam 2014, pp.14–15).

There are many benefits to social media and the online space. We are not seeking to demonise technology but simply to point out the game-changing nature of online recruitment. Face-to-face engagement can potentially be

a fertile source of recruits for dangerous extremists and it is noticeable that prisons, for example, have been cited in these terms. However, the pervasive reach of the internet means that a 12-year-old boy fiddling unsupervised on his tablet in his bedroom may unwittingly stumble across a Daesh recruiter and be led down a path towards violent action or emigration to Syria before anyone realises what is happening.

This brings us to the second point: who might be in particular danger of becoming radicalised? Jennifer Kavanagh discusses the impact of poverty on terrorist group participation. A general view might be that poverty would increase the likelihood of participation in a terrorist group, because poverty may lead to desperation manifesting itself in violent action. Kavanagh does not find this general thesis necessarily persuasive. She suggests that it is only when experience of poverty is combined with at least a high school education that likelihood of participation in a terrorist organisation increases. She supports her hypothesis with analysis of data related to membership of Hezbollah (Kavanagh 2011).

Kavanagh's argument is therefore that failed expectation is a crucial factor in increasing susceptibility to terrorist recruitment. In his study of young Muslim men in London and Madrid, Justin Gest (2010) similarly argues that individual experiences of political expectations being fulfilled is the key determinant for whether an individual engages with political systems. Gest's main point is that the failure to meet expectations, *whether those expectations were reasonable or not*, is the main reason for individuals becoming isolated, alienated, apart and likely to engage in what he calls 'anti-system' behaviour. Similarly, Louise Richardson (2006, pp.71–103) argues that terrorists are primarily motivated by what she terms the 'Three Rs': revenge, renown and reaction. Terrorists seek revenge against an oppressor for acts

of violence already committed against them; try to establish renown for themselves and the cause they represent; and act in a way that seeks to provoke a reaction, especially a reaction of fear which is disproportionate to the actual threat posed. Likewise, Kamaldeep Bhul argues, on the basis of a small pilot study, that those who are more sympathetic to terrorism or violent protest tend to be more socially isolated, but they are not poor and did not report more discrimination than those who condemned or were neutral about terrorism and violent protest. Those who were more sympathetic to violence were also less politically engaged and had more depressive symptoms in the two-week period before the survey, although he is clear that there is no direct causal link between mental health concerns and sympathy for terrorist action (Conversation 2016).

What to do about Prevent?

The brief overview of research into the area of who becomes a dangerous extremist suggests that educated but financially disadvantaged and socially isolated young people with access to a smartphone are potentially amongst the most likely to become dangerous extremists. In concluding his discussion about Daesh online recruitment, Berger notes:

> The majority of those who post messages in support of the Islamic State on social media will never act out. There is no consensus on when radical rhetoric signals a move to violence, at what point intervention is appropriate, or what type of intervention is most appropriate. (2015, p.23)

This is another part of the complexity. When does espousing extremist views move into extremist action? This is not necessarily a linear process; there is no single conveyor belt to radicalisation. Grindrod and Sloggett (2010) suggest

that an analogy with the board game snakes and ladders is more appropriate. They describe the ladders as points where individuals make a greater commitment to their cause, and the snakes are moral hazards that prohibit commitment to the cause, of which the Prevent strategy is one small part. Even this analogy is limited, as it still includes a linear process. Be that as it may, some people may choose at some point in time to take violent action. This is the potential threat that the Prevent strategy is trying to meet. In October 2016 the Metropolitan Police's head of counter-terrorism, Neil Basu, noted that counter-terrorism and security services had foiled at least ten attacks in the past two years, and have around 550 live investigations at any one time. He stated that Prevent is an important element of the strategy to respond to this threat (National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) 2016).

The particular challenge for Prevent is that it operates in the so-called 'pre-criminal' space. That is to say, it seeks to prevent individual(s) engaging in criminal activity. Therefore, its success is primarily in things not happening, in attacks not taking place. The police calculate that between April 2007 and 31 March 2014 there were 3934 referrals to the Channel programme (NPCC 2014).

Channel is described as 'a multi-agency approach to identify and provide support to individuals who are at risk of being drawn into terrorism' (HM Government 2015c, p.3). It is a voluntary process in which professionals from different sectors, including health, social care, education, the police and community stakeholders, meet together to devise a programme of support to work with an individual viewed as vulnerable to being drawn towards terrorism or extremism.

However, many measurable success stories are hesitantly publicised, if at all. Part of this is about preventing 'copycat' incidents, and another aspect is, if the criminal actions were part of a broader network, to ensure that that closing off of one avenue does not jeopardise further investigations.

Although publicity is rare, recently *The Times* ran an article that gave some details about Channel (Rumbelow 2016). Helen Rumbelow describes the case of a boy whom she calls Ali (not his real name). He drew a picture of a gun being fired in a detention, which in and of itself is not an especially threatening action. But when his teacher tried to talk with him about the drawing, 'Ali hunched, avoided eye contact and gnawed at the skin of his fingers, making them bloody and raw.' He explained that he wanted to fight for Islamic State. Ali's mother, Yasmeen, was invited to the school, shown the drawing and asked if she would like to refer her son to Channel, which she agreed to do. His personal circumstances were challenging: an abusive father, from whom the whole family had fled, as well as bullying at school. Ali's anger at his own life experience led him to watching violent videos online, where he confused the Pakistani Army and so-called Islamic State. The Channel programme arranged a series of interventions: a GP prescribed treatment for Ali's hand biting; a social worker isolated the bully at school and helped Ali develop his self-confidence; a youth worker expanded his social life; Yasmeen led discussions about the family's future; and the imam from a moderate, liberal mosque met one-to-one with Ali several times. Ali's access to the internet is now quite restricted and monitored by his mother. He was transformed by the intervention, and Rumbelow was clearly impressed by what she had seen, stating: 'I find myself amazed that our public services actually work this well in concert. It is as though they have woven the fabric of civil society around this boy.' This is the type of work that Channel is engaged in; complex but transformative when done right.

The strategy adopted by the St Philip's Centre is to invite people to enter into the complexity, to help them see the dilemmas for themselves and to suggest their own solutions. At the heart of this strategy is an understanding

that rather than taking power over individuals or groups, we must share power with them and empower them to tackle the problems they face. Although we are all at risk, it is the Muslim community which faces a particular threat from terrorism in the name of Islam, and it is disadvantaged and deprived white majority communities who face a particular threat from far right and neo-Nazi extremism. Therefore, they must be the communities who are given the greatest power to tackle the issues. Hence an important part of our strategy is to have a community reference group, who meet quarterly to discuss Prevent work and offer constructive and critical feedback as to how we are carrying it out. We do, however, note one particular challenge, namely that whilst civil society in the Muslim community is active, the same is not true in some other communities. There are reference points to call upon to access Muslim views, but where and who are the mainstream voices for the white majority population? And in particular, how can we best engage those with extreme right-wing views?

How to establish trust?

There are a number of basic steps that must be taken if trust is to be established. The most crucial concerns attitude. If the organisers of any inter- or intrafaith encounter choose to trust, then this will communicate to all participants. Organisers must also choose to sit lightly to the power they have, allowing other people appropriate control over what takes place. For any programme to run smoothly, there must be a degree of structure and organisation, but this does not have to be done in a domineering fashion.

If a long-term process of engagement is envisaged, then it is essential to begin with clear boundaries and expectations of the engagement for everyone to be honest about what they are hoping for and realistic about what

might be achieved. These expectations should be recorded and revisited regularly throughout the engagement, to ensure everyone still agrees and is still on board with them.

Practical details are also crucial. Take food as an example. A strict Jain diet is not only fully vegetarian (no meat or fish, or any related products) but also vegan, ruling out eggs, and moreover avoiding onions and garlic. For a Jain to genuinely participate in any encounter where food is involved, they would need reassurance that their dietary needs are catered for. This is, of course, true for anyone who has dietary needs, whether religious, medical or simply personal preference. Organisers must therefore make sure they check the details of what is required and not make an issue of meeting those needs. This is not always as straightforward as may be supposed, as whilst some people will insist on strictly vegan food, others will object if they are not served meat. Developing appropriate ways of balancing conflicting demands is crucial.

There are also many different cultural expectations regarding the position of a leader, such as who gets to talk, for how long and in what order they should speak. At least some consideration, certainly more than simple lip service, should be paid to those concerns, unless there are very valid reasons why this is not possible.

Trust is primarily generated over time. If I consistently demonstrate my awareness of power dynamics, my concern for your wellbeing and my willingness to work for your good, even if it costs me, then trust can be earned. The story that Jesus told of a man who is mugged and is then ignored by two individuals but helped by a third is one of the better known in the Bible. It occurs in Luke 10.25–37, and is traditionally termed the parable of the Good Samaritan. The story is told in response to a question about 'who is my neighbour?' and recounts how a man is mugged and left for dead. The first two people who pass him, a

Jewish priest and a Levite, pass by and ignore him, but the third, a Samaritan, cares for him. This was somewhat surprising, since Jews and Samaritans were sworn enemies. The story is taken as teaching about how we can care for those who are different from ourselves and is sometimes used by Christians for critical self-reflection, to challenge themselves as to whether they are self-centred or outward-focused. The story is also a favourite amongst Christians to use when talking about showing love and compassion for their neighbours, whether they are Christian or not. What the majority of Christians do not realise is that some Jews hear this story as an offensive denigration of Jews. Since the first two characters ignore the man who is mugged, most Jews hear it as being of deliberately anti-Semitic intent, told to foster anti-Semitism even. The question is, would they explain this to Christians? Some who are combative by nature might do so, but the more reserved would not.

I have developed particularly close relationships with a number of Jews through my work at the Centre. One particular individual does share her reaction to this story with Christians on a regular basis, especially as part of the St Philip's Centre training sessions for Christian clergy. They are normally quite taken aback to discover that the story can be heard in that way, but they invariably learn from the encounter. In conversation with this individual, I learned that it was only because of the relationship of trust that I had built up with her that she felt able to first share her views. Trust is crucial for meaningful co-operation to take place.