

University of Groningen

Resilience in radicalization prevention

Gruber, Barbara

DOI:
[10.33612/diss.675764944](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.675764944)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2023

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Gruber, B. (2023). *Resilience in radicalization prevention: a study about resilience as a norm in primary and secondary prevention in Germany and the Netherlands*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen. <https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.675764944>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Resilience as norm in
radicalization prevention

“Why is it positive? Someone who is resilient is less likely to be in danger, let us just call it that. That really says it all. Resilience is like an immune system, if you have a good immune system, you don't get sick so quickly, and if you strengthen your resilience, you minimize the risk of being drawn into something, of getting into risky situations, and that's why this is a very important aspect” (Interview 13, GE, 23/09/2019)

Resilience has a distinctively positive connotation. So positive indeed, that I started to inquire during interviews with (social) professionals in the field of radicalization prevention in Germany and the Netherlands, why they think resilience radiates such a positivity. The quote above is indicative of a certain conceptualization of psychological resilience as the equivalent of a psychological immune system (e.g. Lewitus and Schwartz, 2009). Psychological resilience is often compared with the physical immune system, because resilience in psychology designates the capacity to productively engage with challenges from “daily hassles to major life events”: “the study of psychological resilience [...] seeks to understand why some individuals are able to withstand – or even thrive on – the pressure they experience in their lives” (Fletcher and Sarkar, 2013, p. 3). Discernable from this quote is the widespread belief that resilient individuals do not radicalize. What kind of silver bullet is this quality that it single-handedly prevents individuals from becoming dangerous? And what could possibly not be positive about preventing radicalization through making individuals immune to danger?

From a governmentality perspective, there is nothing inherently or unquestionably positive about resilience. French philosopher Michel Foucault proposes to render the familiar strange to understand how self-evident practices are not self-evident at all, but the result of certain power-knowledge formations shaping our conduct. “Practices themselves are neither ‘positive’ nor ‘negative,’” Foucault (1994, p. 256) reminds us, but “they are all dangerous”, with respect to their ethico-political consequences. Consequently, this research approach proposes to defamiliarize practices considered as normal and beneficial, and as Stone (2013, p. 391) stresses even those practices that “we might like” in order to see “how power operates through them”. Therefore, the guiding research question in this thesis is: “how did resilience become a norm in radicalization prevention?” I argue that resilience in the context of radicalization prevention is a norm, because through resilience those who are normal, and hence healthy and resilient, are differentiated from those who radicalize, and are hence abnormal and must be treated to become resilient (again). Accordingly, I treat resilience is a practice of normalization, which in the context of radicalization prevention shapes and disciplines the conduct of individuals and populations to prevent a future threat from emerging.

Critical Security Studies (CSS) questioned the self-evident positivity of resilience in the past decade. Whether the focus is on engineering, ecological or psychological resilience some central premises of resilience remain the same. Resilience characterizes the capacity of a material, an ecosystem or the psyche to maintain an equilibrium despite stress, disturbances and adversity. Resilience is the capacity to autonomously cope with such stressors, to absorb them, to withstand and to adapt to these stressors, without changes in the basic functions of the system, the material or the psyche. Rather than an attempt to seek protection from such stressors, resilience strengthens the system itself, as the external world is too complex to be ever fully protected from. Hence, resilience is based on an ontology of insecurity and was therefore critiqued for replacing security – because in a complex and insecure world beyond our control all we can do is to become resilient (Walker and Cooper, 2011; Chandler, 2013; Joseph, 2013; Evans and Reid, 2014; Zebrowski, 2016; Grove, 2018). This is also why resilience is so intuitively fitting with neoliberalism: rather than changing the external world, we shall be concerned with our own subjectivity, to improve ourselves to function better in uncertain circumstances and under more stressful conditions.

Regarding resilience in radicalization prevention, I inquire the claim that resilience replaces security, because potentially dangerous subjects cannot be left to govern themselves, rather they are woven into a tight administration of social control, care and surveillance to normalize and normate them. Security concerns thereby spilled over more intensively into policy fields usually outside the realm of counter-terrorism, such as social and youth work, health care, and education which was dubbed “the securitization of social policy” (Mythen, Walklate and Peatfield, 2017; Ragazzi, 2017; Jukschat and Leimbach, 2019). Such a governance through resilience is not solely responsabilizing populations and individuals to care for their own resilience, rather this governance integrates the aforementioned professions more tightly to national security concerns. The integration of these professions increases social control, and resilience serves to “regulate social deviance” and “to create risk-averse citizens who are also virtuous” through administrations of care (Amery, 2019, p. 364). Therefore, the role of resilience is ambiguous in this process, as much as it is an enhancement of security in state policies, as much it is used to counteract a threat perspective from these professions who suddenly found themselves as part of the counter-terrorism effort. Hence, the question if security is replaced through psychological resilience in this context warrants an investigation, leading to the second research question: “How does resilience relate to security in radicalization prevention?”

Psychological resilience is hereby the key, because in contrast to ecological resilience, psychological resilience provides a prescriptive norm from which practices of normation and normalization can be derived. Such a norm establishes a “moral control of individuals and populations” (Turner, 1997, p. x) and serves as the opposite of radicalized. Sedgwick (2010)

and Malthaner (2017) asked what is the normal, if radicalization is what is undesired and deviant, and through this dissertation I argue that resilience became this normal. Important in this regard is that resilience as psychological norm includes both a biopolitical component, expressed through its recurrence to health, and a disciplinary component through its recurrence to social conformity and moral control. It is this recurrence to disciplinary power inherent in psychological norms that distinguishes this dissertation from previous accounts of ecological resilience analyzed through biopolitics and governmentality.

Hence, this dissertation also draws on and contributes to the study of “how the psy disciplines [note: subsuming psychology, psychiatry, psychotherapy] are implicated in contemporary security and ordering practices” (Howell, 2011, p. 37). The psy-disciplines became entangled in security and ordering practices, because crime and madness became entangled (Foucault, 2003a). Thus, madness, social disorder and irregularity became a source of danger to society, for which the psy-sciences provided an angle for social control to cure these ills. Social deviancy, as a form of abnormality became a source of danger, and therefore subjected to forms of control and discipline. But more than that, those irregulars were no longer solely confined or punished, but rather they had to be cured and rehabilitated through therapeutic engagement. The psy-sciences still provide this social defense function for societies, demonstrated for example through resilience as therapeutic governance in relation to radicalization prevention (Coppock and McGovern, 2014; Altermark and Nilsson, 2018), but also more generally as a ‘moralising’ intervention for populations ‘at-risk’ (Ecclestone, 2017). To my knowledge, this is the first study excavating the therapeutic governance of resilience, composed of both field research and policy analysis engaging with resilience in radicalization prevention.

This therapeutic governance is discernable in that both radicalization prevention, as well as resilience, are introduced within the current prevention regime derived from medicine, specifically epidemiology (Heath-Kelly, 2017b). Prevention in medicine was sub-divided into primary, secondary and tertiary forms referring to intervention points for medicine. This sub-division on the one hand refers to temporality: before an illness occurs, early stages of the illness and relapses; and on the other hand, it refers to target groups: everyone, those who just started to manifest the disease, and those that recover. Castell (1991, p. 286) demonstrated how psychiatry followed this sub-division of prevention, which according to him introduced “a whole program of political intervention”. Resilience in the regime of primary prevention was introduced as enhancement of a population to be better equipped in dealing with radicalization. As such it is not necessary prevention in terms of forestalling an event, but rather as equipping the population with means to cope with and resist radicalization. Resilience in secondary radicalization prevention necessitates a screening to filter potentially “risky” and “at-risk” subjects (Heath-Kelly, 2013). Subsequently, resilience is introduced

to interventions to correct them through a restoration of resilience. Resilience has thus an ambiguous relationship with prevention, as it is both a variant of and an alternative to prevention (Broeckling, 2017, p. 115). Prevention is supposed to render a radicalization more improbable, whereas resilience is supposed to strengthen the subject to resist radicalization, or to cope better with radicalization and restore resilience despite exposure. But rather than solely responsabilizing subjects to care for their own security, leading to a roll-back of state provisions, resilience in this field leads to more state interventions, surveillance and administrations of care and control.

In accordance with this tri-partite governance of prevention, sequestering prevention in primary, secondary and tertiary, I chose empirical cases in the Netherlands and Germany illustrating a governance through psychological resilience in relation to radicalization prevention. This dissertation focuses on primary and secondary prevention to delimit the scope of the analysis. The empirical case illustrating primary prevention is a psycho-social resilience training called “Bounce – Resilience Training for Youngsters”, one of the first resilience trainings with the explicit aim to prevent radicalization in Europe (Euer, Van Vossole, *et al.*, 2014; Altermark and Nilsson, 2018). The training was implemented in both countries and therefore fit the purpose. The empirical cases illustrating secondary prevention are programs for individuals assessed as being “at-risk” of radicalization. In the Netherlands, every municipality is supposed to organize such an early prevention approach (National Coordinator for Counterterrorism, 2016). In Germany, such programs vary from federal state to federal state, I chose Signpost in North-Rhine Westphalia, because a) it was the federal state with one of the highest numbers of so-called travelers and hence implanted early prevention on a large scale and b) because Signpost explicitly referred to resilience (Wegweiser Köln, no date; Ceylan and Kiefer, 2018). A variety of European countries implemented such programs for early prevention, the most prominent among them are Aarhus in Denmark, and the Channel program in the UK (Lindekilde, 2012; Martin, 2018; Pettinger, 2020b). In contrast, in-depth research about the German and Dutch approach are not as prominent in the literature, demonstrated by recent publications about experiences and particularities in other European countries (Mattsson, 2019; Ragazzi and de Jongh, 2019; Gøtzsche-Astrup, Lindekilde and Fjellman, 2021; Haugstvedt and Tuastad, 2021; Sivenbring and Malmros, 2021). While these programs received more attention, the role of resilience is usually subordinated and they lack an analysis of the country specific “varieties” of resilience.

“Varieties of resilience” refers to Joseph’s (2018) governmentality about resilience, which demonstrates the differences in the governance through resilience in European countries. Inspired by Joseph’s study I similarly engage governmentality to show how resilience as a norm is also shaped through the country specific contexts in Germany and the Netherlands. With regards to governmentality, Foucault (2004a, p. 253) placed the norm at the “heart of

things”, because the norm “can be applied to both a body one wishes to discipline and a population one wishes to regularize”. As such resilience regularizes a population to enhance its resilience (in accordance with primary prevention), but it also disciplines individuals who either lack resilience, or who are not sufficiently resilient (in accordance with secondary prevention). Country contexts matter with regards to how resilience as a norm emerged, and how it is embedded and hence imbued with further meaning. Thus, I introduce why I selected the Netherlands and Germany as contrasting cases to show a variety in the governance through resilience.

1.1 Varieties of resilience

Joseph (2018) argues that the emergence of resilience in a range of policy areas across European countries is part of a neoliberal governmentality, particularly shaped by an Anglo-Saxon approach. Therefore, the Anglo-Saxon approach is the baseline, against which he compares and contrasts variations, as these variations are not “distinct approaches in themselves”, although they are shaped by “cultures, traditions and contexts” (ibid. pp. 188, 191). In contrast to Joseph, I start from understanding resilience through the definition of the psy-sciences, which is part of a neoliberal governmentality, and then research how this discourse is taken up specifically in radicalization prevention policies in the Germany and the Netherlands.

In this dissertation I engage with how resilience emerged in the Netherlands (chapter 5) and Germany (chapter 6) as a governance of radicalization. I use governmentality as approach to analyze policy documents engaging with radicalization prevention. I follow Mitchells definition of governmentality as an “analytics of government examin[ing] the conditions under which regimes of practices come into being, are maintained and are transformed” (Mitchell, 2010, p. 31). In both countries, radicalization hinges on what is constituted as societal norm, as a particular standard of what is still permissible in a liberal democratic society, thus the conditions under which these regimes of practices emerged were different.

In the Netherlands, radicalization is understood against the backdrop of a growing disquietude with multiculturalism, and the perceived threat this constitutes for societal cohesion:

“The greatest threat to the Dutch democratic legal order is currently the existence of a broad social problem in which interethnic confrontations are provoked in an atmosphere of frustration about the Dutch ‘multicultural’ society on both the native and immigrant sides” (Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, 2007, p. 2).

In the Netherlands, the meaning of radicalization is thus also imbued with a deviancy from social conformity, or in other words Dutch values, similarly to what Martin (2019) has proposed with regards to radicalization as a deviation of British identity. As Joseph (2018, p. 46) argued in relation to the UK, radicalization prevention introduces a more “normative” and “disciplinary” aspect in governance practices, similar to what Amery (2019) argued about resilience in social policy in the UK. I am contributing to these studies about resilience, to illustrate through the example of the Netherlands, how psychological resilience not only introduces a more disciplinary governance in relation to radicalization prevention, but also that it corresponds to an expression of social conformity, expressed through broad definitions of national and cultural identity, which is particularly concerned with regulating multiculturalism (cf. also Schinkel and Van Houdt, 2010).

Germany provides a contrasting approach, to both the UK and the Netherlands, as Joseph (2018, p. 49) notes with regards to Germany: “it is noticeable there is none of the ‘our values’ rhetoric or ‘resilience of the nation’ characteristic of US, British and French national security discourse”. Rather, Germany is oriented towards its distinct past because “[n]ational identity and the way security is understood is a product of history and is enshrined in the constitution” (Joseph, 2018, p. 49). Radicalization is understood as a deviation from democracy, threatening the constitution of the state against which the state must be protected:

“Skepticism about democratic processes and institutions to the point of open hostility and rejection of a free, peaceful social order are not just marginal phenomena. Radicalization tendencies are visible up to the middle of society and challenge all social and political actors.” (Die Bundesregierung, 2016, p. 7)

Therefore, Germany provides a contrasting picture, because the approach to prevention appears radically different from counter-terrorism policies in the UK and the Netherlands. As such radicalization is a failure of proper democratization of the individual and society alike, and must be addressed on the societal as well as on the individual level. The psychologized radicalization discourse of the UK and the Netherlands was only introduced in 2016, and was adapted for this particular understanding of failed democratization. As a result, psychological resilience is thus transformed to correspond to an expression of being properly democratized.

Through the focus on the Netherlands and Germany, this dissertation forms a part of the emerging IR literature, showing that many practices of radicalisation prevention pioneered in different countries (Bjørge and Gjelsvik, 2015; Dalgaard-Nielsen and Schack, 2016; Mattsson, 2019), especially the Netherlands (Kundnani and Hayes, 2018; Fadil, De Koning and Ragazzi, 2019), and engaging with outliers such as Germany, where it is actually the state that must be protected (Berczyk and Vermeulen, 2015; Shannah 2022 forthcoming).

1.2 Resilience and Subjectivation

Against the backdrop of how resilience is imbued with meaning through the policy analysis, my third research question is: “how is resilience enacted in primary and secondary prevention practices?”. The research goal is to show how the policies correspond with the therapeutic practices of enhancing or restoring resilience. In this regard, the empirical objective was to show how practitioners take-up and shape resilience, contrasting or corresponding to the national policy discourse of resilience. Following Butler (1997) we cannot escape processes of subjectivation and normalization, but the process of becoming a subject still gives room for appropriation, resignification and for subverting a discourse by including it in another discursive regime. Therefore, I chose the empirical sites with two objectives: a) they had to exhibit a reference to psychological resilience in relation to radicalization prevention to examine how resilience is enacted in practice, and b) to see how the context (referring to national discourse and professional background) is shaping resilience.

This approach is in line with research I call “resilience from below” as these studies investigate the relation between policy discourses and the actual enactment of resilience, demonstrating how neoliberal governmentalities of resilience are challenged on the ground (Ryan, 2013; Vilcan, 2017; Zebrowski and Sage, 2017; Krüger and Albris, 2020). To date, there are literature reviews and policy or program analysis about resilience in radicalization prevention (Hardy, 2015; Altermark and Nilsson, 2018; Jore, 2020; Stephens and Sieckelinck, 2020; Stephens, Sieckelinck and Boutellier, 2021). This dissertation offers an empirical contribution, contrasting, reaffirming and disputing the assumptions about resilience in policies through 40 interviews with practitioners in primary and secondary prevention in Germany and the Netherlands.

I chose primary and secondary prevention, because they deal with radicalisation before it is manifest in a type of juridical punishable action and hence have a challenging relationship with security. With challenging relationship, I refer to the issue that these interventions take place in the so-called “pre-crime space”, which designates the space before a punishable offence occurred. “Pre-crime” logics in counter-terrorism are supposed to counter a threat before it emerges, which lead to an integration of criminal justice to national security frameworks (McCulloch and Pickering, 2009; Zedner, 2010; Rizq, 2019). Radicalization prevention equally is supposed to counter a threat before it emerges, but in contrast counter-terrorism, there is a shift from punishment and detention, to care-based interventions and control. In a recent genealogical excavation of radicalization prevention Heath-Kelly and Shannah (2022a, pp. 2–3) assert that anticipatory modes of rehabilitation are deployed to “safeguard the potential offenders [...] by meeting their socio-economic and psychological needs”. Rather than restricting the possibility of interventions in the pre-crime space, this shift led to an inclusion of care and care professionals in the prevention effort, which in turn

led to a considerable widening of the possibility of state interventions in the name of security (Qureshi, 2016; Heath-Kelly, 2017b; Younis, 2021b; Heath-Kelly and Shana'ah, 2022a). Rather than prosecution for preparatory actions or detention as during the 2000s, there was a shift to interventions of care and control, including professions from the social realm exhibiting a therapeutic form of governance.

I theorize this notion of therapeutic governance through affective governmentality (Penz and Sauer, 2020). Affective governmentality shows how affects, emotions and feelings are mobilized in the governance of subjects and populations. Penz and Sauer (2020, p. 48) argue that “the governmentalisation of the state since the 18th century has strongly relied on normation processes, on the alignment of conduct and affect, according to a given norm”. In this case the norm is resilience which targets the affective states of those who govern through resilience, as well as those whose resilience shall be enhanced or restored. This is relevant for this dissertation, because psychological resilience is expressed through emotional states such as self-efficacy, emotional regulation and control, or self-esteem (Masten, 2014). As such, psychology describes resilience by referring to particular emotional states that resilient subjects exhibit, and in turn therapeutic practices aim to teach these emotional states, for example through exercises in emotional literacy. Hence, resilience is normating and normalizing the emotional states of subjects, because being in such a state, adhering to this norm, is supposed to prevent deviant behavior to emerge.

Regarding the Bounce project as an example for psychological resilience in primary prevention (chapter 7), the project emphasizes emotional literacy, getting in touch with one's feelings and rationalizing them in order to develop self-competences such as self-esteem and self-control, to strengthen resilience. This is in line with (development) psychology's definition of resilience, taught to at-risk youth in relation to all kinds of social deviances and dangers, including juvenile delinquency for example (Martineau, 1999). The critique about such programs is not an issue with emotional literacy or getting in touch with one's feelings as such, but that inequality and socio-economic differences are neglected and rendered into an issue of a skills training in order to overcome such structural issues individually, in line with a neoliberal governance (Ecclestone and Lewis, 2016; Burman, 2018). The Bounce project is of interest in this regard, because it not only teaches such emotional skills to become resilient, but to become resilient to radicalization. On the one hand, this project illustrates the entanglement of the psy-sciences as ordering practices in security. On the other hand, it also shows that social and youth work is now part of the counter-terrorism effort to prevent radicalization, widening the security realm substantially and introducing a threat perspective to social and youth work (van de Weert and Eijkman, 2019; Doering, Neitzert and Roeing, 2020; Haugstvedt and Tuastad, 2021).

But the interviews with the Bounce trainers, most of them social and youth workers, also demonstrate that this widening of security is challenged on the ground. Social and youth workers mostly perceive radicalization prevention as stigmatizing for their clients, and as an introduction of a threat perspective to their profession. They experience both issues as counter-productive for their work with clients, and as detrimental to their professional ethics, which pre-supposes a non-judgmental interaction. Interestingly though, they emphasize that prevention is part of their everyday work, only that they employ a non-security understanding of prevention which also affects how they understand and employ resilience. This understanding is based on care for their client's well-being and an appreciation for them. In this context, resilience becomes an expression of a relational engagement of support. This relational understanding of resilience, in which resilience is the product of supportive relationship and being embedded in an appreciative social environment, challenges the understanding of resilience as individualized quality. This is relevant, because resilience is often critiqued as a neoliberal subjectivation to create inter alia "self-sufficiency" (Joseph, 2016; Park, Crath and Jeffery, 2020), whereas in these accounts the reliance on the other is stressed as important component of resilience.

The interviews also demonstrate that there are country specific differences regarding resilience as well as regarding critique towards resilience in radicalization prevention. Therefore, I also engage with these accounts and relate them back to the respective prevention discourses of both countries.

In accordance with the German prevention approach, practitioners demonstrate a strong commitment to radicalization prevention as democracy enhancement. Rather than perceiving radicalization as an individualized problem, radicalization was also depicted as a reflection of society. Therefore, radicalization prevention was discussed often in relation to anti-racism and anti-discrimination measures, as well as in relation to democracy enhancement to enable political participation. Nonetheless, resilience as democracy enhancement was also tight to emotional states, but meant as a feeling of empowerment generated through collective action. This contrasts the neoliberal resilient subject debate, because on the one hand societal power relations are taken into consideration, and on the other hand resilience was described as the product of collective action, rather than as an individualized characteristic.

In accordance with the Dutch prevention approach, practitioners described resilience as an individualized quality creating self-sufficiency consistent with the neoliberal critique towards resilience. On the local level, radicalization prevention mostly comes in form of awareness raising campaigns through which as many (social and care) professions as possible shall be alerted to the signals of radicalization and teach these professionals on how to engage with

these supposedly radicalizing individuals. Through the interviews, I encountered critique towards this individualizing approach and in relation to the discrimination of minorities. On the one hand, practitioners questioned the individualization of radicalization and in the course of this critique practitioners pointed out that radicalization is a societal issue. In the same vein, some practitioners also questioned if resilience is an individual or a societal characteristic. One practitioner's personal account of resilience stood out, because as an immigrant s/he questioned the normalization through resilience which s/he experienced as assimilatory. In this process s/he pointed out that resilience for him/her means to integrate values from both cultures into one's identity and to be proud of both. Hence, I encountered the neoliberal subject from the resilient literature in the Netherlands, but I also encountered critique towards this discourse, an appropriation and re-signification of the discourse, and propositions for a more society-oriented resilience.

These findings demonstrate the importance of field research, because it shows that 'a power *exerted* on the subject is still a power *assumed* by the subject' (Butler, 1997, p. 11; italics from the original). This matters, because studies about "resilience from below", to which this dissertation contributes, show how practitioners challenge a neoliberal governance of resilience and the enhancement of security through resilience.

Regarding individual programs for at-risk individuals as secondary prevention (chapter 8), there is a strong emphasis on a therapeutic aim of restoring resilience and reintegrate healthy subjects to society. Resilience serves as a correction, meaning that potentially dangerous individuals are intervened upon not only to protect them, but to protect society. Resilience is a form of "social defence" referring to a governance of deviancy, which was rendered dangerous by the intersection of the psy-sciences with criminal justice (Foucault, 2003a, p. 163). In this regard, resilience unfolds its full disciplinary-normative effect, it serves as a prescriptive norm through which individuals can be qualified and assessed, and serves as a standard to which these individuals shall be restored (Foucault, 2003a, p. 50). In this individualized engagement with deviating subjects, resilience is administered through disciplinary and pastoral power.

I engage with the multi-disciplinary organization of radicalization cases in Germany and the Netherlands and introduce them against the backdrop of how different European countries organize case management to highlight my findings. The issue with multi-disciplinary organization of case management is that national security concerns override the primary mandate (care, heal, educate) of the social professions which are part of these settings. The interviews and the two different countries show how practitioners negotiate national security concerns in practice. Subsequently, I analyze how resilience is enacted.

In accordance with affective subjectivation, practitioners govern subjects through care and concern, while simultaneously this governance is supposed to target the affects of those subjected to these individual interventions. The governance through resilience exhibits similarities in the Netherlands and Germany, in its emphasis on affect, but also in relation to the technologies. Resilience is enacted through therapeutic technologies starting with the anamnesis of a case. The lack of resilience is visibilized through signs of maladjustment and through confessionary truth-telling to diagnose individual reasons for radicalization. Upon this in-take, resilience is enacted as technology of the self to restore affective relations to one's social environment and to the self. The social environment, including the practitioners working as counselors, are representatives of society which confers through these interventions a feeling of belonging, of importance and recognition onto the subjects. This affective engagement serves as an invitation for the subject to become a member of society again. Butler (2015, p. 24) stresses that even in disciplinary power subjectivation does not work through subjugation alone, but also needs the desire of the subject to be subjectivated. This desire stems from the need of recognition from the other in order to have a societal existence (ibid.). As such disciplinary power works through the desire of the subject to be recognized by the other, as an internalization of the norm, restored through affective relationality. Restoring the affective relation to the self is part of this internalization, because this technology of the Self works as self-transformation. In this context, self-transformation means that subjects work on the relation to their selves, to appreciate themselves, to become confident and to exert self-control over one's emotions. If this self-transformation is completed, the subject is redeemed and welcomed to society again.

While the governance through resilience is the same, there are differences regarding the social conformity aspect of resilience as a norm. In accordance with the German prevention discourse, social conformity is strongly related to being properly democratized, enacted as a sensibilization to democratic values and Human Rights, as being able to recognize and question undemocratic ideologies. This is consistent with the Germany approach, because what is threatened by radicalization and hence the object of protection is the democratic state. In accordance with the Dutch prevention discourse, social conformity is strongly related to productivity and self-sufficiency, to curtail dependence on the state and exhibiting value as a working member of society. This is consistent with the Dutch approach, because what is threatened by radicalization is societal cohesion and hence the object of protection is Dutch identity.

The contribution of this chapter is to emphasize the productive role of affects in the restoration of resilience. With restoration I refer to resilience as a prescriptive norm, as it is determined beforehand how a resilient subject is supposed to conduct itself. Restoration is thus not meant as a return to a previous state, but as installment of a correct state.

This matters, because it demonstrates even more clearly than in primary prevention, the disciplinary aspect of psychological resilience, which is not taken into account by biopolitical and governmentality depictions of resilience.

Regarding the role of resilience and the question of security, I inquire if resilience is indeed a replacement of security, or if security is enhanced. The issue is that resilience has an ambiguous role in this context, as the question of radicalization prevention is caught up between care and safeguarding and the protection of the individual, and national security aiming to protect society from danger. Resilience is overwhelmingly championed by the care and safeguarding aim and by the attempt to push prevention towards bigger societal changes. However, resilience brings with it an element of social control and correction, which is nonetheless enhancing security, particularly visible in secondary prevention, but also a challenging issue for primary prevention.

The added value of this dissertation is a focused analysis of psychological resilience in the realm of security governance. I propose that resilience is a psychological norm, introducing a normating and normalizing governance of social deviancy. I offer a reading of resilience which is not emphasizing the similarities of ecological, engineering and psychological resilience, but rather the differences. In this regard, I trace the productive role of the psy-sciences in governmentality to show how the psy-sciences, nowadays through resilience, establish a normative-disciplinary system of structuring the mentalities of populations and individuals. Rather than only showing this governance through a policy analysis, I also offer an investigation of how such a governance of psychological resilience plays out in two empirical sites primary and secondary prevention, in two cases, Germany and the Netherlands through field research.

1.3 Structure

In chapter two, I engage with resilience in Critical Security Studies, in relation to therapeutic governance and in Critical Terrorism Studies. This dissertation will make a theoretical contribution to the currently dominant resilient subject debate in CSS by showing how in relation to radicalisation prevention, resilience is not only an instance of biopower, but is also an instance of mainly disciplinary power (cf. Chandler 2013; Evans and Reid 2016; Joseph 2013; O'Malley 2010). The role of psychology in establishing norms and procedures of normalisation used in radicalisation prevention are highlighted. The role of disciplinary power in establishing resilience as a norm, as well as its role in establishing practices of normalisation is not as scrutinized in CSS yet, despite their growing relevance in the policy field of counter-terrorism (Aly, Taylor and Karnovsky, 2014; Hardy, 2015; Heath-Kelly, 2017b; Wimelius *et al.*, 2018; Stephens, Sieckelinck and Boutellier, 2021), and the adjunct field of Critical Terrorism Studies (Heath-Kelly, 2017b, 2017a). Both critical strands take

governmentality and biopolitics as dominant lenses of analysis. To not use governmentality as an all-encompassing frame to study psy science related issues in IR is also put forward by Howell (2011, p. 58) who argues to see how the psy-sciences work through also through disciplinary power.

In chapter three I engage with the productivity of norms in governmentality. I differentiate between the norm in biopower and disciplinary power, to examine the norm as an “unresolved question” in the psy-sciences (Foucault, 2003a, p. 163). I continue with illustrating how disciplinary power is no longer a subjection of the body through training, but rather works on and through the emotions of those to be governed. I add a critique of Butler of Foucault regarding the process of normalization, which is necessary for the empirical part. Finally, I engage with resilience in development psychology and illustrate what this norm entails.

In chapter four, I introduce the method, a mixture of governmentality and the extended case methodology. I use governmentality for the policy analysis to research the emergence of resilience as a consequence of the introduction of the concept of radicalization. I complement the policy analysis with interviews in relation to primary and secondary prevention practices. The extended case method serves to reconstruct and extend theory in light of the field research findings. The reason for choosing this approach is that I do not claim that the governing practices I research are outside of governmentality, as they are aimed at shaping the conduct of populations and individuals. However, a governmentality consisting of a policy analysis alone cannot account for how those subjected to practices shaping conduct, conduct themselves in the process. Therefore, I reconstruct my initial take on governmentality through an inclusion of affect, which was prevalent in the interviews. In the method chapter, I also discuss research ethics and/in interviews, introduce semi-structured questionnaires, and coding as data analysis.

In chapter five, I introduce how psychological resilience emerges as a norm in Dutch radicalization prevention policies between 2000-2020. I contextualize how resilience is a) an expression of social conformity to a Dutch ideal of citizenship embedded within concerns about multiculturalism, and b) how resilience changes as it hinges on the conceptualization of radicalization. During the 2000s, radicalization was conceptualized as caused by structural issues, hence also resilience included structural factors. Around 2010, radicalization was thoroughly psychologized, giving rise to a psychological conception of resilience akin to how particularly development psychology conceptualizes resilience. As a result of this conceptualization health care, social and youth work, and education became tightly integrated to national security concerns, demonstrating how resilience enhances security.

In chapter six, I engage with how psychological resilience emerges as a norm in German extremism and radicalization prevention policies between 1990-2020. I engage with the particularities of Germany's prevention approach to emphasize the contrast of this approach by illustrating prevention as democratization and protection of the state. Germany's approach showcases the vision of a resilient society and therefore not only targets individuals but society as a whole. Subsequently, I show how the British and Dutch conceptualization of radicalization and resilience enter the German context relatively late, and how it is adapted to fit the German approach to radicalization prevention. Again, the consequence of this introduction, is a tighter integration of social and youth work as well as education to national security concerns, demonstrating how resilience enhances security.

In chapter seven I engage with primary prevention and the Bounce project. First, I introduce the project and its premises, and how it introduces an affective subjectivation. Subsequently, I engage with the social and youth workers (Bounce trainer) perspective on resilience, and show how resilience becomes part of another discourse regime which champions a broader perspective on prevention, against the securitized and stigmatizing notion of radicalization prevention. Finally, I also show in two different parts how resilience in Augsburg corresponds to the national policy discourse in Germany, and how resilience in Groningen is also the subject of critique in relation to the national policy discourse in the Netherlands.

In chapter eight I engage with secondary prevention and individual programs, also called "case-management approach". I first order the Dutch and German approaches within the broader setting of multi-disciplinary case management approaches in the European context, to elaborate on how Germany and the Netherlands fit in. Subsequently, I discuss the governance of resilience through the steps of case management: intake and assessment, interventions as self-transformation, and the end of case management. Finally, I show the differences between the Netherlands where resilience amounts to self-sufficiency and productivity, and Germany, where resilience amounts to democratization.