Federal Ministry for
Family Affairs, Senior Citizens,
Women and Youth

German Federal Government Report on the Work and Effectiveness of the Federal Government Programmes to Prevent Extremism

Contents

1 Mandate

1.1 Reason for the report: German Bundestag resolution of 23 April 2013

On 23 April 2013, at the request of the CDU/CSU and FDP parliamentary groups, the German Bundestag resolved to produce a report on the evaluation of the Federal Government Programmes to Prevent Extremism:

- The German Bundestag calls upon the Federal Government to prepare and submit a report setting out recommendations for action and providing an analysis of the effectiveness of the programmes to prevent extremism that are funded in each legislative period (Bundestag Document 17/13225, p. 6).

Although the resolution was approved under the title "Rechtsextremismus entschlossen bekämpfen" (Resolutely Combating Right-Wing Extremism), the Federal Government interprets the mandate cited on page 6 of the motion to call for a report on all forms of extremism. In addition, the Federal Government expressly points out that the preventive educational work performed under the federal programmes does not constitute action against extremism in terms of repression but rather by means of prevention work and democracy promotion activities engaged in by civil society. This takes in all prevention levels up to and including the tertiary level (deradicalisation) and prevention to promote exit and distancing from extremist connections. The Bundestag resolution regarding the need for the report was taken prior to adopting the recommendations contained in the final report of the Second NSU Inquiry Committee. The aims of the federal programmes to prevent right-wing extremism, group-focused enmity and other inequality-based ideologies have been aligned and further developed in line with the recommendations of the NSU Inquiry Committee. And in the "Federal Government Strategy to Prevent Extremism and Promote Democracy", adopted by the German Cabinet in summer 2016, the Federal Government announced a wide range of recommendations to promote the effectiveness of preventive and educational measures. This report will also refer to those measures in its concluding recommendations.

The reporting date is 31 December 2016.

1.2 Thematic focus

In line with the German Bundestag resolution, since 2013 the report has focused on the Federal Government's programmes to prevent right-wing extremism, left-wing extremism and Islamic extremism.

Those programmes are as follows:

- XENOS – Integration and Diversity (2008–2014)

- XENOS Special Programme on Labour Market Support for Individuals with Leave to Stay and Refugees with Access to the Labour Market (2008–2015)

- XENOS Special Programme Exit to Entry (2009–2014)

- Cohesion through Participation (2010–present)

- PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE (2001–2014)

- STRENGTHENING DEMOCRACY INITIATIVE (2011–2014)

- Live Democracy! (2015–present)

This report does not cover other nationwide approaches and measures to prevent extremism and promote democracy which are not funded under federal programmes, and which are described in their entirety in the "Federal Government Strategy to Prevent Extremism and Promote Democracy", adopted in summer 2016. Addressing all forms of extremist attitudes and action is thus one of the key tasks and responsibilities of the Federal Agency for Civic Education (BpB), whose aim it is to provide citizenship education and information on political issues, and promote both

an awareness of democracy and participation in politics. BpB activities thus use political education to prevent the establishment and consolidation of extremist attitudes and structures, and to encourage socially engaged citizens to speak out against extremist thinking. In addition to developing its own programmes and services, BpB is active in sponsoring recognised providers of political education and information, and particularly those whose work focuses largely on promoting democracy and preventing extremism. With regard to Islamic extremism, a nationwide counselling network has been established in conjunction with the Advice Centre on Radicalisation at the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees especially for family members and others in the social environment of young people who are either at risk of radicalisation or have already become radicalised. Another area not covered by this report involves the initial and further education and training covering political issues received by the German armed forces. Also, the extremism prevention measures of the Military Counter Intelligence Service (MAD) are, among other things, described in a catalogue of measures and in a Joint Service Regulation (ZDv), which combine and coordinate the preventive and reactive measures against extremism in the German armed forces.

The above-mentioned federal programmes to prevent extremism are subject to specific conditions which must be considered in the expert or political evaluation of the respective programmes. Despite their differing focus areas, funding formats and funding provisions, all federal programmes to prevent extremism and promote democracy are to be seen as federal level responses to changing societal challenges in dealing with political extremism in its many and varied hues and forms. Mandated by the German Bundestag, the programmes are designed to take a preventive approach to countering political extremism and to encourage and promote democratic counterforces.

The Federal Government prevention programmes are conducted in line with the federal division of responsibilities operated in the Federal Republic of Germany. The German Länder (states) and municipalities play an indispensable role in preventing and promoting democracy, most notably by means of Länder-specific programmes and municipal strategies. The Länder are also responsible, among other things, for police-operated prevention, the penal system, issues concerning child and social welfare, and education. They work together with the Federal Government in providing political and civil education. When it comes to addressing local-level problems and needs, linking federal measures with those of the Länder and municipalities is of key importance.

In past legislative periods, federal programmes to prevent extremism and promote democracy have always been designed as ongoing, long-term extremism prevention and democracy promotion instruments despite the fact that project funding is only made available for limited periods of time. The key function of federal programmes lies not only or not primarily in nationwide prevention of political extremism and promotion of democracy but in the development and testing of best-practice approaches, strategies and practices to prevent extremism and promote democracy. Federal programmes are thus to be seen first and foremost as exemplary field experiments in which experience can be gathered in the respective area and innovative approaches can be collected.[1] In this way, they can also be seen as a way to implement the Federal Government's task of encouraging youth welfare activities (Section 83 SGB VIII).[2] The emphasis on best practice as an expression of the limited federal responsibility of the Federal Government with regard to preventing extremism and promoting democracy, as called for in the Federal Budget Code (BHO), has been and is documented in the promoting and funding principles of the federal programmes. Funding is provided primarily for educational and informational projects for civil society stakeholders with the aim of developing, testing, evaluating and enhancing methods and approaches to prevent extremism, promote political and civic education, and promote democracy and tolerance. A key criterion in all of this is that following successful development, testing and implementation of the practices at local level, an analysis be conducted to assess the transfer potential of experiences and results for use in other contexts (place, provider structure, thematic areas, etc.). In their local context, (pilot) projects link with actual needs and, as federally-sponsored (pilot) projects, aim to achieve super-regional effects by collecting experiences and delivering results which – if tried and proven useful – could potentially be used elsewhere.

To fulfil this task, federal programmes are learning programmes which are designed for change. They respond both to changing social and political challenges – such as the emergence of new forms or modi operandi of political extremism – and to respective German Bundestag resolutions. The programmes are also developed further due to the experience gained and above all, through scientific monitoring and evaluation and numerous forums enabling exchange with programme stakeholders, the experience gained from the funded projects is consolidated and used as a basis on which to readjust and realign their contents and goals. Against this backdrop, the chronology of the federal programmes and their recognisably different content and focus must be seen as an ongoing, further development and enhancement process spread over several years.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

1   Lüders, Christian (2003): Jugendhilfeforschung zwischen Wissenschaft, Politik und Praxis. In: DJI-Bulletin, Heft 64, München, p. 4.

2   See: Haubrich, Karin/Lüders, Christian/Struhkamp, Gerlinde (2003): Wirksamkeit, Nützlichkeit, Nachhaltigkeit. Was Evaluationen von Modellprogrammen realistischerweise leisten können. In: Schröder, Ute B./Streblow, Claudia (Eds.): Evaluation konkret. Opladen u.a., pp. 183–201.

This is of key importance in political evaluation. In this light, it would be wrong to judge the federal programmes and their effectiveness solely on the basis of the scope of their potential contribution to reducing political extremism at local level and encouraging democratic action – and possibly also measure them against the election results of extremist parties or the number of politically-motivated crimes. Instead, the success of the programmes should be judged in respect of the extent to which they have provided practitioners with new, proven strategies and practices to prevent political extremism and promote democracy, reach and sensitise new target groups to the issues concerned, and sustainably integrate the approaches into regulatory systems such as schools and vocational training.

Delineation can be made between "internal" and "external" sustainability. While "internal sustainability" (perpetuation) takes in problem-adequate development and establishment of structures and processes at project implementer level, "external sustainability" (transfer) describes the diffusion of implemented innovation into the implementer's external environment (disseminator and model effect).

"Internal sustainability" thus refers to the project infrastructure (resource and performance potential, trained personnel, etc.). It also focuses on the question of how the project implementer can continue with the programme-sponsored activities once the funding has been used up and develop the activities further in line with changing conditions, where the emphasis is not on casting the solution to a problem in a structure but rather the creation of the ability to solve a problem, i.e. the ability to dynamically and actively adapt or align a structure so that it remains fit for purpose without continued third-party funding [funding created under a project/funding programme].[3]

Internal sustainability is thus present when the project implementer continues the measures or partial measures of the (former) pilot project, and staff working on the pilot project or for the implementing organisation gained learning experiences (positive or negative) during the pilot project phase and can apply or consider what they learned in their current work.

"External sustainability" takes in two aspects of external diffusion of innovation. These are 'disseminator effects' which ensue when project impacts and project-related learning experiences go beyond the scope of the original project (e.g. through further-trained staff or enhanced working materials) and 'model effects' created when the structures and services created by the project become a model for other organisations and are disseminated in the form of context-adapted copies.[4]

External sustainability thus occurs when the measures or sub-measures of the (former) pilot project are continued by other implementers or (positive or negative) learning experiences gained with the (former) pilot project are picked up by other individuals and organisations. In the "Live Democracy!" programme and its predecessor programmes, 'sustainability' and strategies to promote sustainability are described differently for the local action plans, pilot projects and counselling networks funded so far. In the area of pilot projects, as opposed to the other programme areas, external sustainability was not a downstream aim but rather a central goal. The aim was to develop needs-based working approaches and methodologies to promote democratic attitudes and actions, which include addressing right-wing extremism, group-focused enmity and antisemitism. This requires that the (expert/specialist/subject-related) learning experiences gained with pilot projects are transferred and used. By way of contrast, the central sustainability goal of the measures contained in the local action plans and

. . . .

[3]   Stockmann, Reinhard (1992): Die Nachhaltigkeit von Entwicklungsprojekten. Eine Methode zur Evaluierung am Beispiel von Berufsbildungsprojekten. 2., rev. ed. Wiesbaden.

[4]   Ibid.

counselling networks fell in the category of internal sustainability (local-level structures and networks), although external sustainability effects were also evident where the structures created and the strategies developed were integrated into municipally-regulated structures and strategies.

The "Cohesion through Participation" programme ensures sustainability in that the sponsored projects support the volunteers and employees in such organisations and associations which form the core of voluntary engagement with nation-wide or broad-based regional impact, including in rural and structurally weak regions. The members of the organisations and associations who are promoted in this way are given the opportunity to develop, implement and adopt lastingly effective approaches to promote democratic participation and prevent extremism in organisational structures.

In implementing the programme, counselling structures and communication processes are established and enhanced in the sponsored organisations to enable timely, professional responses to discriminatory and anti-democratic behaviours. For this purpose, the associations and clubs provide access to effective internal and external training and advisory services, and promote their further development. In the funded organisations, structures and work processes are developed in such a way that acceptance and enforcement of equal opportunity and equality are both increased and enhanced.

This has enabled a sustainable ESF-Federal Government programme, "XENOS – Integration and Diversity", to be implemented so that the innovative approaches taken in the action area of "intercultural openness and awareness to topics involving cultural diversity in the learning environments of companies and public administrations" have flowed into the design of the guidelines for the new area of sponsoring pilot projects for "engagement and diversity in the

working and business world" contained in the Federal Government's "Live Democracy!" programme run by the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ).

Since 2014, the exit projects run under the XENOS special programme "Exit to Entry" and the "EXIT Initiative" have been integrated into the BMFSFJ programme to prevent right-wing extremism, i.e. projects are funded (not with ESF funding) which are primarily designed to encourage young right-wing extremists to leave the scene.

In addition, the jobs market-based approaches used in the XENOS "Integration and Diversity" and "Leave to Stay" programmes, and the "Integration through Exchange" programme were further developed and promoted in the new ESF funding period 2014 to 2020 as a separate, stand-alone action area in the "Federal ESF Integration Directive" using ESF funds and federal funds provided by the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (BMAS).

Against this backdrop, Section 2 of this report describes the federal funding programmes run by the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) since 2013 and outlines the key results achieved. It must, however, be remembered that the current Federal Government programme "Live Democracy!" has just reached the half-way stage, so that the experiences and results can only be presented in the form of an initial status report. Section 3 is dedicated to the "Cohesion through Participation" funding programme launched in 2010 by the Federal Ministry of the Interior (BMI) in conjunction with the Federal Government Commissioner for the New Federal States. Section 4 then sets out the opportunities for programme implementation and, based on experience gained to date, provides recommendations for future federal policy measures.

2 Programmes run by the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth

This report focuses on the federal programmes to prevent extremism and promote democracy in place since 2013. Both the structure of these programmes and their content are, in addition to altered societal challenges in this area, also a response to the experiences gained from the predecessor programmes. Against this backdrop, the current and predecessor programmes along with the experiences gained from both are described in brief.

The funding periods for the BMFSFJ-operated federal programmes to prevent extremism and promote democracy from 2007 to 2010 were shaped by the fact that there were two completely separate programmes: the "kompetent. für Demokratie – Beratungsnetzwerke gegen Rechts-extremismus" counselling networks programme to counter right-wing extremism and the "VIELFALT TUT GUT. Jugend für Vielfalt, Toleranz und Demokratie" youth programme for diversity, tolerance and democracy.[5]

The "kompetent. für Demokratie" counselling networks programme to counter right-wing extremism focused on the transfer and testing of the mobile counselling services initially developed under the federal programme "Civitas" in eastern Germany across all German Länder (states). Land-specific coordination units were also established in all German states. In most cases, these were attached to a state agency and were tasked with operative and strategic management of the counselling work. Another new addition came in the form of the Land-wide implementation of initial contact points for people seeking advice and of (counselling) networks with a minimum 50 percent participation by stakeholders from civil society. The aim was to foster the establishment and expansion of a counselling infrastructure across all German states to provide short-term, crisis-related counselling measures that could be used in dealing with right-wing extremism, group-focused enmity and antisemitism.

5   See: https://www.demokratie-leben.de/bundesprogramm/weitere-programme-und-initiativen/abgeschlossene-programme-und-initiativen.html.

The results of the scientific monitoring and evaluation show[6] that in terms of achieving their goals, the vast majority of those receiving counselling and advice saw the counselling processes to be successful, whereby regional integration and staffing continuity were seen as especially important in achieving the desired result. Given the associated empowerment of civil society achieved, the counselling service was seen as a successful preventive approach.

The "VIELFALT TUT GUT" youth programme for diversity, tolerance and democracy was characterised by the programme's Local Action Plans (LAP) and Pilot Projects pillars. Under the LAP pillar, a new action approach was tried, which is to become to be established using long-term strategies to strengthen democratic civil society at a local level, and potentially in municipalities with specific development needs and in structurally weak rural regions. As key structural elements, leading municipal authorities and (internal) coordination units and monitoring committees were established with strong participation by civil society stakeholders. The largely structure-establishing measures aimed for by the programme, which aimed to implement democracy-promoting structures such as the monitoring committees and the coordination units at municipal and district level, were for the most part well implemented in all LAPs, thus contributing to democracy and tolerance development and to the prevention of right-wing extremism and group-focused enmity at local level. The LAPs suffered, however, in that they were implemented as projects, thus making it difficult to embed them in terms of strategy and conception. As a result, over the course of the programme a continuum arose between LAPs which were (as yet) unable to achieve (sufficient) structural sustainability and LAPs which succeeded in establishing (extensive) sustainable structures.

Especially noteworthy services performed by the LAPs include the growth in knowledge concerning local/regional problems, greater cooperation between civil society and municipal stakeholders, the creation, stabilisation and expansion of thematic networks, and raising local-level awareness.

Under the pilot projects pillar, four thematic clusters (TCs) were created whose content and focus concentrate on best-practice testing of action approaches:

• TC1: Dealing with historical and modern-day antisemitism

• TC2: Working with young people vulnerable to right-wing extremist ideals, including with parental involvement

• TC3: Prevention and educational offers for the immigration society

• TC4: Early intervention and prevention

In these thematic clusters, measures aimed at prevention were implemented, which for the most part targeted changes in personal attitudes and behaviours. Where this involved educational measures, further development of the institutional structures involved was taken into account.

With regard to the content of the pilot projects, it can be reported that despite certain difficulties a range of innovative methods and approaches were developed, and that these in turn led to valuable contributions to right-wing extremism prevention.

. . . .

6   For more on the findings of the programme evaluation, see: https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/vielfalt/PEAbschluss-bericht2010.pdf; http://www.dji.de/ueber-uns/projekte/projekte/programmevaluation-vielfalt-tut-gut-und-kompetent-fuer-demokratie.html.

All pilot projects followed strategies – albeit in different, context-related ways – to ensure a lasting effect. However, the findings concerning aspects of perpetuation in the implementing organisation (internal sustainability) are more specific than those for transfer and diffusion of knowledge and concepts (external sustainability).

Among the project implementers, offers involving seminars and project days, tours and exhibitions, further education and training were established on a lasting basis. In most cases, however, the offers developed were not in line with the original project scope, among other things because adequate further financing could not be secured. Also, reference was made to learning experiences and an altered thematic relevance within the implementing organisation, and to topic-specific further training of employees who were not directly involved.

With regard to transfer and diffusion, it is evident that at the time the survey was conducted in 2011, the transfer of entire models into regulatory structures was (still) relatively rare. The approaches and/or methods developed for approximately one in two pilot projects were continued at least in part by other organisations. This largely involved the publication of documentation for all sponsored projects, most of which contained the collected (learning) experiences and findings and/or presentations on related (participant-produced) products. And for almost all projects various forms of conventional public relations work were used (such as flyers, press releases, newsletters and informational e-mails). Given the diverse materials and methods which evolved, the numerous requests for project-specific materials and speakers, and the high number of training courses provided, the disseminator effect also played an important role.

On the whole, the pilot projects funded under "VIELFALT TUT GUT" had lasting effects. This primarily involved dissemination of results and experiences, both internally and externally. In many cases, the measures or parts of the measures developed for the pilot projects are continued – mostly internally but also externally through third-party efforts. With regard to the continuation of (parts of) measures, great differences were evident between the various thematic clusters, whereby projects involving antisemitism were particularly successful in this regard. Looking at external continuation, rather poor dissemination was seen in respect of early intervention and prevention when it came to internal continuation and work with young people vulnerable to right-wing extremist ideals.

A key prerequisite for sustainability lies in securing follow-on funding. Depending on the thematic cluster concerned, different levels of success where achieved in funding acquisition (both for co-financing and follow-on funding). Looking at the funding sources according to thematic cluster, it is evident that it was easier to obtain inhouse funding or participant contributions for antisemitism projects. For the other thematic clusters, participant contributions played only a subordinate role or even no role at all. Land-specific funding was largely used for antisemitism projects and in work with young people vulnerable to right-wing extremist ideals. Federal funding was also obtained for work with young people vulnerable to right-wing extremist ideals and for prevention and educational programmes. Municipalities mostly provided follow-on funding for early intervention and prevention projects, something which could be explained by the fact that the projects were conducted in the elementary education sector which falls within municipal authority responsibility.

What is clear is that in overall programme practice, project implementation was broader-based than the targets set out in the guidelines. Practitioners and project implementers used the available scope for action to tackle local challenges and develop effective solutions.

2.1 Challenges and development potential

The following challenges were identified in the course of the programme monitoring and evaluation activities:

- While in many LAPs young adults were involved in the project as participants, they did not play an active, structuring role in terms of the LAP strategy and substantive design. Overall, too great a focus was placed on eastern German regions, while other affected regions were not adequately considered.

- It was evident that the goal of achieving broad involvement in the LAP of different groups/ representatives from civil society remained intact. There was room for improvement in terms of broad participation by and involvement of citizens and local influencers. The creation of new networks, especially those involving a broad civil society contingent, was seen to have developmental potential.

- In the programme area of pilot projects, problems were evident when it came to reaching the target-group in the thematic cluster involving work with young people vulnerable to right-wing extremist ideals. Youths with (ingrained) right-wing tendencies were hardly reached at all. With regard to the thematic cluster prevention and educational programmes for the immigration society, the approaches of intercultural learning/inter-ethnic exchange appeared too general and thus harboured too little potential. In educational work involving antisemitism, it was recommended that greater attention be paid to the need to also work with target groups in the immigration society who have no or a very different relationship to the holocaust. Topical focus should also be tightened in early intervention and prevention.

- For both programme areas covered by the federal programme "VIELFALT TUT GUT", it was noted that the focus was largely placed on creating robust external structures.

- Another finding was that the promotion of the various action approaches in two programmes (among other things because of different departmental allocations) hindered systematic exchange or at least made it difficult, for example in identifying joint action areas, consolidating resources and improving specialist work.

2.2 The "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE" and "STRENGTHENING DEMOCRACY INITIATIVE" programmes

2.2.1 "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE"

The federal programme "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE" (2011–2014)[7] integrated the prevention approaches contained in the Federal Government's two predecessor programmes in order to achieve greater mutual encouragement for exchange and create greater synergies between the various prevention and action approaches contained in the programme's local action plans, counselling networks and pilot projects pillars. The existing action approaches were further developed, with new topics and components being added.[8]

Of particular relevance for the "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE" LAPs was that a pre-implementation phase of several months was planned, which included a situation and resource analysis that was then used to define strategic goals for the LAPs. It was only then that thematically appropriate, smaller-scale projects to promote democracy and prevent right-wing extremism were eventually implemented. Strategic aspects thus played a significantly greater role.

For existing LAPs, the focus was placed on sustainable components and specific tasks, such as integration into municipal development plans, active involvement of local industry and business, and the constant reduction of funding allocations with parallel increases in organisations' own contributions. When selecting the new LAP regions, care was given to achieve a balanced regional (east-west) distribution throughout Germany. As the "VIELFALT TUT GUT" programme had been criticised for placing too great a focus on regions in eastern Germany, care was taken to ensure adequate consideration of affected municipalities and rural districts in western Germany (based on the relative size/area of the Länder, the statistics on politically motivated crime and the Königssteiner Schlüssel – a system by which joint funding responsibilities are divided among the Länder).

With regard to the LAPs, the (further) establishment of local coordination units, municipal authority networks and monitoring committees in the funded municipalities, rural districts and public authority associations focused on capacity building to improve collaboration, and on coordination processes between civil society and state actors. With the established structures, integrated strategies aligned to local needs were developed, proposed and implemented to tackle right-wing extremism, group-focused enmity and antisemitism, strengthen democratic values, and foster tolerance and respect.

. . . .

7   See: https://www.toleranz-foerdern-kompetenz-staerken.de/.

8   For more on the findings of the programme evaluation, see: https://www.dji.de/ueber-uns/projekte/projekte/programmevaluation-toleranz-foerdern-kompetenz-staerken.html.

The key areas for action in the various LAPs were largely dependent on the problems to be tackled at local level, and also on existing state and non-state structures. In the course of programme implementation, the following strategy types were identified for the new LAPs: Public Opposition (Type 1), Democratic Participation (Type 2), Civil Education and Information (Type 3) and Promoting Intercultural Coexistence (Type 4). Based on the strategy types identified, it was shown, that for the most part, the action areas contained in these LAPs focused on promoting democracy and fostering democratic structures. To a certain extent, the LAPs also contained thematic priorities concerning local-level prevention of right-wing extremism. Here, it was initially thought that the LAPs were only partly suited to acute, localised incidents of right-wing extremist phenomena. It was only as programme activities were fully underway that further progress was made in this area and local-level self-help capacities were improved.

The various LAP projects mainly targeted children and young people, focusing on their democratic activities. The projects largely involved democracy and tolerance education, and strengthening democratic civil society. A small number of projects involved measures to tackle right-wing extremist aspirations among young people. It must be noted, however, that not all LAPs actually encountered right-wing extremist problems.

The actual contributions made by the LAPs in promoting democracy and preventing right-wing extremism primarily involved information and awareness-building, topic-specific compe-tence-building and activation of key local actors, improvement of disseminators' and influencers' knowledge base concerning democracy-friendly attitudes, processes and structures, and the design of participative processes. In addition, they played a key role in enhancing the quality of thematic approaches to promote tolerance and democracy,

prevent right-wing extremism, boost situational knowledge regarding local right-wing extremist structures, improve public positioning of local actors and institutions whose work focuses on promoting diversity and preventing racism, and increase the response and mobilisation capacities of local actors in tackling right-wing extremism. Programme actors also cite other contributions in the form of stronger networks between public authorities and civil society resulting in faster coordination of measures to prevent right-wing extremism and mobilisation of a greater mass of people for such activities, with the aim of forcing right-wing extremists out of the public realm.

In terms of sustainability, by the end of 2013, 60 per cent of the LAPs from the predecessor programme were seen to have lasting effects and 40 per cent had at least a medium-level degree of sustainability. Particular progress was seen in the areas of structure retention and sustainability in goal-setting and relevance retention. Only with regard to transfer to administrative structures were comparably few new LAPs seen to be sustainable. The experience shows that sustainable development is not solely reliant on securing the availability of funding but also on the availability of concrete plans to secure the existence of coordination units, public authority networks and/or monitoring committees for the medium term.

Under the pilot projects pillar, the findings and experience gained with "VIELFALT TUT GUT" led to a significant change in thematic focus. The following thematic clusters (TCs) were applied:

• TC1: Dealing with historic and current anti-semitism in the integration society: integrative approaches for use with target groups

• TC2: Dealing with right-wing extremist-oriented young people: tightening the defini-tion of the target group

- TC3: Coexistence in the integration society: processing ethnicised conflict

- TC4: Dealing with diversity and difference in early childhood education and primary education: testing diversity approaches

The contributions made in the pilot project area covered prevention-oriented (and competence-related) promotional work with the respective target groups. In this area, innovative educational strategies in predetermined thematic areas were also tested and associated learning experiences were triggered. In this way, identified service gaps and developmental needs were addressed in non-school programmes for children, adolescents and young adults in the area of educational prevention of right-wing extremism, group-focused enmity and antisemitism, and democracy promotion, and new action approaches were tested and disseminated.

The offers were designed to change personal attitudes and actions, focusing on promoting democracy by strengthening democratic competencies and structures. This was particularly evident in the area of early childhood education and primary education. At the same time, the thematic cluster involving work with right-wing extremist-oriented young people – an area not covered by the predecessor programmes – was introduced which expressly focused on secondary and tertiary-level prevention.

In the pilot projects, target group-specific goals were set which tended to differ in terms of whether work would be conducted with young people or with educational staff. In work conducted directly with young people, many of the projects either communicated knowledge to prevent certain attitudes or stop them from becoming ingrained, or aimed to achieve change in the direction of young people distancing themselves from right-wing extremist and

group-focused enmity attitudes. In work conducted with young disseminators and with adult educational staff, reflection on one's own attitudes and the acquisition of specific abilities/powers to act played a greater role, for example to develop confidence in dealing (appropriately) with prejudice or with right-wing extremist-oriented young people – whereby the communication of knowledge played a central role in the work conducted with this target group.

In the other thematic clusters, acquisition of abilities among the respective target groups also played a central role, for example in the form of communicating a respectful attitude to diversity and difference, and developing the necessary coping skills.

The innovative areas of relevance in preventing antisemitism involved giving reasonable consideration to the diverse family background-related attitudes regarding the holocaust and also to links with Jewish culture and society in Germany and the State of Israel. In addition, the various roles of the (collective) historical memory of the national socialist era for various target groups with and without migration backgrounds posed a new challenge, especially as regards educational work with groups of differing origins.

Approaches were also tried and tested in work conducted in mostly gender, ethnic and culturally-homogeneous settings (e.g. work with girls and young women or mainly with Muslim youths). In particular, the work conducted in homogeneous settings comprising young people with migrant backgrounds proved to be an innovative development area in dealing with current antisemitism trends, which apart from the challenges involved also demonstrated promising potential.

In implementing the project activities involving prevention in dealing with right-wing extremism-oriented young people, it was again evident

that gaining access to the target group proved difficult and as a result, the intended measures for targeted prevention could not always be implemented as planned. These access difficulties were in most cases tackled in a proactive way, with tried and tested alternative approaches being used, for example, by working with 'natural' groups (such as school classes and sports club groups). These were, however, heterogeneous groups in terms of their political orientation, which meant that the offers almost inevitably took the form of primary prevention. Other projects circumvented the access problem by focusing more on work with disseminators, whereby it was assumed that these would then work directly with right-wing extremism-oriented youths.

When implementing the thematic area of prevention in the immigration society, specific conflict solution strategies were tested and communicated. Approaches were also tried which brought the various ethnic and migrant groups and milieus together in constructive, de-escalating dialogue. In addition to conflict solution skills, other social and intercultural skills were communicated and taught. In this work, attempts were made to improve the target groups' willingness and ability to participate and offer them greater opportunities to become involved – the aim being to achieve appropriate attitudes to segregation and prevent or at least alleviate socio-spatial conflict.

In the thematic area of diversity, a number of projects focused on early intervention and prevention in the organisational development of pre-schools/kindergartens and primary schools. New ways of promoting democracy for the as yet poorly-reached target group of six- to twelve-year-olds were tested and existing diversity approaches were enhanced to include the 'social origin' dimension.

On the whole, it can be said that of the pilot projects almost all were designed to promote democratic attitudes among their respective target

groups and to break down prevailing group-focused enmity and prevent them from becoming ingrained. By way of contrast, less importance was placed on breaking down or preventing decidedly right-wing extremist attitudes from becoming ingrained.

Once the programme had been completed, most of the pilot projects had been successful in embedding the tried and tested measures or partial measures in the implementing organisations' structures to ensure they could be continued beyond the project lifecycle. Significant differences were, however, evident relative to the thematic cluster involved.

As seen with the pilot projects implemented as part of the "VIELFALT TUT GUT" programme, in the "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE" programme it was evident that in the thematic clusters with a broad-based target group and a prevention approach, municipal funds (such as from the pre-school sector) or Land-specific funds (particularly funds from Länder education ministries) could be used to secure the long-term continuation of programme measures and activities. As a result, the most successful efforts in terms of embedding project-specific measures for the long term took place in the thematic clusters involving coexistence in the integration society and dealing with diversity and difference in early childhood education and primary education. By way of contrast, this was far less frequently reported for the thematic cluster dealing with historical and modern-day antisemitism and especially for the thematic cluster dealing with right-wing extremism-oriented young people, which at minimum indicates less continuation potential for more 'volatile' topics and for projects with more specific target groups. Another key programme perpetuation aspect was seen in employees who were trained as part of the pilot projects remaining with the implementing organisations.

There were only few reports of (components of) pilot projects (model effects) by other organisations at the end of the programme in summer 2014. Nonetheless, there was evidence of concept and methodology transfer into regular practice. Among other things, the counselling programme for parents of right-wing extremism-oriented young people which was developed during the project lifecycle was taken up and implemented by other organisations. There was also evidence of broad dissemination effects: a large number of child and youth welfare workers and/or school teachers who received training as part of the programme measures used their newly acquired knowledge in their everyday work. In addition, project contents were transferred via training curricula into the existing structures of child and youth welfare work and also into school education.

In sum, it is possible to report that in many cases, the pilot projects were able to encourage child and youth welfare services to integrate the programme topics more (intensively) into their regular practices. This occurred for the most part through awareness-building and further training of staff who up to that point had rarely had to deal from an educational perspective with right-wing extremism, group-focused enmity and antisemitism (disseminator effect).

It was equally effective that project implementers retained staff trained as part of the pilot project. This enabled the learning experiences gained in implementing the pilot projects not only to flow into implementation and further development of the respective measures but also to be passed on to other staff and thus disseminated further.

In the programme area involving counselling networks, a quality development process was implemented and, in addition to their coordination activities, the Land-based coordination units assumed responsibility for Land-wide transfer of experience and information. Based on actual needs, the mobile counselling service was expanded to provide support in times of 'crisis'. Also, the various Länder were required to establish services to provide specialised victim counselling and support (for comparison purposes, six Länder as of 2011). In 2014, the programme area was expanded in all German states to include the establishment and implementation of services involving distancing and exit work (Rex).

Although all German Länder had mobile counselling services, coordination units and networks in place in 2010, these differed in terms of their level of development and quality; among other things because some Länder had started creating services and structures as part of the "kompetent. für Demokratie" programme in 2009. This was evident due to the heterogeneous nature of their guiding principles, concepts and the content of their work. The quality assurance process used in the federal programme enabled the Länder to engage in nationwide (clarifying) exchange. As a result, fundamental work definitions were agreed, for example with regard to what constitutes counselling and a 'case'. The quality development (QD) process fostered discourse on self-perception, thus causing all German states to review their structures and functions (structural and role-definition processes) in respect of their suitability/usefulness and robustness/sustainability. This in turn resulted in restructuring or reorganisation activities in some places. The quality development processes also helped in boosting the robustness of established networking structures and counselling practices. Using the specially-developed manuals and the self-assessment reports, the QD processes introduced in the German states were used on an ongoing basis. Quality officers were nominated or quality circles established; several Länder also implemented permanent quality assurance-related networks.

There was also evidence that between 2012 and 2014, the models tested in the Länder to establish specialised victim counselling services had achieved only limited success. In particular, attempts to integrate them into existing (voluntary) victim counselling services failed because the low-threshold level needed and the pro-active, outreach approach could not be implemented which meant that the target group could not be reached. At the end of the project lifecycle, seven German Länder had introduced specialised services with adequate staffing and resources. In three other Länder, such services were in place but did not have the resources needed or were unable to (adequately) implement the standards needed to reach the target group.

With quality development in the Land-based counselling networks and the associated counselling services, federal programme funding helped to improve the structural resources to make professional counselling services available on an as-needed basis (and also beyond) to assist individuals and institutions in dealing with stress situations related to right-wing extremism. It is also worthy of note that in isolated cases some of the instruments and processes developed as part of the QD processes, and also quality development expertise, were successfully transferred to other (social) areas of work (e.g. welfare and youth associations). Transfer of the advisory and other field expertise gained under the programme (especially knowledge and action skills gained by the counsellors) did not occur in a targeted way but as a side effect of cases where (counselling) specialists went to work in other fields. The nationwide establishment of the exit and distancing work, begun in 2014 as part of the counselling networks, has helped to expand the scope of impact of the counselling infrastructures by designing and establishing suitable approaches (which up to that point were few and far between) for use in working with right-wing extremism-oriented young adults or those at risk of becoming involved in such groups.

In the programme area involving counselling networks, the various components of the Land-specific counselling structures (Land coordination units, counselling services, counselling network structures) have through their coordinating, advisory and other assistance-related activities each helped to promote democratic thinking and behaviour, and prevent right-wing extremism, group-focused enmity and antisemitism. The QD processes also enhanced both capacities and performance of the network structures, especially with regard to democracy promotion, by establishing them as coordinating bodies for democracy-promotion policies in the German states.

Because the counselling networks and the mobile counselling teams promoted both civil society engagement and acceptance-oriented collaboration between state and non-state actors in addressing societal problems, they worked (together) to embed and further develop democratic structures and processes – primarily at local level but also at Länder level. This can serve as a (structural) benchmark for democracy promotion. With regard to local intervention approaches, the specialised victim counselling services also provided an instrument which penetrated local communities. By raising awareness among local population groups to the everyday occurrence of racism and to the needs of marginalised minorities, including promoting the ability to take action and help oneself among this population group, local intervention helped to retain or reconstruct democratic relations in the social sphere.

As a result of the consolidation of the various action approaches into a federal programme, numerous dialogue and cooperation links were created between programme implementers both within and between the various programme areas and to the benefit of everyone involved. External factors such as similar target groups and thematic areas, perceived structural similarities and spatial proximity were seen to be beneficial. Prerequisites

for collaboration include knowledge of a pro-gramme's internal and external actors and structures in the respective action area, planned occasions for collaboration and consultative programme stakeholders.

The experience gained with this particular programme also highlighted the level of *diversity and methodological plurality* needed in preventing extremism and promoting democracy among young people, and that such activities must take place and be linked across all federal levels.

2.2.2   The "STRENGTHENING DEMOCRACY INITIATIVE" programme

While the "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE" programme focused on the phenomenon of right-wing extremism, in 2010 the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) launched a second, far smaller-scale, first-of-its-kind pro-gramme which focused on preventing left-wing extremism and Islamic extremism.

The aim of the federal programme "STRENGTH-ENING DEMOCRACY INITIATIVE"[9] was to promote and (further) develop preventive educa-tional practices in the as yet largely unaddressed phenomena of left-wing extremism and Islamic extremism. Its main focus was placed on develop-ing and testing educational strategies concerning the preliminary stages in the emergence or stabilisation of problematic tendencies. In addi-tion to offers designed to strengthen young people in their attempts to reject extremist notions, the idea was to reach those for whom certain risk constellations could be assumed or who had already adopted extremist ideals. Other target

groups included actors in the social sphere such as employees in religious centres, the police and those involved in youth socialisation. This latter group involved individuals such as parents, nursery school staff, teachers and disseminators who had access to young people and served as central socialisation bodies, and who, for this reason, could play an important role in imple-menting prevention work. In practice, a need for further development was seen in three areas:

- Educational projects with young people
- Socio-spatial approaches
- Work with actors involved in socialisation

During the programme's lifecycle, a total of 22 pilot projects were funded on the topic of Islamic extremism and 14 on left-wing extremism. Another two cross-thematic pilot projects were also sponsored. In addition, funding was also provided for research projects designed to create and expand the scientific basis needed to conduct educational work.

During their implementation, these projects were fraught with political controversy. Although they were designed as an additional, independent programme, it was feared that they would have the effect of playing down right-wing extremism. But what had even greater consequences in terms of specialism and practice was that in contrast to the phenomenon of right-wing extremism – for which not only long-standing, differentiated practical experience, pilot programmes operated at federal level but also broad-based research findings were available – not even a remotely similar basis existed for the two other project phenomena. Any and all experience gained with this programme thus had to be considered against the backdrop that it has meant exploring new territory for all involved.[10]

. . . .

9   For more on the findings of the programme evaluation, see: https://www.dji.de/ueber-uns/projekte/projekte/wissenschaftliche-begleitung-der-initiative-demokratie-staerken.html.

10   On the following: Leistner, Alexander/Schau, Katja/Johansson, Susanne (2014): Gesamtbericht der wissenschaftlichen Begleitung des Bundesprogramms "INITIATIVE DEMOKRATIE STÄRKEN" Berichtszeitraum (reporting period) 01.01.2011–31.12.2014, p. 87ff. Available at: https://www.dji.de/ueber-uns/projekte/projekte/wissenschaftliche-begleitung-der-initiative-demokratie-staerken/projekt-publikationen.html.

Against this backdrop, the pilot projects faced the challenge of assessing how the new content could be applied and how methodologies and educational processes from other work areas could be adapted for use in dealing with the new phenomena. The search efforts were thus made easier in some respects in that there was a majority consensus among the (specialist) public with regard to the need to tackle the problem of Islamic extremism. This consensus grew during the course of the programme in response to current events (the "Lies!-Aktion" (Read It!) campaign which saw Salafists distributing copies of the Koran in public places, the Syrian exodus, and support for ISIS activities among groups of Muslim youths). And there was another challenge which came in the form of the polarised perceptions of Islam in the public sphere and the at times over-exaggerated problematisation of Islamic developments and the need to reflect on the associated social polarisations and polarisation risks. Due to the scepticism shown towards the prevention programme by some Muslim communities, differentiated problem descriptions and stigmatisation-sensitive problem management were needed.

This was the starting point from which the projects funded under the programme addressed Islamic extremism in their problem descriptions and educational practice in a variety of ways and to varying degrees. Looking at the ways individual problems were approached, the projects largely moved along a continuum between direct reference to the programme-prescribed, predetermined object (Islamic extremism) and modification (to varying degrees) of the same. Three fundamental positions were evident: there were projects which adopted Islamic extremism as a problem category and thus aimed at researching or taking an educational approach to specific risk constellations in relation to radicalisation. This group did not include projects which expanded the problem category of Islamic extremism to take

in Islamophobia/Muslimophobia and assumed mutual effects between Islamophobia and radicalisation and radicalism. Along with the assumed interaction, project implementers assigned an element of responsibility for the problem to the majority society. A third group of projects distanced themselves in their problem description from the object of Islamic extremism and focused instead on topics such as Islam, prejudice, and segregation without creating any direct link to the actual prevention objective of the federal programme. These default positions along with the profiles of the respective implementing organisations formed a close link with the project identities and the goal of the intended educational work: around one half of the projects aimed their educational work at prevention in its strictest sense, meaning that they wanted to prevent or reduce (further) problematic developments with regard to Islamic radicalisation. The other half focused more on building capacities and resources for use in dealing with the challenges involved in a complex immigration society.

In order to implement a topic-related approach to Islamic extremism and conduct target group-specific educational work with Muslim youths, it became evident – from the learning experience gained through the projects – that knowledge of the environments in which Muslim youths and young adults live is vital. The more the projects demanded that the educational work directly address Islamic extremism, the more necessary it became for the specialists involved to possess a sound ability to recognise Islamic extremist ideals. The ability to differentiate between liberal, conservative and Islamic interpretations, along with knowledge of the diversity of Islamic movements, ideologies and actors, is a fundamental requirement in well-founded thematic discourse; it enables indiscriminate perceptions of "the real/true" Islam, not least among Muslim or Islam-oriented youths.

In the field of disseminator training to build their awareness to manifestations of Islamic extremism, it was found that *stronger links to children and young people* were required. For educational staff, this was helpful in gaining an overview of the heterogeneous complexities in young people's motivation to adopt Islamic/Salafist ideologies and join associated groups. It was also vital that educational staff develop awareness for the fluidity of tendencies in teenage years. It appeared to make sense, and for many reasons, for specialists who had no real knowledge of Islam and Islamic extremism, to reflect on their own attitudes to the complex topic of Islam in Germany.

With regard to the target group reached by the programme, it must be noted that work with youths with an affinity with Islam or who were already ideologised only occurred in isolated cases. There were some projects which, especially in heterogeneous settings (such as school classrooms), also reached radicalised youths and those at risk of radicalisation. The vast majority of projects addressed the large group of non-radicalised Muslim youth.

With regard to access to Muslim target groups, there were also differences which were linked to the respective action areas of religious and non-religious project implementers/organisations and their various options for collaboration. Islamic organisations appeared predestined to reach Muslim youths; however, experience has shown that due to the fragmented nature of Islam (e.g. segregation into Sunnites and Shiites and differing schools of law), they rarely reached youths beyond their organisational borders. For non-religious organisations, collaboration with mosque associations or schools with a high proportion of Muslim youths was a prerequisite for gaining access to the target group. Collaboration with Islamic communities was often made difficult due to structural asymmetries and also due to distrust towards the prevention aims of the federal programme. Some project implementers felt that visible religiousness on the part of the educational staff was helpful in obtaining access to and conducting educational work with Islam-oriented and/or ideologised youths.

With regard to the educational approaches, the scientific monitoring and evaluation showed that within the programme area there were significant differences regarding the degree of project testing, which was of great relevance in terms of pilot projects. A large number of projects used mostly tried and tested youth education approaches – such as those used in intercultural learning – and did not include adequate educational appraisal of their programmes. Even where the respective projects applied good educational practice, little knowledge was gained with regard to preventing Islamic extremism.

By way of contrast, a small number of projects implemented educational activities, related to the programme component Islamic extremism, which were of a strong exploratory nature. They used various settings, for example, to test (new) modules for preventive educational work in the field of Islam and Islamic extremism in Germany, and/or developed new approaches for use in discussing Islamic extremism. The learning experiences gained with these innovative projects are especially valuable in terms of the intended promotion of child and youth welfare work involving prevention strategies that target Islamic extremism. Despite the initial approaches which directly addressed Islamic extremism, there remains a great need for (further) development and testing in this field. For example, the federal programme contained no projects involving deradicalisation work. It was thus recommended that in the future more intensified exploratory measures be adopted when it comes to gaining access to and performing educational work with radicalised youths.

At the end of the pilot project funding period, all project implementers demonstrated a high level of interest in continuing to work in the programme area involved: there was (for the most part) a consensus that prevention work involving Islamic extremism, Islamophobia/Muslimophobia and conflict in the immigration society continues to be of great importance. This perceived need went hand in hand with a similar view of the problem among policymakers and the general public. With regard to their perpetuation attempts and strategies, great differences were evident between the various projects: while one group of project implementers wanted to continue working on the focus topic but had not developed any real strategies or methodologies for such continuation, most project implementers planned to continue or had already begun implementing the programmes and educational strategies developed and tested during the pilot project phase. A third group involved project implementers who wanted to continue with the thematic work but modify the educational strategy. This is partly the result of changes involving the target group but where the existing long-term and overarching project goals were largely retained (e.g. prevention of Islamic extremism). For projects in this group, a high degree of willingness for reflection and innovation was evident in terms of the educational approach.

The transfer of (partial) models, educational knowledge and methodologies, in other words the transfer of project-related learning experiences to external individuals and institutions, was achieved with most projects via presentations at expert seminars and/or by passing on products, such as handouts and educational modules. In some projects, the specially-developed products were used for public relations work and to advertise the projects themselves.

The implementation experience gained in the programme area involving left-wing extremism,[11] and also in scientific debates, showed that the need for a nationwide programme area for the prevention of left-wing extremism among young people was a controversial issue. Problematic phenomena such as confrontational violence and violence-based protests focused on local, largely urban groups of radicalised left-wing extremists. At the same time, the term left-wing extremism also caused significant difficulties in implementing educational work and with regard to public acceptance. This meant that access to target groups was either blocked, or at least hindered, and that no thought had been given to scaling up and perpetuation. Some pilot projects in this programme area were able to achieve transfers and further define the category of left-wing extremism. At the forefront of these activities were defining problematic phenomena such as militant protests and/or left-wing extremism-associated youth cultures. These transfers were accompanied by attempts to further define and demarcate the component of educational work, and in many cases, as a key take-away, to detract from its explosive nature.

As part of the "STRENGTHENING DEMOCRACY INITIATIVE" programme, some pilot projects developed prevention approaches with strong thematic or target-group focus. For example, they used elaborated 'scene' discourses on topics such as Israel-related antisemitism and developed formats to foster self-education processes within anti-imperialist groups via disseminators. Other projects developed approaches to reach 'leftist' youths via youth clubs in left-wing districts and involve them in political educational processes, or to interact with autonomous groups.

. . . .

11   On the following: Leistner, Alexander/Schau, Katja/Johansson, Susanne (2014): Gesamtbericht der wissenschaftlichen Begleitung des Bundesprogramms "INITIATIVE DEMOKRATIE STÄRKEN" Berichtszeitraum 01.01.2011–31.12.2014, p. 141ff. Available at: https://www.dji.de/ueber-uns/projekte/projekte/wissenschaftliche-begleitung-der-initiative-demokratie-staerken/projekt-publikationen.html.

From the perspective of scientific monitoring and evaluation, these approaches have the potential to further test the instruments developed for use in reaching target groups and also in the educational work in topic-specific, highly-politicised settings, and to develop them further and fine-tune them to help bring them to maturity and put their transferability, for example to other local contexts, to the test. From the experience gained in implementation, it is markedly clear that successful, component-specific prevention work is reliant on comprehensive knowledge of the scene in question, sound substantive knowledge of scene-typical and to an extent intellectual discourse, as well as reliable access to the young people involved.

Because structures which systematically promote the forging of links between various programme areas and levels had still not become adequately established in the "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE" programme, recommendations were made for further expansion of the necessary contacts, especially at federal level, and for stronger processes for cross-programme area and thematic networking and coordination. Recommendations were also made for nationwide events to be held to stimulate expert dialogue with theme-related programme components and for nationwide meetings of future programme stakeholders.

The analyses of the relationships in standard practice and also in pilot project and LAP-related practice indicate that, with regard to the working area involved, there was a need which had not been met on two counts. There was an obvious lack of a model for basic funding of locally and regionally active civil society organisations in certain working areas such as political (and socio-cultural) education – adult education centres, trade unions, foundations, Land-specific agencies and also the Federal Agency for Civic Education. Also, given their specific goals and working principles, current child and youth welfare structures are less well-suited to adopting such projects. The frequency in which the pilot and LAP projects were funded in schools, including in terms of teaching/curriculum, and for which schools were actively approached, makes it clear that – apart from the opportunity to compensate for the lack of regular funding – there appears to be a particular need for extremism prevention and democracy promotion expertise, which neither schools nor providers of regularly funded (independent and public) youth welfare services are able to meet. This special need stems from the content-related and methodological challenges faced when dealing with right-wing extremism and other democracy-distant, group-focused enmity and human-rights opposing attitudes, and their associated behaviours.

It must also be remembered that for the transfer of concrete results from the pilot projects into everyday practice (pilot project effectiveness), no structured framework was provided under the "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE" programme. There is thus a need for processes of cooperation-based concept and experience dissemination because the measures developed were in some cases services which required a high degree of professionalisation, meaning complex educational knowledge, specific content-related and methodical competence, vast (implementational) experience and the necessary funding and resources. Such measures cannot easily be integrated into existing structures but require instead additional "transfer assistance" which also takes account of the necessary alignment to local conditions and needs. Based on the findings of the monitoring activities, it can be concluded that centralised federal structures and organisations could be a step towards providing some of these services on a permanent basis in order to meet at least some of the demand beyond Länder-specific borders, such as with exit and distancing work.

Despite the progress achieved in the "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE" programme, a further challenge involved improving cooperation between state and non-state actors, and between and within the various state levels to bring them onto an equal footing. The constantly recurring conflicts both within heterogeneous civil society and between civil society and state actors as to how individual manifestations and organised forms of right-wing extremism can and should be dealt with indicate that achieving a coordinated approach in which the stakeholders involved act on equal terms poses a constant challenge. This also means that the actors in the action area must not only exhaust their respective potential but also mutually recognise existing restrictions and attempt to overcome them.

In connection to this reference was made once again to the poor level of proactive involvement of young people and young adults in municipal structures designed to tackle right-wing extremism and promote democracy. Another challenge was seen in achieving greater involvement of local industry and business – and not only in respect of robustness and sustainability.

In the existing advisory fields, the aim was to further develop existing structures and systematically link these with other action plans.

With regard to the action areas of left-wing extremism and Islamic extremism – and against the backdrop of the experience gained – it was recommended that the focal points of the plan be realigned and greater emphasis be given to the aspect of democracy promotion. The need for prevention work cannot be denied, especially in the area of differing variants of violent Islamism. It was, however, a difficult starting point for a federal programme aiming at young Muslims for the first time to be conducted unter the auspices of extremism prevention.

2.3 "Live Democracy!"

2.3.1 The federal programme "Live Democracy!"

With the federal programme "Live Democracy! Active against Right-wing Extremism, Violence and Hate", launched on 1 January 2015 as the successor to "PROMOTE TOLERANCE – ENFORCE COMPETENCE" and the "STRENGTHENING DEMOCRACY INITIATIVE", the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) placed greater focus on promoting democracy and responded in a concerted way to the challenges that right-wing extremism, extremist Islamism, left-wing militancy and other manifestations of group-focused enmity bring. When developing the programme, care was taken to include the underestimated risks involved in right-wing extremist ideologies and actions. The programme also addresses racism and right-wing extremism in a more intensive and effective way.

The specialist approach taken with the federal programme "Live Democracy!" is based on the findings of the scientific monitoring and evaluation of the predecessor programmes, the recommendations contained in the Report of the German Bundestag Second Committee of Enquiry on the NSU Murders (Bundestag Document 17/14600) and those contained in the Report of the Independent Expert Group on Antisemitism – "Antisemitismus in Deutschland – Erscheinungsformen, Bedingungen, Präventionsansätze" (Antisemitism in Germany – Manifestations, Conditions, Preventive Approaches) (Bundestag Document 17/7700). Since 1 January 2015, the federal programme "Live Democracy! Active against Right-wing Extremism, Violence and

Hate" has intensified the work of its predecessor programme with the support of local "Partnerships for Democracy", Federal State Democracy Centres, pilot projects and the promotion of structural development of nationwide NGOs. This also includes the expansion of the programme to take in various manifestations of group-focused enmity. When developing the programme, particular focus was placed on improving collaboration between state actors and heterogeneous civil society, which is involved to the greatest possible extent in the development of measures and in designing ways to foster and ensure social cohesion.

The federal programme "Live Democracy!" takes a holistic approach, focusing on phenomena such as Islamophobia and Muslimophobia, right-wing extremism and left-wing extremism with its associated left-wing militancy on the one hand, and on Islamic extremism on the other. In the first instance, this approach involves cross-phenomena expert exchange between the implementing organisations via the Expert Forum of the federal programme. In addition, networking between implementing organisations and other organisations as well as with state-run institutions such as schools and public authorities (e.g. child and youth welfare) is explicitly welcomed and encouraged.

The experience gained through previous programmes and the demands of the NSU Inquiry Committee were taken up in the re-design of Programme Area A, "Partnerships for Democracy", in the "Live Democracy!" programme. Local action plans were expanded and turned into "Partnerships for Democracy" with the aim of improving the promotion of specialist and coordination units in the municipalities to provide training covering all inequality-based ideologies. In addition, the involvement of young people in local-level democracy work was also promoted by including the development of youth forums in municipal funding and promotion. And for the first time,

processes for democratic participation were prescribed in the form of binding democracy conferences to be held at least once a year.

The development of Federal State Democracy Centres, Programme Area B, also builds on the experience gained with the predecessor programmes and the demands of the NSU Inquiry Committee. Funding and promotion of Democracy Centres for Land-wide coordination and networking as well as mobile victim and exit counselling services enables testing of a whole range of new priority areas: the Federal State Democracy Centres address all anti-democratic phenomena and not just right-wing extremism. They combine intervention and prevention programmes and address specific problems in the various German states. Funding for the Länder and counselling networks was also increased. In addition, the Federal State Democracy Centres forge links between the existing Land-specific programmes to promote democracy and prevent extremism, pilot projects, and municipal "Partnerships for Democracy". They also forge links between measures funded under the federal programme "Cohesion through Participation" and those contained in the Federal Government's "Live Democracy!" programme in the Länder.

Given the tremendous challenges involved in work to prevent extremism and promote democracy, and also the rise in Länder-specific engagement, a different kind of collaboration is additionally planned. Based on the 10-point Joint Declaration issued on 19 July 2016 in connection with the "Live Democracy!" programme, the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth will work more intensively with the Länder ministries responsible for implementing measures under that programme.

In line with the recommendations in the scientific monitoring and evaluation report, in Programme Area C, structural development of nationwide

NGOs, 28 non-state organisations who work throughout the country to promote democracy and prevent right-wing extremism and group-focused enmity, and who each have expertise in a specific thematic and structural field, are to receive support for the first time in professionalising and perpetuating their work. The aim of this model approach to funding provision is the development of structures, dissemination of expert approaches to promote democracy and prevent extremism, and networking between implementing organisations in the respective thematic and structural fields.

In addition to these funding priorities, pilot projects will be used to develop and test innovative approaches for democracy promotion and for prevention activities. The main aim is the further development of educational practice in work performed with children, adolescents and young adults. The Federal Government programme "Live Democracy!" supports pilot projects in Programme Area D, which address selected phenomena of group-focused enmity, such as current forms of antisemitism, antigypsyism, Islamophobia/Muslimophobia and hostility towards homosexuals and transgender individuals. In Programme Area E, "Pilot Projects to Prevent Radicalisation", funding is provided for projects which address right-wing extremism-orientations and activities, violent Islamism and left-wing militancy. In developing the preventing radicalisation themes of violent Islamism and left-wing militancy, the recommendations of the scientific monitoring and evaluation report, made on the basis of the findings from the federal "STRENGHTENING DEMOCRACY INITIATIVE" programme, were taken into account. These had revealed that the definition of the thematic area "left-wing extremism" had led to significant difficulties regarding the target group. The recommendations also called for greater focus to be placed on democracy promotion.

Given the fact that funding was doubled in 2017, under the federal programme "Live Democracy!" both qualitative and quantitative improvements are planned. On the basis of the findings from the scientific monitoring and evaluation report, current studies and research, the BMFSFJ has developed the programme further as part of a participative process. An associated intensive participative process took place between May and November 2016. Following the kick-off at working level with the Federal State Democracy Centres, a symposium was held on the current situation along with a workshop which addressed the need to discuss much-needed further developments in the existing programme areas, identify new thematic areas and include additional target groups. Representatives from various projects funded under the federal programme – from civil society, the science community, the Länder (states) and the security services – were invited to these talks. The approach taken with "Live Democracy!", to include all anti-democracy and group-focused enmity phenomena, is to be continued. For 2017, in addition to providing greater support for the work performed by the "Partnerships for Democracy" and the Federal State Democracy Centres, five new programme areas are planned: "Engagement im Netz – gegen Hass im Netz" (on online hate speech), "Prävention und Deradikalisierung in Strafvollzug und Bewährungshilfe" (on prevention and deradicalisation in prison and the parole system), "Engagement und Vielfalt in der Arbeits- und Unternehmenswelt" (on commitment and diversity in employment and business), "Zusammenleben in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft" (on coexistence in the immigration society) and "Demokratieförderung im Bildungsbereich" (on promoting democracy in education).

2.3.2 Initial findings of the scientific monitoring and evaluation

In the following outline of the initial findings of the programme evaluation and the parallel study for "Live Democracy!"[12] it must be remembered that these are only interim results. At the time of writing and publishing this report, the programme is only at the half-way stage of completion. Various surveys are still underway for which the results have still to be submitted or evaluated.

Against this backdrop, the programme has not been evaluated as a whole. Focus has been placed on the individual programme areas instead.

2.3.3 "Partnerships for Democracy"

At the time of writing (31 December 2016), 233 "Partnerships for Democracy" (85 new locations) are receiving funding in Programme Area A. Looking at the predecessor programmes, "Live Democracy!" plays an important role in shaping municipal engagement to promote democratic political culture. These partnerships place greater focus than has previously been the case on promoting diversity in civil society engagement, activating youth participation, expanding the focus of current thematic priorities and strengthening local-level structures.

The latter occurs via the further development of local coordination units into specialist units as initiated under the federal programme. These

specialist units have all been established and, in 90 per cent (195) of the funded locations, have been set up not within municipal administrations but within external, independent organisations. Most of the other operative bodies and structures, meaning monitoring committees and democracy conferences, are also in place. In these, a total of 10,783 individuals work to further the cause. It should be noted that one quarter of those working on the monitoring committees are volunteers.

One innovative component of the current funding arrangement involved the establishment and funding of youth forums in which young people are given the opportunity to engage in greater self-organisation and help shape municipal activities to promote democratic political culture. In the 166 forums created so far, 2,566 young people conducted 304 projects within the space of a year.

Despite this generally satisfying result, specific actor groups are to be better integrated in the future – especially young people from migrant organisations (including self-organised groups) and representatives from the private sector, schools and sport.

With regard to funding, the partnerships work under heterogeneous conditions because some locations also receive funding from Land-specific programmes or municipal budgets, meaning that funding for coordination and specialist units and also for the action and initiative funds that have been set up can differ greatly depending on the municipality involved.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ··

12   See: https://www.dji.de/ueber-uns/projekte/projekte/programmevaluation-demokratie-leben/projekt-publikationen.html.

Be that as it may, the approach taken by many partnerships focuses on promoting participation and raising awareness among young people. For the most part, they address children and youths with migrant backgrounds. In line with the focus on current trends, in 2016 many partnerships focused on promoting a welcome and acceptance culture towards asylum seekers/refugees in addition to their more traditional focus areas. This goes hand in hand with the fact that the "Partnerships for Democracy" are confronted to a great extent with polarising public debate on issues concerning refugeeism, asylum and flight. In about three out of four partnerships, these confrontations occur in the public realm and also online. At one in two locations, refugees were the subject of insults, threats and attacks. A new phenomenon sees local-level partnerships being systematically restricted in their work and that high-profile actors are subject to threats and demands to withdraw their engagement and support.

To be successful, democracy promotion relies on the development of integrated action plans and the design of centralised structures and processes. In this way, partnerships can make a significant contribution to strengthening political culture by integrating fundamental democratic principles into their specific structures and processes, and raise awareness to them in their everyday activities and work. As this occurs, for the most part, independent of the prevailing situation at local level, the co-governance arrangements have proven to be flexible instruments for use in democracy promotion.

Some "Partnerships for Democracy" were able to establish an efficient and powerful network in their start-up phase. If this happens at an early stage and with broad involvement of local actors, subsequent activities are made easier in many respects. Partnerships that had not yet been able to build an efficient network faced a number of

difficulties, especially with regard to integrating the relevant actors. Partnerships which had only begun building networks in their municipalities under the "Live Democracy!" programme needed/need additional support.

Despite this, the "Partnerships for Democracy" were largely successful in reaching both the specialist public and local policymakers. Activities targeting the general public are to be stepped up in 2017.

2.3.4 Federal State Democracy Centres

In Programme Area B, promoting Democracy Centres for Land-wide coordination and network-building as well as mobile, victim and exit counselling services, of the federal programme "Live Democracy!", the BMFSFJ has expanded the thematic focus to include the phenomena of Islamism, left-wing militancy and group-focused enmity, and has thus responded to the challenges faced by the predecessor programme. A new aspect involves that in addition to intervention measures (counselling) in the working areas cited, funding is also provided for stand-alone prevention measures.

The former Länder coordination units (LCUs) will be transformed into (Länder) Federal State Democracy Centres (LDCs) and thus assume a wide range of new responsibilities and tasks which go beyond the coordination and networking functions assigned under the previous programmes. In terms of content, in the programme year in question, addressing the phenomenon of religion-based radicalisation of young people (political Islamism) and dealing with asylum, refugeeism and flight posed key challenges, which in turn resulted in rising numbers of engaged volunteers. In the meantime, in addition to their

core activities in addressing right-wing extremism, the phenomenon of political Islamism has become a key action area for two-thirds of the LCUs/LDCs.

With regard to the coordination and network-building responsibilities of the LCUs/LDCs, the coordinating circle of relevant advisory actors at Länder level have expanded to include at minimum the "Partnerships for Democracy" and the implementing organisations of pilot projects under the federal programme – and in most Länder to also include additional partners in additional programmes.

The range of tasks and responsibilities which can be tackled by the LCUs/LCDs depends not only on the amount of federal funding supplied but to a great extent also on the Länder themselves providing funding. In only six of the 15 LCUs/LCDs do current staffing levels meet those required to fulfil their responsibilities and tasks.

At the mobile counselling service level, changes in social needs meant that the programmes offered in various action areas had to be expanded. For example, in addition to promoting civil society engagement, requests for support from non-state and state actors dealing with asylum seeker and refugee migration, and tackling right-wing populist mobilisation/right-wing extremist agitation and people of right-wing persuasions, played an important role. Dealing with problems and issues in connection with the topic of refugeeism, asylum and flight made up around one quarter of the 'cases' dealt with by the mobile counselling services. Support for civil society engagement involved almost half of the cases dealt with in eastern Germany and around one-third of those in the west. Flexibilisation of funding criteria also enabled non-case dependent services which had until then remained invisible, such as prevention work performed in schools, to be brought out into the open.

The main forms of action in the mobile counselling services involve informing, researching, analysing and assessing. The latter means, for example, assessing both the mood and the situation as regards right-wing extremism. These form the core activities in almost all 'cases' dealt with by the mobile counselling service and were combined with other services, such as support in developing action plans. Looking at the support provided by the mobile counselling services, it is evident that, among other things, about one quarter of the cases handled involved long-term support. In three-quarters of the cases, support involved short-term tackling of specific problem issues as well as education, information and referral to targeted assistance processes which were both requested and supported by state and non-state actors.

In the area of right-wing extremism, distancing services differ from exit services in that they each address specific target groups. In distancing services, it is largely young people and young adults who have connections with but do not actually belong to right-wing extremism groups, and also their family members and teachers (seven German states). Separate again are those services which address young people who want to leave the right-wing scene and, albeit to different degrees, have firm links with right-wing extremism groups. In most German Länder (states) the service structure takes a division of labour approach, whereby the genuine exit work is conducted as a specialised counselling and assistance programme alongside distancing work. Currently, there are six counselling services available for young people wanting to exit the right-wing scene. One is operated as a multi-Länder network comprising five German states. Counselling for parents of right-wing extremism-oriented young adults or of young people vulnerable to right-wing extremist views is provided by all German Länder, both as part of exit and also distancing programmes.

Pilot projects which focus on political Islamism are underway in seven German states and others will be added during 2017. In all Länder, the LCUs/LCDs also conduct measures to prevent violent Islamism. The pilot projects are designed to develop into specialist distancing programmes which directly target young people who are vulnerable to or have affinities with Islamism.

In many German states which at the time the programme was launched had no or only few developed structures for specialist victim counselling, such services have been developed and are being further established. In 2017, funding for Programme Area B, "Federal State Democracy Centres", was significantly increased.

2.3.5 Structural development of nationwide NGOs

In Programme Area C, structural development of nationwide NGOs, funding is provided for 28 non-state, non-profit organisations which can be divided into two main groups: one comprising umbrella/specialist associations with their own member organisations and membership-independent specialist/transfer units, and the other consisting of education/counselling organisations. As an entirely new component of the federal programme, this programme area aims to improve the transfer of knowledge and expert exchange – both nationwide and at federal level. It is also designed to foster development of specialist infrastructures to promote democracy and prevent extremism.

In the first two years of the programme, the implementing organisations achieved medium-term strategy development, further specialisation, quality development, and (further) development of both their own specialist practices and new offers in the thematic spectrum as well as in

the context of current social trends. In addition, great importance was placed on personnel and organisational development, including, against the backdrop of structural expansion, to take in organisational development processes.

Networking with and specialist counselling of educational staff in other implementing organisations and other actors involved in the thematic and structural area make up a large part of the activities conducted by most organisations. The challenges they faced involved estimating and anticipating where overlaps and barriers of understanding occurred in respect of network-building activities, and perceiving developments and trends outside their own thematic and structural fields. For many organisations, it was important to offer further training for permanent and voluntary staff (disseminator groups) and to consider further training needs in order to be able to develop both targeted measures and generate material resources.

The implementing organisations offer many different support services for state and non-state actors within and beyond the boundaries of the federal programme and were approached with their specific services in mind. Specialist and/or organisational support for actors in other programme areas became a key area of concern. Some organisations reached their capacity limits as nationwide demand for their services grew in line with increasing awareness of the programme. Numerous cooperative relationships have ensued among the organisations. As a result, great importance was placed on exchange and collaboration with other NGOs from Programme Area C.

Providers' perceptions as regards their function as nationwide NGOs varied greatly and took in widely diverse issues. Clarification on certain issues has since been achieved, with the criterion of super-regional importance and the tasks and functions assumed by the providers playing a key

role. The specialist (and conceptual) further development of existing offers, of quality assurance in umbrella associations and transfer and specialist unit responsibilities are also proving to be important. Worthy of note in this regard are the assumption of network-building activities in the thematic area and structural field, the creation of association-specific and/or policy-related capacities to make decisions and take action, and federal-level representation for membership groups.

2.3.6   Pilot projects

The pilot project area of the federal programme is thematically structured and comprised of:

- a) Pilot projects to address various phenomena of group-focused enmity and promote democracy in rural areas (Programme Area D).

- b) Pilot projects for the prevention of various essentially political radicalisation processes (Programme Area E).

In 2015 and 2016, funding was provided for 103 pilot projects with eight thematic areas. These included thematic areas with long-standing funding tradition into which new focus areas were integrated as well as thematic areas being addressed for the first time under a Federal Government programme. This had the effect that both phenomenon-related and educational experience and prevailing knowledge differed in relation to the thematic area involved.

Providers with relevant previous experience were evident in the thematic areas of democracy promotion, current forms of antisemitism and right-wing extremist-orientations and activities. A different starting point was evident with regard, for example, to the thematic area of Islamic

orientations and activities where, before the project funding was made available, large numbers of providers had little or no involvement in the prevention of Islamic orientations and activities. Where little previous experience was available (the phenomena of antigypsyism, current forms of Islamophobia/Muslimophobia, homophobia and transphobia, and left-wing militancy), project activities in the implementation phase 2015 to 2016 focused on generating knowledge of the respective phenomena, including existing educational practice.

Looking at the overall picture, thematic area-specific needs and discrepancies were evident regarding the degree of attention given: while prevention programmes addressing violent and political Islamism met a huge demand among target groups and disseminators, projects with other thematic areas faced considerable problems in gaining access to the respective target groups. This can be apportioned to the differing levels of public awareness to the issues being addressed (such as antigypsyism and homophobia).

One marked social development which emerged during the reporting period was the immigration of vast numbers of asylum-seeking refugees and the associated escalation and polarisation of discourse and conflict concerning refugeeism, asylum and flight. At the level of the phenomena being addressed, a change was evident in perceptions of the problem: in relation to antisemitism, the question arose as to the extent to which antisemitism was being 'imported' with the growing number of refugees. The concerns and uncertainties specialist staff were facing in light of the social discourse on the risk of radicalisation arising from and for refugees, had led to an increased demand for counselling and advice. Pilot projects made a valuable contribution in this regard, providing the confidence and certainty needed to take action and respond.

In the action area involving current forms of antisemitism, the pilot projects faced a number of challenges. Historical education on antisemitism has the task of dealing with the plural and often contradictory remembrance cultures of a migration society. At the same time, Muslim and migrant youths must be addressed as problem figures, whereby in such cases reflection on the relationships between antisemitism and (anti-Muslim) racism is a fundamental requirement. In this thematic area, educational work involving current forms of antisemitism ideally takes one of the following approaches:

- Development and implementation of specialist standards and staff training programmes
- Development and testing of educational programmes for young people, focusing on Israel-related antisemitism and historical education, while taking account of the realities of a migration society

For the first time, educational and preventive work addressing current forms of Islamophobia/Muslimophobia was integrated into the programme as a separate educational work area. Depending on the core target and the educational approaches taken, the educational strategies can take one or other of the following forms:

- Supportive and awareness-building educational programmes for members of minority groups
- Further training programmes to professionalise the work performed by disseminators belonging to majority groups
- Awareness-building educational programmes for members of the majority society and of minority groups which both complement and relate to the other
- Awareness-building 'meet and encounter' programmes for members of the majority society and of minority groups

Most of the pilot projects funded in this thematic area took an anti-racism approach, with work on cultural-religious prejudices and the empowerment of victims of discrimination at the forefront of their activities. Little focus has been placed so far on manifest Islamophobic attitudes and groups.

Addressing antigypsyism has also yet to become an established part of regular practice in child and youth welfare work. To date this has largely occurred in the form of (voluntary) engagement in self-organised groups. As a result, it remains a 'young' action area with great innovation potential. To achieve its objectives, the following strategies, which target both victims and non-victims of antigypsyism activity, will be adopted:

- Antigypsyism awareness-building, information and education
- Further training programmes for young and adult disseminators to help them address antigypsyism in a professional way
- Meetings and encounters between victims and non-victims
- Empowerment of Sinti and Roma

One specific problem involves the fact that individuals receiving support under the pilot projects are at risk of deportation and that in working with victims in precarious situations, the boundaries between educational work performed under the pilot projects and child and youth welfare work often become blurred.

Also, with the pilot projects designed to address broad social rejection of sexual/gender diversity (homophobia and transphobia), the federal programme enters new territory and the projects address the respective focus issues by adopting three key strategies:

- Awareness-building to eliminate discrimination
- Empowerment of LSBTIQ* individuals
- Providing stimulus for (further) development of structures and institutions

For the projects in this thematic area, a challenge arose in having to focus on goals within this complex, multifaceted phenomenon because comprehensive treatment of homophobia and transphobia can potentially overburden both implementers and target groups. Looking at the overall picture, the pilot projects funded under the programme still covered a broad range of discriminatory contexts and forms, and differing target groups (fan cultures, structural discrimination on the part of state institutions, exclusion within migrant communities, etc.).

The thematic area of promoting democracy in rural areas is a comparatively well-established working area which is designed to address the increasing, multiple-problem structures in rural and peripheral areas (high prevalence of group-focused enmity, dominant influence of right-wing extremism powers, limited presence of civil society-democratic stakeholder circles, broad-based culture of similarity and conformity). The pilot projects in this thematic area aim to foster democratic cultures and take a socio-spatial approach:

- Development of participative opportunities and abilities among young people and young adults
- Training and support for and networking between specialists in child and youth welfare institutions
- Tackling local-foreign conflict

These projects have managed to take hold in their respective working regions and to approach and integrate local stakeholders. In particular, those projects that targeted community-focused conflict resolution faced difficulties in gaining access to target groups. With the influx of refugees, a new problem area emerged which to an extent changed the projects' conditions and areas of responsibility. Projects involving community work and youth participation explicitly addressed these issues.

Critical engagement with right-wing extremist orientations and activities has long been a component of pilot project funding and promotion. The projects currently being funded in this thematic area demonstrate tremendous heterogeneity in terms of their target groups, target-group access and the approaches they take. Most of them built on the implementing organisations' previous experience and were highly innovative. In many cases, they tested new educational programmes/offers/action approaches and attempted to gain access to specific target groups. The funded projects can be separated into those which take a preventive approach and those which focus on specific target-groups. In both cases, there are a number of projects which:

- Target young people who are vulnerable to certain risks and are thus vulnerable to right-wing extremist views (selective prevention)
- Work with, among others, young people with right-wing extremist tendencies, i.e. they have already adopted problematic ideologies and attitudes but have not internalised full-blown ideologies (indicated prevention)
- Implement integrated engagement strategies and have several core target groups

In some respects, the group of projects with several core target groups is extremely broad-based. This appears both appropriate and meaningful given the variety and complexity of the phenomena they address. However, many of the projects are ambitious and could become overburdened to a certain extent.

Work in addressing Islamic orientations and activities is quite a new educational action area. Project implementers had little scientifically analysed practical experience on which they could draw and huge knowledge deficits exist on Islamic radicalisation – especially against the backdrop of such strong dynamic trends. This poses a challenge when it comes to identifying specific risks for young target groups and in preventing their stigmatisation. The projects funded in this thematic area can be categorised as follows:

- The project targets young people with no apparent indications of Islamic tendencies or activities.
- The project targets young people vulnerable to specific risks and perceived as at risk of becoming radicalised.
- The project involves working with young people with anti-democratic, Islamic tendencies, i.e. they have already demonstrated initial problematic behaviours but have not internalised full-blown ideologies.
- The project targets both young people who want to exit the scene and their family members.
- The project uses combined prevention strategies and has several core target groups.

Over half the projects did not address any specific risk target group. Many of the others targeted specific risk groups or combined a range of prevention strategies. Only a few involved distancing work. As regards innovation, the analysis revealed practice field potential, for example in developing new target groups, such as parents and imams, or greater involvement of Islamic organisations in prevention work. This provides additional modes of access, approaches and perspectives. Further innovation potential is seen in peer-based work, in socio-spatial work and in integrated, modular strategies.

The pilot projects funded under the new thematic area of left-wing militancy face a series of professional challenges. In addition to considerable knowledge deficits in a problem area that has not yet been adequately analysed to date, the projects address a heterogeneous target group that is caught between youth culture scenes and ideologically ingrained militancy. They respond to these challenges, for example, by focusing not on the actual target group but on the disseminators in areas involving educational work. Where left-wing militancy is concerned, an area where considerable barriers were encountered regarding phenomenon-specific and target group-specific lines of access, this approach could be successful in that it provides ways of addressing both the problem and the target groups by means of training for educational disseminators.

3 Activities of the Federal Ministry of the Interior – "Cohesion through Participation"[13]

3.1 Background, aims and structures

In Germany, social cohesion is based on values which are shaped by our free democratic basic order. Citizens can help shape our society in many ways. In times of rapid social and economic change, it is necessary to help people in integrating diverse forms of democratic participation into their lives and in applying them in their everyday attitudes and actions. The Federal Government places great importance on providing new opportunities for participation, on strengthening civil society stakeholders in developing skill and abilities, and in gaining access to resources. Those who take responsibility and become engaged in shaping their local environment can see the impact of their actions on societal processes and are less receptive to extremist ideologies.

The Federal Ministry of the Interior (BMI) believes it has a special responsibility to eliminate the breeding grounds for crime, violence and extremism well before these take hold by means of broad-based, universal promotion of democratic structures and systematic prevention work.

Against this backdrop, and under the federal programme "Cohesion through Participation", the BMI in conjunction with the Federal Government Commissioner for the New Federal States has since 2010, promoted projects in rural and structurally weak regions, which aim to foster a self-confident, vibrant and democratic culture, in which extremism and anti-democratic structures have no place. Active and engaged volunteers in super-regional associations and clubs form the core of the programme. These organisations, most notably those involving organised sport, the voluntary fire service, the volunteer technical relief service (THW) and other aid organisations, form an essential pillar of social cohesion. Their permanent staff and volunteer members make a key contribution to effective cohesion, both within and beyond the boundaries of the organisations funded under the programme. Especially in areas where, due to the relatively weak presence of democratic parties and institutions, pluralist, democratic discourse is no longer possible in the public arena, extremist tendencies can easily take hold. To ensure that democratic participation in a self-confident, vibrant and democratic culture remains a natural component of everyday society, cohesion-promoting associations and clubs are vital.

....

[13] Funding policy structure and project selection occurs in conjunction with the Federal Government Commissioner for the New Federal States.

The funding measures are designed to strengthen the civil engagement infrastructure, improve the quality of life in rural regions by offering greater opportunity for social participation and integration, strengthen democratic attitudes and activate and train democratic behaviour.

In all of this, projects to promote democratic participation should, for the most part, follow the Federal Government's holistic approach to democracy promotion and extremism prevention and, by building capacities for action and greater democratic participation, eliminate the breeding ground for extremist influences, whatever their form. As targeted stimulus activities, these projects are intended to take account of the experiences, successes and outcomes of existing promotional approaches adopted by the Federal Government, the various Länder (states) and individual municipalities. Wherever possible, synergies with existing programmes and measures will be generated and used.

The Federal Government programme "Cohesion through Participation" was launched in 2010 to supplement the existing promotional programmes operated by the BMFSFJ. In implementing the BMFSFJ programmes, it became clear that additional regional-specific needs existed, that the funding provided so far had not reached all target groups to the same extent, and that certain target groups require different lines of access. In responding to this situation, the "Cohesion through Participation" programme enabled a targeted promotion and funding structure to be developed and established in rural and structurally weak regions in eastern Germany. Due to its special design, "Cohesion through Participation" reached and still reaches the (then new) target groups of associations and clubs, especially those in organised sport, the THW, the voluntary fire service and other volunteer organisations.

With regard to these special target groups, the funding measures implemented under the programme focus largely on adults and thus differ significantly from most other programmes which address right-wing extremism and promote democratic culture. This closed a gap highlighted by many scientific studies which argue that right-wing extremism and group-focused enmity are not a purely youth-related problem and that greater focus must be placed on adults in this regard.

The Federal Government programme "Cohesion through Participation" was initially designed to focus exclusively on the new federal states in eastern Germany. In the third funding period (2014–2016), funding was also provided for isolated projects in the west. In the course of 2016, associations and clubs throughout the country were afforded the opportunity to obtain funds from the asylum package to help them better cope with migration-related demands. At the start of the current funding period in 2017, all programme areas were opened nationwide and funding is now provided in all rural and structurally weak regions across Germany. The programme budget was increased in 2016, raising the funding allocation from the previous €6 million to €12 million per year.

Since it was launched, a focal priority of the "Cohesion through Participation" funding programme involves the development and expansion of capacities for action to strengthen democratic practices in associations and clubs. In this respect, the programme promotes the development and expansion of counselling structures to identify and address incidents which constitute a danger to democracy in structurally weak and rural regions in Germany where the associations and clubs receiving funding are located. Among other things, their permanent and volunteer staff are trained to serve as democracy counsellors in their respective associations and clubs and to raise

awareness of the need to identify and recognise anti-democratic and discriminatory attitudes within their organisations, provide counselling in extremism-related conflict situations, and initiate and support the development of appropriate prevention strategies.

In the past, focus was placed largely on strengthening participative structures and opportunities for participation with the respective organisations. Through the programme measures, functionaries within the associations and clubs were given the skills needed to help design and develop structures in a participation-oriented and democratic way. This was a priority focus in the funding period 2010 to 2012 and remained an integral aim in programme implementation thereafter. Guidelines for participation and inclusion were developed in numerous associations and clubs. These help strengthen democracy within those organisations, serve as a basis on which to address and deal with prejudice and conflict, and provide a sound platform on which democracy counsellors trained under the programme can act.

In future implementation of programme measures, focus will continue to be placed – and to an even greater extent – on conducting counselling sessions and addressing discriminatory, undemocratic behaviours within the associations and clubs, and to establish appropriate processes and procedures. Building on the structures already developed within the associations and clubs, project implementers will be in an increasingly better position to address discriminatory and anti-democratic behaviours, and deal with all related conflict potential in an appropriate, results-oriented way.

From 2017, programme implementation will also focus on the municipal context of (established) projects and thus strengthen democratic participation in the local community. The aim is to empower project implementers who already have

sound action capabilities in this programme area – as can be assumed in the associations and clubs funded under the programme so far – to use their potential for voluntary engagement beyond their organisational boundaries, to shape democratic participation at the municipal level and use it in dealing with conflict situations. Members of the associations and clubs are to be given the opportunity to use at local level both the democratic participation experience and action-taking capacities gained in existing projects funded under the "Cohesion through Participation" programme in an efficient and effective way.

Providing funding for pilot projects is one way to tackle the prevailing societal issues and problems involved in strengthening democratic practice in associations and clubs, in promoting democratic participation in local communities and in testing innovative approaches and working formats as part of that process. In addressing these issues and problems, project implementers need to further develop and apply best-practice structures and methodologies for democratic participation, train stakeholders to give them the skills they need to act and attract and exploit new resources.

Since 2016, pilot projects have been funded in which implementing organisations with sound expertise in political education have developed customised programmes for intercultural learning in conjunction with an association or club. The aim is to train permanent and voluntary staff in this field and to open associations and clubs to people with migrant backgrounds.

Associations and clubs face the challenge of better integrating individuals with asylum status, as well as people with migrant backgrounds who live in Germany, into their organisational work. Participation in the work of charitable associations and clubs gives these individuals both the opportunity to participate in the local community and in society as a whole, and contributes significantly to

successful integration. The idea is to install comprehensive integration processes into the respective organisational structures of associations and clubs which are largely active in rural and structurally weak regions, such as the fire service, sport, the THW and other voluntary organisations operating at regional level.

The process of mutual, intercultural learning is a future-focused responsibility of associations and clubs for which they are still not adequately prepared and thus require sound expert support. This is especially the case concerning those in eastern Germany. By funding pilot projects on the topic of intercultural learning in associations and clubs, the Federal Government programme "Cohesion through Participation" thus aims to develop and test urgently-required knowledge regarding intercultural needs. The measures, methodologies and instruments for intercultural learning, jointly developed and tested by an education provider with vast expertise in intercultural learning and a collaborating association or club, should also be transferable to other associations and clubs and be so designed that they can be permanently integrated into the structures of those organisations and remain in place beyond project completion. Intercultural learning is, however, not limited to simply becoming acquainted with another culture and goes beyond the mere take-up and adoption of information on offer. In terms of the advertised pilot projects, it involves learning together and understanding and experiencing different cultural influences, values and traits.

In addition, the stakeholders involved in the federal programme receive training via accompanying measures along with support in their everyday project work. In this way, all project implementers have access to process accompaniment in the form of coaching and supervision. Regional and organisation-specific networking meetings and counselling forums serve mutual

knowledge transfer, networking and exchange between project stakeholders and democracy counsellors. The Bundesverbände der Deutschen Sportjugend e. V. (German Youth Sports Association), THW-Jugend e. V. (youth section of the voluntary technical relief service) and Deutsche Feuerwehrverband e. V. (German Fire Service Association) coordinate networking activities on behalf of their regional organisations.

As part of various training programmes, project staff receive training on topics such as quality assurance, evaluation and argumentation training. Once a year, all stakeholders involved in the federal programme are invited to super-regional seminars where they can discuss their work, exchange experience and share their ideas.

3.2   Monitoring and evaluation results

The federal programme "Cohesion through Participation" has been accompanied by a scientific monitoring and evaluation panel since 2011. The results of the monitoring and evaluation activities are constantly taken into account when managing and enhancing the programme.

Monitoring and evaluation takes a multi-phase approach which includes various methodologies for use in analysing both the implementation and effectiveness of funded projects. The results from previous funding periods were integrated into the analysis. Two key issues lie at the core of the monitoring and evaluation activities. Firstly, the panel looks at the changes achieved in the relevant target groups prior to receiving funding. Secondly, they identify which of the measures and strategies implemented were particularly effective. The monitoring panel thus has the task of monitoring the achievements made and highlighting the effectiveness of the measures taken. With

regard to effectiveness, in its previous evaluation, the monitoring panel focused on the management target group. Because the monitoring and evaluation was designed to identify the effects of operationalising the programme's goals, it is also possible to identify effects by surveying managers responsible for project implementation.

To assess the level of success in achieving the programme goal, the monitoring and evaluation panel conducted comprehensive qualitative data collation and analysis in addition to conducting advance and follow-up surveys with project managers. This included qualitative analysis of the measures implemented, differentiated qualitative analyses of selected projects and qualitative analysis of the effectiveness of promising case management strategies.

On the whole, the programme was seen to have steadily developed both qualitatively and quantitatively. There was also evidence that while no rapid developments had taken place since the beginning of 2011, steady further development had been seen among both the stakeholders and organisations funded under the programme. With regard to its medium and long-term focus, "Cohesion through Participation" is designed as a learning programme which adapts and aligns to prevailing needs. This occurs in response to the results of the monitoring and evaluation report, whereby the allocation of funding focuses on the prevailing socio-political issues of the day.

Vital to the classification and assessment of the monitoring and evaluation results are the target groups and contexts addressed by the "Cohesion through Participation" programme. The programme focuses in particular on adult volunteers in associations and clubs involving sports, the voluntary fire service, the volunteer technical relief service (THW) and other organisations. This largely involves institutions with established structures in which members often volunteer over

a number of years or even decades without a break. For project managers, opening up prevailing hierarchies with a view to embracing change poses a huge hurdle. If they are to be successful, those involved in the projects must first and foremost establish a fundamental understanding and awareness of the issues addressed by the "Cohesion through Participation" programme.

In the results of the first monitoring and evaluation report for **funding phase 2010 to 2012**, it was shown that with the many and varied projects funded under the "Cohesion through Participation" programme, positive developments were achieved in respect of initiatives to strengthen, further develop and stabilise a democratic culture in rural areas in eastern Germany. In relation to the core topic of conflict management and resolution, there is evidence that the project activities helped to establish and integrate counselling teams. It is, however, clear that members of the respective associations and clubs had reservations when it came to making use of the counselling services on offer.

To improve their expert capacities and skills, and thus their role in the associations and clubs, accompanying measures were expanded as programme implementation got under way. As a result, supervision for democracy counsellors was introduced in 2014, and in the area of project accompaniment and support, greater focus was placed on the need to plan implementation strategies right from the start. In addition, a core curriculum for democracy trainer training within the associations and clubs was developed which was made available to all project implementers starting with the second funding phase (2013 to 2014). To ensure fast and comprehensive flow of information in dealing with serious cases and conflict situations, strategic development and expansion of an information network among the associations and clubs was begun.

Following the monitoring and evaluation of *funding phase 2013 to 2014*, it was evident that the intensive project accompaniment and the prescription of a core curriculum on the part of programme management had borne fruit. To further professionalise both the counsellor training and counselling work, additional documentation (definition of counselling, instruments for use in counselling documentation, self-evaluation and assessment, table of goals and aims) was prepared to simplify project implementation and ensure the provision of harmonised and standardised counselling work. To take account of the differing starting points and capacities of the various members of the associations and clubs, the counsellor training programme was designed in modular form. It was also found that counselling work performed in the associations and clubs can only be effective if management and functionaries at all levels not only know of the service but actively foster it and give the democracy counsellors their support. In many cases, project stakeholders ventured into unexplored territory within their organisations. Not all associations and clubs welcomed or embraced the discussions and changes involved in project implementation. The processes were often long and drawn out, and had to be implemented on an ongoing basis.

The monitoring and evaluation activities for this funding period also showed that effectiveness was greater if people who supported the project and its aims could be found on site. This led to a new programme area being introduced at the start of funding period 2017 and to the implementing organisations being given the opportunity to work more intensively at municipal level.

In the third *funding phase from 2015 to 2016*, focus was mainly placed on initial and further training of counsellors within the associations and clubs, and on the further development of counselling work and the management target group.

Initial and further training of democracy counsellors became well-established in the organisations promoted in both funding periods. As a rule, the participants in the modular initial and further training courses are able to recognise exclusion situations and will intervene to counter discriminatory insults and abuse. There was rise in counselling activities in the third funding period, with some 3,000 counselling sessions taking place. And it is notable that more counselling cases have been dealt with in the current funding period (almost 2,000) than in the rest of the programme cycle (almost 1,000). This shows that implementation of the counselling programme has progressed well in many associations and clubs.

In the course of the third funding period (2015–2016), the approach to counselling and thus the definition of counselling under the federal programme was clarified as a participative process. Based on the differing target groups and the specific problems involved, differentiation was made between the scope and the substantive complexity of the counselling required. The scientific evaluation in the previous funding periods had shown that most cases requiring counselling involved brief consultations. Around one in ten counselling sessions took place on a referral basis, where the actual counselling was conducted by an external organisation, such as the mobile counselling service provided under the Federal Government's "Live Democracy!" programme. On the whole, project implementers tended to call in external counsellors more frequently.

At the same time, it was evident that the vast majority of the counselling cases reported were conducted by full-time democracy counsellors who in addition to the modular training offered under the Federal Government programme also had other qualifications such as a degree in social work, training in (systemic) counselling or similar. With almost one-third of all counselling sessions

conducted independently by voluntary counsellors, these made up a significant share of the counselling services installed in the programme-funded associations and clubs.

The qualitative analysis of the counselling cases shows that when confronted with difficult and complex counselling situations, voluntary counsellors still reach their limits and tend to keep counselling brief. By way of contrast, a high degree of acceptance is evident concerning the precise definition of counselling and the differentiation between various counselling types: voluntary counsellors are able to recognise their own limits and in the interests of achieving successful conflict resolution, either work directly with full-time counsellors as part of a counselling process or refer the case to them after a professional counselling session conducted on referral.

Such differentiation between the differing degrees of professionalism in the democracy counselling structure is fully intended in the programme implementation process. The skills and capacities of the trained democracy counsellors in being able to recognise the different situations and assess their own abilities must be strengthened further. In future programme development, greater differentiation must be made between the tasks to be performed by counsellors at differing training levels. Here, it is important to focus on the necessary differentiation between brief, processual and referral counselling, and on the options available in using external counselling programmes. The basic training for democracy counsellors should be retained and the modular training system should take a more differentiated approach, be made more flexible and focus on actual needs.

High-quality counselling work is a key prerequisite for successful establishment of the counsel-ling programme in the associations and clubs. This is evident, for example, in the previous programme evaluations. The development and use of a common counselling standard as a quality assurance tool is an important programme goal whose achievement was significantly aided by the most recent monitoring and evaluation. While in the second funding period numerous project implementers reported that only initial discussions had been conducted on common counselling standards or that initial counselling standards had been agreed, by the end of the third funding period (2015–2016), counselling standards had been introduced in the vast majority of projects, either as needed or as part of a systematic process. The advantage of counselling standards and self-evaluation tools is to be communicated more intensively in the project support and monitoring process and requirements will be intensified regarding their systematic, wide-spread use.

In addition, the evaluation results clearly show that the involvement of managers and functionaries remains one of the most important requirements for project success and for permanent integration of the newly-created structures in the respective associations and clubs. That managers and functionaries understand the benefits to be had from implementing the project and that it brings added value to their organisations is a key prerequisite for successful, robust integration of the programme goals within their organisational structures. While such understanding and recognition is abstractly evident, when developing the programme further, it is important to achieve greater involvement of managers by assigning them active roles rather than merely involving them in ongoing processes. It must be remembered, however, that in the "Cohesion through Participation" programme, the sector-specific peculiarities of the target groups call for differing forms of address.

4 Programme Implementation Perspectives and Recommendations for Action

4.1 Programme implementation perspectives

The Federal Republic of Germany is an open, democratic, pluralist state with a democratic national constitution and a sound, well-established legal system. It also has broadly-developed structures to encourage democratic engagement on the part of civil society along with well-established forms of codetermination and participation. People in Germany have a wide range of opportunities to help shape our society and foster cohesion. Social cohesion is based on values which are shaped by our free democratic basic order, and on solidarity-based interaction in our communities, in the workplace, in associations and clubs, in local neighbourhoods and in family life.

Nonetheless, a broad range of challenges exist which pose a risk to social cohesion. The state can create the conditions needed to strengthen social cohesion and to assist Germany's citizens in integrating diverse forms of democratic participation into their everyday lives. This also means promoting conditions in rural and structurally weak regions which are based on common values such as mutual tolerance, acceptance and respect.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, extremist attitudes and behaviours still abound to a significant extent, posing a challenge for society as a whole. Along with measures to repress such manifestations, the Federal Government wants to respond by implementing preventive measures in line with its federal programmes to strengthen inner security.

By promoting different target groups and by focusing on specific action areas, the Federal Government's "Live Democracy!" and "Cohesion through Participation" programmes, and also the work performed by the Federal Agency for Civic Education, create the conditions needed to ensure from an early stage that radicalisation and extremism cannot take hold in German society. The Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth operates the Federal Government's "Live Democracy!" programme on the basis of child and youth welfare activities and, in its capacity as the highest federal authority, has a responsibility to encourage and support youth services where these are of super-regional importance and are of a nature such that they cannot be effectively supported by a Land (state) alone (Social Code Book VIII). Consequently, the Federal Ministry has the responsibility to take action and provide funding in matters of super-regional

importance. Such stimulus, encouragement and promotion can be achieved by promoting pilot projects.

Promotion and funding under the Federal Government's "Cohesion through Participation" programme run by the Federal Ministry of the Interior (BMI) is conducted in conjunction with the Federal Government Commissioner for the New Federal States in line with promotional policies which contain programme priorities and focus areas for specific funding periods.

In the current legislative period, the Federal Government has tripled its funding allocation for centralised federal programmes involving civil society engagement to promote democracy and prevent extremism, from a combined €35 million to a combined €115 million.

4.2 Recommendations for action

In its "Strategy to Prevent Extremism and Promote Democracy" adopted in July 2016, the Federal Government outlined wide-ranging recommendations for future action areas. The Federal Government programmes on extremism prevention and democracy promotion must constantly be in a position to respond to prevailing trends. This was demonstrated by both programmes in response to the wave of migration seen in the summer of 2015. For example, measures were quickly added to the funding programme to strengthen the welcome culture, resolve socio-spatial conflict and prevent radicalisation of vulnerable youths. Promotion of tried and tested structures such as victim counselling centres and mobile counselling services was extended to all German Länder (states), and available funding was increased. In this way, the

Federal Government has complied with many of the recommendations put forward by the NSU Inquiry Committee.

The Federal Government has stepped up activities to consolidate measures to promote democracy and prevent extremism. Under the "Federal Government Strategy to Prevent Extremism and Promote Democracy", the intensified dialogue and exchange between the Federal Government programmes "Cohesion through Participation" and "Live Democracy!" will be further intensified. The Democracy Conference "Zukunft gemeinsam gestalten" (Shaping the Future Together), hosted by the Federal Ministry of the Interior and the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth in November 2016, marked the first steps towards collaboration between implementing organisations, associations and clubs under the federal programmes. In addition, starting with this current electoral period, the inter-ministerial working group on extremism prevention and democracy promotion has been meeting regularly and thus ensures regular, cross-departmental dialogue and exchange on issues involving extremism prevention and democracy promotion. Efforts thus continue with the aim of avoiding duplicate structures and intensifying collaboration.

For some years now, it has been recognised that while security is provided in Germany by law and order measures, our country also needs proactive democracy promotion and a sound prevention architecture.

All extremism phenomena are of huge importance and call for appropriate strengthening and consolidation measures. In recent times, Islamic extremism has challenged German society in a number of ways.

The Federal Government will thus take a cross-departmental approach which complies with federal lines of responsibility and involves close consultation with Länder, municipal and civil society stakeholders, as provided for under the "Federal Government Strategy to Prevent Extremism and Promote Democracy", with the aim of building on the many existing measures to achieve a robust, sustainable national prevention programme to prevent Islamic extremism by adding yet more focus areas which supplement and support the existing federal programmes, and also contain other approaches that go beyond what is currently in place. These measures include support for mosque communities, expanding online prevention activities, enhancing prison, probation and parole programmes, increasing effectiveness through research and improved risk management, and engaging in more intensified collaboration at international level. To implement this national prevention programme, federal funding in the amount of €100 million is foreseen for 2018.

The Federal Government already provides various types of support for a number of mosque communities to prevent radicalisation. These include pilot projects to develop preventive educational approaches, training and awareness-building on the topic of radicalisation, and capacity building and support for volunteers in certain mosque communities. These measures are to be implemented in a broad-based approach, the implementing organisations are to receive training (e.g. in cooperation with organisations with experience in deradicalisation work) and the results will be subject to evaluation.

Online prevention measures must be stepped up. With target group-specific civic education and information, such as videos posted on YouTube, a variety of user groups can be reached. But to counter the increasingly professionalised propaganda published on the internet by extremist groups, an integrated response is needed with strong and meaningful messaging, alternative models of interpretation and greater user abilities to judge and discuss. The Federal Government will thus develop joint guidelines for strategic communication along with alternative forms of narrative. In doing so, we will need to engage in intensive dialogue with online platform operators and secure their willingness to take action against illegal content and messaging (joint and shared responsibility). Monitoring of Islamist online content will be continued and intensified. Islamism-related hate crime will be countered in collaboration with civil society effort. In this regard, the Federal Government places particular importance on broad-based provision of media skills, both for target groups and disseminators.

The Federal and Länder governments recognised the importance of prevention and deradicalisation in prisons and in the probation and parole services at an early stage. In many German Länder, a wide range of related measures have been introduced which involve both prevention and exit and distancing work with radicalised individuals. The Federal Government supports these activities by providing funding for pilot projects in all German states. These measures are to be further intensified in accordance with local needs.

To increase the effectiveness of prevention measures, more research is needed, measures must be consolidated, risk management must be improved and international collaboration must be stepped up. The Federal Government relies on knowledge-based, tried and tested concepts and strategies. As a result, all measures funded and promoted by the Federal Government will be accompanied by a monitoring and evaluation study. The Federal Government will drive the development of suitable evaluation and quality assurance tools. And in efforts to increase the effectiveness of extremism prevention, a comprehensive scientific evaluation is needed of the current status of prevention and deradicalisation

work being performed in Germany, along with exhaustive knowledge of the causes and flows of individual and collective radicalisation processes and the utilisation of the respective findings for the actors involved. The Federal Government thus intends to intensify its related research promotion activities. It will also step up practice-oriented research to further develop proactive democracy promotion, preventive educational work and approaches for exit and distancing work. Measures and strategies for use in prevention work must be better coordinated. Given the programmes' huge security-related relevance, we must raise awareness among and improve (further) training for all stakeholders, including those involved in extremism prevention, and develop robust risk analysis tools.

Despite the problems specific to Germany, many countries face similar issues. We will thus intensify international dialogue at EU level. In an EU area of security and freedom in which the rule of law applies, we need EU-wide programmes and measures which focus in particular on the internet, on strategic communication and on collaboration with online platform operators with a view to establishing greater self-responsibility and commitment.

The report of the independent expert panel on antisemitism and the recommendations it contains will be carefully assessed by the Federal Government in a process of political and social debate. The Federal Government continues to pursue the goal of strengthening extremism prevention and democracy promotion over the longer term and in a robust, sustainable way. By expanding the Federal Government programmes and with the associated longer-term promotion of civil engagement, the Federal Government has already implemented key elements of the recommendations put forward by the NSU Inquiry Committee. Promotion of pilot projects to develop new, innovative, preventive educational ap-

proaches is to continue to provide a response to new challenges and trends, and to develop innovative ways to help establish lines of access to the respective target groups.

The Federal Government's visions, plans and measures outlined in this report, which have a budgetary impact, are based on the understanding that they can be covered by the budgets and financial plans of the ministries involved. Where they result in federal budget expenditure, they are subject to the availability of funding and must be approved. Citing of such measures as are contained in this report prejudices neither current nor future budget negotiations.