

Lord Carlile's Terms and Conditions – altered Julia Farrington

I have taken the text of Lord Carlile's Terms and Conditions, published in September 2019 and altered it to open up the process to the kind of evidence that would fundamentally challenge the strategy and welcome new voices into the review process. By altering the text, I have created a juxtaposition between what I see as a closed process that precludes questioning of the premise on which Prevent is built, and an open process that invites a far-reaching review of the strategy. By inserting new text (in green) into the original (in black), the reader can make a direct comparison between the two approaches, to critique the original text while simultaneously encountering a different vision and scope for the review process.

Notes on reading the text:

Lord Carlile's original text is in black, some of which is struck through, but is still intended to be read as complete text. The inserted text in green should be read in combination with the unstruck-through black words to make complete sentences.

For example: The altered second paragraph, below, can be read in two ways 'original' and 'alternative' versions:

The altered:

The review will consider the ~~present delivery of~~ suitability and effectiveness of Prevent, and recommendations for the future alternative strategies, rather than based on a critical assessment of the past delivery of Prevent.

The original: The review will consider the present delivery of Prevent, and recommendations for the future, rather than past delivery of Prevent.

The alternative version: The review will consider the suitability and effectiveness of Prevent, and recommendations for future, alternative strategies, based on a critical assessment of the past delivery of Prevent.

The alternative version implies that Lord Carlile's Terms & Conditions were prescriptive, and limited to a review of the delivery of the strategy, rather than the suitability of the strategy itself.

Guidance on Independent review of Prevent: Terms of Reference Updated 20 December 2019 - Lord Carlile

Purpose

The purpose of the alternative independent review, ~~as set out in the legislation,~~ is to review the government strategy for supporting people vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism.

Objectives

The review will consider the ~~present delivery of~~ suitability and effectiveness of Prevent, and recommendations for ~~the future alternative strategies, rather than~~ based on a critical assessment of the past delivery of Prevent.

The review in particular will consider the following:

- is Prevent achieving its ~~declared~~ objectives (in black) or other objectives (in green) ?
These are to:
 - tackle the causes of radicalisation and respond to the ideological challenge of terrorism (or did it intentionally set out to create a nation of spies and transition to a full-blown surveillance state?)
 - safeguard and support those most at risk of radicalisation through early intervention, identifying them and offering support (or did it intentionally suppress discriminate and stigmatise to showcase the government's disregard for human and civil rights?)
 - enable those who have already engaged in terrorism to disengage and rehabilitate (or did it set out intentionally justify the need for increasingly violent and repressive state intervention and control by exacerbating the tension between the state and the citizen)
- how effectively is Prevent being delivered at both the local and national levels to monitor disaffection, dissent and disengagement? Please include examples of ideologies, campaigns and ideas that are under state surveillance.
- ~~how effectively does Prevent interact with other safeguarding and vulnerability strategies, and what are the critical dependencies and common threads~~ What are the implications of re-branding the Prevent strategy as safeguarding as achieved by the introduction of the Prevent Duty?
- how ~~effective~~ fit for purpose is the Statutory Prevent Duty and how effectively is Prevent Duty being implemented?
- how ~~could~~ can Prevent be improved to respond to justified given the evidence and authority underpinning pervasive criticisms and complaints?
- what should the government consider ~~in the development of~~ as an alternative to Prevent, and what policies should it adopt over the next 5 years, as the threat ~~evolves~~ diminishes, in order to best engage with all communities and support a healthy safer society where human rights, justice and dissent are protected? ~~people vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism~~

Outputs

The ~~Reviewer~~ curator/commissioner should ~~provide a report~~ curate a multi-artform performance programme, exhibition and installation featuring existing and commissioned artworks that seeks to address the above. The ~~report~~ programme will be open to the public in a suitable public space and should provide in depth critique of the impact of-and/or imagined alternatives to ~~recommendations on improvements to~~ Prevent. ~~Any~~ All ~~recommendations~~ artworks should be evidence-based, and proportionate to the extensive scope of this review, with consideration given to their implementation through a public programme of discussion and consultation.

Scope

~~The review should consider Prevent as set out in CONTEST (counter terrorism strategy), most recently revised in June 2018, and not cover the delivery of other strategies, such as the other 3Ps (pursue, protect, prepare) of CONTEST. The review will apply to England, Scotland and Wales with consultation with the devolved administrations as appropriate. The review will be focused on specified authorities (by legislation) but may include non-specified authorities, such as the military and immigration, by consent and if relevant. The review will consider efforts to reduce the risk from terrorism within the UK rather than Prevent activity done to reduce the risk to UK interests abroad. This is a forward-looking review and, as such, will not consider past decisions.~~

The review grants artists complete freedom to explore the issues raised in this review.

Timing

~~The report, including any recommendations of the review, must be submitted to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by end June 2020 in time for the Secretary of State to respond to each recommendation and lay the review report and government response before both Houses to meet the statutory deadline of 12 August 2020.~~

The timing of the review is under review.

Governance and methodology

~~The Independent Reviewer/curator/commissioner will be appointed by and accountable to, the Secretary of State for the Home Department for recruited through an open, public process and chosen, supported by and accountable to, a six-person advisory panel. All members of the advisory panel must be independent of the Government, coming from civil society or bringing personal or professional experience of the impact of the Prevent strategy. Details of the governance which achieves this accountability and the methodology for the review - including evidence gathering, consultation with central government, devolved administrations and local partners, and engagement with local-suspect communities, children and young people in primary, secondary and tertiary education, artists, campaigners for civil rights, environmentalists, teachers, former prisoners, social workers, doctors and health workers, people working with victims of domestic abuse - will be agreed between the Reviewer Secretary of State by end of September 2019. This will be set out in a ways of working document in collaboration with the advisory group. A secretariat of Home Office staff Civil Society campaigners and human rights lawyers will support the curator/commissioner.~~