Abstract for the general public (in English)

Proposal title**: Preventing Radicalisation of Muslim Communities in the Counterterrorism Policies of the United Kingdom and the United States**

In recent years, radicalisation has become the leading analytical paradigm for interpreting and explaining the phenomenon of political violence. In particular Islamist terrorism. The activation of domestic terrorists (including the so-called lone wolves) in Europe and the United States has led to the questioning of the view that prevailed after September 11, 2001 about the "external" nature of the threat of terrorism. Researcher, policymakers and the public– all had to come to terms with the fact that the perpetrators of the cruel terrorist attacks were young men born and raised in Western countries. Terrorism could no longer be viewed as an "external threat". In this way, the mystery of how and why does terrorism happen has been increasingly re-formulated into the question: How do young men become radicalized?

The evolving threat from homegrown Islamist terrorists has led Western countries to revise their national security concepts, especially counterterrorism policies. One of the most important goals outlined in these documents is on how to prevent violent radicalisation leading to acts of terrorism, which means as all "soft" measures and instruments going beyond the security agenda in terms of combating terrorism with operational methods within the competence of relevant services and institutions. The United Kingdom and the United States are interesting cases for a comparative study of approaches to countering radicalisation for at least three reasons: (1) the close cooperation of both countries to counter international terrorism and shared responsibility for the costs of certain decisions, (2) different conditions, assumptions and effectiveness of integration policies towards Muslim communities, (3) and also due to the time and manner of shaping the approaches of both countries to prevent radicalisation, which differ mainly in the general philosophy that determines the nature of interventions, manifested in the way of defining and understanding the phenomenon of radicalisation (which is part of the broader philosophy of security and the history of developing civil rights in both countries).

The subject was inspired by the observation that preventing radicalisation can be considered as a "wicked problem" within the framework of counterterrorism policy, which implicates a whole catalogue of negative consequences and dilemmas, both at the phase of developing and implementing preventing radicalisation programs/plans. The concept of "wicked problems" assumes that in the structure of public problems there is a category of problems that are particularly difficult to solve due to their complexity and connection with other problems that are difficult or impossible to solve or reduce, such as the link between radicalisation and social marginalization.

Therefore, the goal of the project is to **compare the United Kingdom's and the United States' approach to prevent radicalisation among the Muslim communities of these countries and to assess the effectiveness and adequacy of developed implemented policies and programs from the perspective of the 'wicked problem' governance**. Three research hypotheses will be verified: (1) in both the British and American approaches, attempts to prevent radicalisation generate other problems that are difficult to solve/reduce, especially of a socio-religious nature; (2) preventing radicalisation is a difficult challenge not only because of the inherent complexity of the issue but also because public sector governance mechanisms often complicate and hinder efforts to address wicked problems; (3) Islamophobia and violence motivated by hatred of Muslims may be factors driving radicalisation, but actions taken in the United Kingdom and the United States aimed at preventing radicalisation do not take into account the risks posed by these phenomena, they may even stimulate them.

Polish literature does not contain the proposed comparative approach to preventing radicalization among the Muslim communities of the United Kingdom and the United States. Also, in the English-language literature on the subject, there are no monographic studies in the approach proposed by the author, comparing the preventing radicalisation approaches comprehensively and extensively. Moreover, in Poland, research on radicalization remains on the margins of studies on terrorism. The project topic is therefore topical and relevant. It will bring new content to research on contemporary dilemmas and challenges in security policies. The effects of the project, in addition to scientific and cognitive values, will also have a practical application.