# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2015, two former psychologists employed at the UK National Offenders Management Service (NOMS), Monica Lloyd and Christopher Dean, published a journal article detailing their involvement in a classified government study into the factors of 'radicalisation'.

The study itself had been completed in 2010, and in 2011 its findings were incorporated into the UK government's PREVENT and CHANNEL programmes. This secret study formed the Extremism Risk Guidance 22+ (ERG22+) – a tool that would eventually be used by professionals in order to assess the pathways to 'radicalisation' that individuals take.

In the summer of 2015, the government placed PREVENT and CHANNEL on a statutory footing through the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015, and with it, the 'radicalisation' factors and pathways developed through the ERG22+ also attained statutory significance.

Until the publication of the journal piece by Lloyd and Dean, there had been no scrutiny of the ERG22+ process, methodology or 'science'. This report, The 'Science' of Pre-crime, presents the first accounting of the 'science' as presented by the authors of the study. Our conclusions rest on three main themes:

1. The authors have not provided sufficient evidence to support the ERG22+'s 'science'.
2. The study's conclusions have been implemented far beyond the original intention.
3. A process that should have only ever been used by experts in a limited circumstance has been opened up to the entire public sector.

The study initially focused on 'al-Qaeda influenced' 'extremists' who largely had not been involved in any specific acts of violence. The study's initial focus involved managing risks within a prison environment, to understand processes of 'radicalisation'. What emerged, as acknowledged by Lloyd and Dean, was the UK government's use of these factors in order to predict 'pre-criminality' by claiming that the ERG22+ was an effective tool in identifying the signs of 'radicalisation'. This application, is far beyond the initial study's remit, and presents a disingenuous policy by the UK government in an environment where their previous reliance on the 'conveyor belt' theory has been found to be false. Of key importance, is the recognition by Lloyd and Dean that their study cannot be used as a predictive tool.

As established in a number of writings on 'terrorism' and 'radicalisation', political context is consistently cited as a significant factor. Slowly, 'terrorism experts' and the PREVENT industry have been forced to accept that this is the case. The Lloyd and Dean study, however, admits openly to omitting political context as a significant factor in its own right, despite having been recommended not to do so.

Finally, it should be noted that what is missing from this entire process, is any open process of scrutiny by the psychology community. This is seemingly a cause for concern, as the field of psychology has strict ethical rules about the way in which its science is developed. The government saw fit to place on statutory footing a system that has had no open or wider scrutiny, removing any ability for it to be refined or critiqued in a genuine way.