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In September 11 2001, America was under attack. The citizens were horrified and worried about their safety as a nation. The Homeland Security Council was also created to work hand in hand with the National Security Council. Congress also approved formation of the Department of Homeland Security .   
It was also important to investigate what prudent steps can be taken to minimize America’s exposure to such terror attacks. National funds had to be invested heavily to make the plan successful. It was also of great importance to review the missed steps in averting such risks. In late 2002, through a legislation by congress, the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (9/11 Commission) was formed. It was an independent and bipartisan commission which was tasked with coming up with an account of all the developments that surrounded the 9/11 attacks. The commission was also tasked with describing the challenges faced in preventing the attacks and coming up with recommendations to avert future attacks .   
The commission observed that there were some complications that America faced in anticipation and prevention of the attacks. Some of these complications include:   
The first main challenge was state and bureaucratic failures. After the Cold War, the US failed to adapt any new kind of terrorism. During the Cold War, the threat was from great nations but after it had narrowed down to weak nations, individuals and non-state groups. Policy makers never thought that terrorists could ever strike home. It was only after the World Trade Centre attack in 1993 that they realized the magnitude of foreign terrorism . The US was using the same old tactics to solve terrorism and little was done to reform security agencies. There was a systemic setback to intelligence gathering and sharing among government agencies. Pentagon could not effectively share information with the CIA and the FBI. Government agencies like FBI, NSA and CIA had created walls around themselves. There were boundaries in the operations of each agency like the FBI was the only agency allowed to spy American soil. All this resulted to calls to and from terrorists were not monitored with the notion that the other party might be American. This policy beauraucracies posed a major challenge in anticipation of the attacks .   
Another complication came from executive failures. The laws used for counter terrorism before 9/11 were formulated for the 20th Century. Threats in the 20th Century were from nations and not organized groups like Al Qaeda. The legislative organs had not formulated a good balance between individual rights and law enforcement. Individuals were advantaged at the expense of law enforcement. For instance, one could not be arrested or tracked if he/she had not moved from advocating to activating a criminal plan. Congress also did too little to address weaknesses in institutions . There was little effort made to form an integrated terrorism policy. Congress had not prioritized matters concerning terrorism. This went a long way in causing difficulty in anticipation of the attacks.   
There was lack of inter and intra agency sharing of information. This lack of sharing of crucial information has been viewed as one of the most crucial failures that led to the attacks. Different agencies need to be coordinated properly to form a strong counter terrorism force. This problem was both horizontal and vertical. Information from different departments in the FBI failed to be shared as well as in different agencies. Agencies were thus unaware of the happening in other departments. This miscommunication made a total of three urgent pieces of information pass unnoticed before the 9/11 attacks. The lack of sharing of such crucial information further led to ill-preparedness for the attacks .   
There was also insufficient allocation of financial resources for terrorism preparedness. Terror threats at home were not anticipated hence sufficient efforts were not put in place. Resources allocated for defence and intelligence budgets were in fact reduced over time instead of being increased . It was observed that American administrators did not adapt new and modern security changes after the Cold War; resources were not allocated accordingly to counter terror attacks.   
After the conclusive examination of the 9/11 terror attacks, the 9/11 commission laid down some very important recommendations to increase the security of America. We shall look at some of those recommendations and how they were meant to make sure all Americans are secured.   
First, the government of the United States of America must discover and give key priority to terrorism sanctuaries. Is should make sure to have a realistic strategies to ensure that all possible terrorists feel insecure and are always on the run. This it should do using all its elements of the national power . The government should reach out to other countries, listen to them and work with them in combatting this menace.   
On matters of liberties and human rights, America should form a coalition with its friend and come up with a common approach towards capturing, detention and humane treatment of terrorists. New principles to be were drawn from Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions on the law regarding armed conflict. This article was specially formulated to deal with cases that did not apply normal war laws. Its standards are accepted around the world as customary international law .   
The third recommendation dealt on the root of terrorism. The federal government must offer good example of moral leadership to the rest of the world. This should be done through humane treatment of people, showing kindness and generosity to neighbours and following the rule of law. Both Muslims and Americans can live in harmony and in agreement respecting human dignity. America has a crucial role in giving Muslim parents like Bin Laden a vision to provide their children with a bright future other than violence and terrorism. A consensus can be reached by noting the views of thoughtful Muslim and Arab leaders .   
In addition, the commission also had recommendations regarding weapons of mass destruction. The United States has a duty to support the Cooperative Threat Reduction Programme. It must also expand the Proliferation Security Initiative to counter efforts aimed at manufacture and acquiring of weapons of mass destruction by terror gangs. PSI should have open membership for non-NATO countries and also China and Russia were encouraged to join .   
On travel and financing of terrorist activities, the commission recommended that; America should hinder terrorist movement by combining travel intelligence, law enforcement and operations of terrorists into a strategy that intercepts them and finds their facilitators. Efforts to hunt down the financiers of terrorist activities must remain on the fore front of US counter terrorism agencies. The government should find networks of terrorist money to help them disrupt their activities and understand their operations. Capture of key individuals in terror groups is viewed as a way of curbing their operations .   
Finally, on border security, the commission recommended that integration of border security into large networks of screening points was important. It also stressed about transportation and access to key facilities as a matter of great concern. With the direction of the president, Homeland Security should formulate a thorough screening system and set standards to ensure the border is impenetrable to terrorists .
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