

The policy of the united states

[Countries](#), [United States](#)



This essay will generate the ideas of the role between border security and counterterrorism. The subcategories that will be discussed along side this theory are the lack of border security, both south of the United States and north. The policy of the United States toward immigration will also give the paper a close-up of the harm illegal aliens who are not apprehended will do, not only to the status of the economy but to national terrorism. In the emergence of a lax border security, finally, the issue of this juxtaposed with the opportunity that exists for terrorists to exploit will also be developed in the paper.

In order for a more substantial argument to evolve in this paper a brief history with terrorism and border control will be argued as well as the history of the US Patriot Act and other issues in the past with the United States concerning immigration, illegal aliens, and terrorists. Since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, there have been many changes in the ways the United States government functions. The first act of alteration to the normal code of conduct was the drafting and passage of the USA PATRIOT Act.

There are many who see this act as a bold defense against the fear of terrorism for the American public, however, a growing number of people see the changes in American governmental policy and overall attitude towards enemies and allies alike as an affront against proper American values and freedom. As Andrew Kydd and Barbara Walter explain, there is a distinct politic to the notion of terrorism. However, these tactics are not always effective. There are many events of terrorism in the world each year, yet only a handful are regarded with any merit.

According to Kydd and Walter, through a well argued and insightful article, it is “ the trust between groups” that must be destroyed for an extremist attack to be successful. This is the motivation behind the response to the attacks of September 11, 2001. On December 6, 2001, then Attorney General John Ashcroft addressed the Senate Judiciary Committee in praise of this act, and it’s restructuring of the NSA, CIA and FBI. (Ashcroft 524) His rhetoric was patriotic and concise, and his views of the USA PATRIOT act and its changes seemed sincere.

This was supported with the passage of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373, which paved the road for the Patriot act itself. Eric Rosand wrote about the resolution in 2003. His response to its necessity was one of sympathy to the government, for having to face such a difficult challenge. However, not everyone who has commented on the alterations of the US governmental policy has done so with such reverence. David Cole compared the investigations into possible terrorist cells in the United States, to the “ Palmer Raids” of 1919 - where, following a series of bombings, J.

Edgar Hoover led a series of “ round ups” of immigrants across the country and held them without trial or charge in “ unconscionable conditions, interrogated incommunicado and in some cases tortured”. (529) This attitude has spread throughout the country, as the appearance of indecency has flooded the government’s handling of the terrorists investigations. Mary Jacoby brings up the question of the legal definition of “ Detainee”. This is in response to the holding of prisoners at the Guantanamo Bay military base in Cuba.

The prisoners of this facility have been acquired from around the world - from the war in Afghanistan, and from arrests done in dozens of countries around the world. However, the problem arises when the soldiers fighting for the Afghan military are brought in as detainees, rather than prisoners of war. While the Guantanamo prison has its apologists, such as Charles Krauthammer - who states that freeing of these men would be " lunacy" (537) - the fact remains, that in strict terms, the United States is in breach of the Geneva Convention by holding POWs.

The United States government however sees this detention as necessary. The United States also enlists other tactics involving border control. The United States since September 11 has kept a more watchful eye on the Mexican border to ensure that large trucks are not passing the borders which could hold weapons, but this seems to be the only action officials and military are taking in regards to border control according to Zagorin (2004) in *The Mexican Border Will Get a Closer Look*.

In this article Zagorin is hard pressed to find any true action the US is taking in regards to border control and Zagorin sites many examples of how Mexico is making its own efforts to decrease the chances al-Qaeda terrorists coming into the country or leaving the country, " The Mexicans will also focus on flight schools and aviation facilities on their side of the frontier. ...another episode has some senior U. S.

officials worried; the theft of a crop-duster aircraft south of San Diego, apparently by three men from southern Mexico who assaulted a watchman and then flew off in a southerly direction... a senior U. S. law-enforcement official notes that crop dusters can be sued to disperse toxic

<https://assignbuster.com/the-policy-of-the-united-states/>

substance...”(19). In contrast to the underlying belief of the lax nature in Zagorin’s article Andreas (2003) holds a very different opinion in his article Perspective.

This article gives details about the before and after September 11 border security in the United States dealing with both the Mexican and Canadian border. Prior to September 11 the United States focused its energy on deterring the flow of drugs between the borders. Thus the model by which the United States is equipped in handling border security in regards to terrorism is very juvenile in design because their previous focus has been on migrant workers and masses of illegal immigrants rather than to search a crowd and discover a few terrorists (4).

Another issue that arises in the approach of the Mexican border is that the south border of the United States received much more attention than the Canadian border, “...only 334 agents were assigned to the 5, 525-mile northern border compared with over 9, 000 agents stationed at the 2, 062-mile southern edge” (4), however, since September 11 there are an equal amount of agents patrolling both borders. Under the Patriot Act, as stated previously, the number of agents present in the Canadian border has tripled in a response to September 11.

In an effort to stop terrorism, the US coastguard now stops every boat crossing the Great Lakes as well as escorts large tankers. Thus, Andreas states that these new border securities have merely taken the old ideas of drug trafficking measures and applied them to terrorism which makes for an increase of difficulty in border control (Andreas, 5). Fernando Reinares noted in his article, The Empire Rarely Strikes Back, that after “ more than 2400
<https://assignbuster.com/the-policy-of-the-united-states/>

acts of terrorism against American citizens and interests” there have been only “ three occasions of overt military response”.

(Reinares 92) However, because of the incredible size and depth of impact of the September 11th attacks, war became unavoidable. There did arise a problem with the military action, however, as a growing public opinion seemed to point the target at Islam itself, rather than just Al-Qaeda. This prompted the United States to “ enlist the help of as many Islamic nations as possible” to counter act this perception. (Aretxega 143)

This coalition of Islamic nations does nothing to counteract the rise in racial profiling within the United States. Sherry Colb wrote about the foreseen changes in American law enforcement following the September 11th attacks. Her article articulated the problem of racial profiling and its consequences. Cold notes that “ real numbers do not support profiling”. (539) However this does not stop the utilization of profiling in airports, or in traffic stops. However, this too has its supporters, from such sources as law professor Roger Clegg.

His response to the topic of racial profiling is one of acceptance and justification. “ So what? ” (Clegg 542) Clegg asks of the act of profiling. However his racial make-up lends itself easily to such opinions, as an educated white male is rarely confronted for being white, educated or male. But profiling at the borders is the number one cause by which patrols see fit to apprehend an individual since they fit the profile and the Patriot Act backs up the idea of border security no matter what the cost.

The changes in the United States since September 2001 have been many and wide in scope, however there is little agreement as to whether these changes are for the better - or even legal. As illustrated in these articles, the several aspects of governmental policy that have been affected by these attacks have been met with acceptance and praise, as well as contempt and ridicule - with communicative and sincere arguments on both sides. Though, despite the eloquent nature of the arguments, they do not dissuade one from his or her own opinion.

It is the learned set of moral values that create one's opinion of the new America. The issue of border control seems increasingly to be an issue of economics and as much as the United States focuses its attention on increasing patrol, it is also obstructing trade between countries and so the lax behavior or approach in certain instances of policing and allowing immigrants to cross borders presents to the theorist that increased border control does not necessarily lead to a more protected country.

In Kiely's (2006) article *GOP View*, she states that the United States is more focused on illegal immigration than terrorism and using terrorism as a guise by which to exert an autocratic policing style which does not give rights to immigrants, " A bill the House passed in December called for making illegal immigration a felony offense, punishable by at least a year in jail...Under the law, people who cross the border without permission are already guilty of a criminal misdemeanor.

But people who enter the country legally and then overstay their visas—as many as 40% of the nation's estimated 12 million illegal immigrants, according to Sensenrenner—are guilty of a civil violation" (1). Thus it

becomes apparent that the United States is focusing more attention on illegal immigration than on terrorism since all of their efforts are geared toward this goal. Since the United States has merely adapted their approach to finding terrorists in the same fashion by which they find illegal immigrants there seems to exist a very unreliable system.

The terrorists that entered the country each had different ways to travel, false papers of identification and would have been apprehended if the border security had not been as lax as they had been and since their approach to border control has not changed dramatically as a system, but merely as having more patrols and policing the gate is left open for terrorism, as The US 9/11 Commission on Border Control (2004), states, " We found that as many as 15 of the 19 hijackers were potentially vulnerable to interception by border authorities.

Analyzing their characteristic travel documents and travel patterns could have allowed authorities to intercept 4 of the 15 hijackers and more effective use of information available in U. S. government databases could have identified up to 3 hijackers" (570).

Since these hijackers could have been apprehended but were not, and the government has only increased the number of patrols on the either border and not per se the system by which illegal immigrants are apprehended it stands to reason that the government is not altogether prepared or establishing a methodology in apprehending terrorists, they are merely cracking down by using brute force without strategy,

Looking back, we can also see that the routine operations of our immigration laws—that is, aspects of those laws not specifically aimed at protecting against terrorism—inevitably shaped al Qaeda’s planning and opportunities. Because they were deemed not to be bona fide tourists or students as they claimed, five conspirators that we know of tried to get visas and failed, and one was denied entry by an inspector.

We also found that had the immigration system set a higher bar for determining whether individuals are who or what they claim to be—and ensuring consequences for violations—it could potentially have excluded, removed, or come into further contact with several hijackers who did not appear to meet the terms for admitting short-term visitors (570). Thus, the article emphasized the lack of a system in uncovering terrorism as part of border security. Aristotle was partial to pluralism. He did place his faith in the idea that humans ‘aped’ reality and copy what they are witnessing, and thus making reality a reserved, unattainable subject.

A person’s personal truth, through the philosophy of pluralism and Aristotle, has a background involving historical context and empirical evidence wherein truth can be extrapolated. Aristotle believed that pluralism dealt more with a person’s culture than with a vast array of immitigable scenarios. For Aristotle, pluralism, and not unity allowed for change in the universe, and in this avenue of discourse Aristotle presented the concept of both motion and rest existing in the world in simultaneous reality, “...

it is not the case that all things are at rest or in motion sometimes and nothing for ever; for there is something which always moves the things that are in motion, and the first mover is itself unmoved [Ibid. , 29-32, p. 751]. "

<https://assignbuster.com/the-policy-of-the-united-states/>

Therefore, life, reality, self exist on a plane where the possibility of truth is represented in many. Thus, the United States' approach to terrorism is found to be understood as the common good for everyone as opposed to the common good based on one man.

This is shown in the allowance of holding foreigners in prisons without trial in order to gain information from them, and even in some cases indulging in torture in order to protect the greater good as is stated in Aristotle's logos. In the reality that existed for Aristotle through the philosophy concept of pluralism, empirical facts were the focus, goal and reality which human beings base their existence. In this existence, it is not necessary for a common laborer to delve into the meanderings of the Ideal Good possibly having relevance for anyone besides a philosopher.

The absolute idea for Aristotle was not found in abstract concepts but rather in empirical multiplicity and continuous transformation of facts based on frame of reference, history, and culture. It is through these fundamental approaches that human beings come to know their own truth instead of delving into the misrepresentation of Forms given through Plato's unity, " Pythagoreans say that things exist by ' imitation' of numbers, and Plato says they exist by participation, changing the name.

But what the participation or the imitation of the Forms could be they left an open question [Ibid. , II-14, p. 701]. " The interaction of Forms and human beings in the universe is the core concept on the philosophy of pluralism, as Aristotle states, " Platonists speak as if the One were homogeneous like fire or water; if this is so, the numbers will not be substances.

Evidently, if there is a One-itself, and this is a first principle, 'One' is being used in more than one sense; for otherwise the theory is impossible [Ibid. , 992a 7-10, p. 709]. " Through metaphysics Aristotle suggests that existence is not reliant upon numbers, reasons, or Forms alone, but only that the realistic forms are primary, which is the approach the United States government is taking in regards to counter-terrorism. The number one priority of preventing terrorism is to prevent terrorist travel.

This tactic however has not been seriously employed with regards to border security and finding and preventing terrorism since the focus, as previously stated, is more about finding terrorists, not finding the means by which they are mobile. One system that has not be utilized in border security is the means by which to detect whether documentation is authentic since terrorists have system by which they infiltrate a country. Their travel channels should be found and exploited, but no real clause in the Patriot Act has been given or stated.

Terrorists establish themselves in the United States through their travel channels by which there is a paper trail of documents; therefore, the Patriot Act, and NAFTA should not only be focusing their efforts at the borders where the terrorists may or may not be traveling but the government should also be wary of terrorist activity already transpiring inside the country, as The US 9/11 Commission on Border Control, " Each of these checkpoints or portals is a screening-a chance to establish that people are who they say they are and are seeking access for their stated purpose, to intercept identifiable suspects, and to take effective action" (571). This paper has shown that although the United States is refocusing efforts on border control their

methodology has not been new in design as counter terrorism efforts call for, but instead the United States seems to have merely increased the number of patrols across the border and not changed the system by which they seek out terrorists.

In the information presented in this paper it gave different avenues by which the United States could be making a better effort to fight terrorism by simply having a different strategy on terrorism inclusive of finding their travel channels and relying on identification and false passports. The United States approach to border control, since they are using the same system now as prior to September 11 have not changed how they approach terrorists and their apprehension thus leaving room for terrorists to take advantage of this lax method and exploit it. Bibliography Andreas, Peter. (2003 3rd Quarter). Perspective. Regional Review. Vol. 13, Issue 2, p3-7. Aretxaga, Begona. (Winter 2001). Terror as Thrill: First Thoughts on the ' War on Terrorism'. Anthropological Quarterly. Vol. 75, No. 1, p138-150. Kiely, Kathy. (13 April 2006).

GOP View: Illegal Immigration Won't be Felony. USA Today. Kydd, Andrew; Walter, Barbara. (Spring 2002). Sabotaging the Peace: The Politics of ExtremistViolence. International Organization. Vol. 56, No. 2, p263-296. Reinares, Fernando. (Jan-Feb 2002). The Empire Rarely Strikes Back. Foreign Policy. No. 128. P. 92-94. Rosand, Eric. (April 2003). Security Council Resolution 1373, the Counter-Terrorism Committee, and the Fight against Terrorism. The American Journal of International Law. Vol. 97, No. 2, p333-341. The US 9/11 Commission on Border Control. (2004). Blackwell

Publishing Ltd. p569-574. Zagorin, Adam. (22 November 2004). Bordering On Nukes? Time. Vol. 164 Issue 21, p19.