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## Border Patrol in the USA

The paper " Border Patrol in the USA" is a delightful example of a thesis proposal on the law. The politicization of immigration and partisan politics is doing more harm than good to border patrol I. Border patrol should not be seen as an isolated activity that happens at the country’s borders. Instead, it has to be approached from a wholesome immigration policy perspective. Immigration trends affect border patrol B. Policies passed in Washington, and/or the opposition to those policies, often tend to curtail border patrol II. We live in a heavily polarized political landscape, a divide that has always been the source of balance and political control. A. It is understandable that the left would want to check the policy suggestions of the right when it comes to border patrol, and the right would rightfully do the same. Politics, however, affects the actual jobs and tendencies of the border patrol agents and officers. They deal with dangerous and organized criminal groups, and the political grandstanding often end up affecting how (effectively) they do their jobs. The politicization of the issues has made progress difficult. Border patrol should not be partisan but should be issue based. Public opinion and anti-immigrant sentiment complicate a job that should always be straightforward, protecting the country from intruders and outside threats. One of the biggest immigration and border patrol related stories in recent weeks arose from the photos of immigrants being dispersed using teargas and pepper spray. It was a shocking image to those that are new to the border patrol debate, but surprisingly not a new thing. A caravan with Honduran immigrants had to be dispersed at the Ysidro border crossing after allegedly attacking the border patrol agents with various objects (Robbins). This, as one would expect, say critics of the administration come out strongly in condemnation. Celebrities criticized the move, going as far as comparing President Trump to Hitler. One senator even went as far as accusing the border agents of war crimes and being in violation of the chemical weapons convention of 1993 (Robbins). The politics of asylum notwithstanding, if indeed these immigrants, who have faced violence and clashes with police even in Mexico on their journey to the US border charged at the border patrol agents, this seems a justified response. That this has now been reduced to a partisan argument, one full of rhetoric and the usual comparisons with what the former administration did shows just how much politics and the partisan polarization has affected border patrol. Meanwhile, the actual problem of the migrant caravan is still very much alive. It is this political back and forth at the expense of focusing on the real issues that make border patrol a much more difficult job than it already is.
Partisan Politics One of the strengths of the American political system is the presence of checks and balances, especially considering the two party system. This system has been described as compatible with the societal and cultural nature of the country as well as the structures of government. It is a system that has offered the country the benefits of legitimacy, accountability and policy moderation (Dulio and Thurber). There is a school of thought, though, that believes the days of ideological parties ruling are over. The American winner-takes-all electoral system used to reward and encourage parties that had a broad national appeal, and no party could win with just half of the electorate and give up on the other half (Drutman). The dynamics seem to have changed, though, especially with the election to the office of Donald Trump. In the past, it was widely believed that no party could win by courting extremist anti-system candidates or ideas. Today, both parties regularly seem to forsake half the electorate and are rewarded for it (Drutman). The worst of this, though, is that the political elements often end up affecting real-life policy, and one of the areas that have suffered the most has been border patrol. Recently, the president decided to employ national guardsmen to stem the tide of drugs, illegal immigration, criminal cartels and violence. Again, this was a move applauded by one section of the country, with the other side heavily opposed. It is not difficult to work out the partisan alignments of the majority of the people on either side. The truth is that past deployment of national guardsmen to the border have been very successful. National Guardsmen act as a force multiplier and are often a welcome addition to a border patrol workforce that struggles to contain illegal immigration, drugs and violence (Aguilar). That the framing of these issues and frankly their motivation, is mainly politically motivated does not help. For instance, the April move to send the National Guard to the border came after a series of characteristic tweets from the president (Villagomez). The political angle/ motivation is difficult to ignore and invites criticism which then fails to take into consideration and mostly ends up getting in the way of the true value of such a move. For instance, even in busy places like Texas, the National Guardsmen are not allowed to be in the public eye, in observation or in lookout posts, where they might be most helpful (Hennesy-Finke). The deployment of these troops was either a face value policy to please a political base more desperate for immigration reform, or is being restricted by a very critical opposition. Either way, politics is actively getting in the way of effective border control, effectively wasting money and resources. The often polarized wall debate is another case in point. The wall was made a symbol and metaphor for the Trump administration, and, at least in some respect, allowing him the liberty to build it would have been seen as a symbolic win/loss and endorsement of the messages sent during the campaign (Nakamura and O'Keefe). Very few people debated the actual merits, or lack thereof, of the wall or even considered the opinions of the very people tasked with protecting the border, the actual border patrol agents, who have in many instances come out in support of a wall (Dinan). Conclusion The country and the political class by extension is much divided today along partisan lines. This makes the usual compromises that made things easier in the past more difficult to arrive at. People would rather have a hard stand and appease their support base, instead of approaching an issue with rationality and considering the weight and effectiveness of the policies they take. One of the issues that should never be caught up in this political debate is that of border patrol. In today’s globalized world, immigration will always be a huge political issue. There will always besides taken, but on the issue of border patrol, the politicization of the actual processes protecting the border do more harm than good. Public opinion, political loyalties and nationalist anti-immigrant sentiment, justified as they might be to either side, complicate an already pretty complicated job of policing the border, places agent and border town lives in danger and results in such situations as the one recently witnessed, where border patrol had to teargas and pepper spray an immigrant caravan.