Homeland Security:

Profiling

By

Alan G. Johnson

Student # 172

SGM Huffman, M08

01 October 2005

Homeland Security:

Abstract

In the world of political correctness, civil liberties and the global threat of terror attacks, our society has become to a divided on the subject of profiling. Although many corporations, individuals and scientific groups, use profiling, it is the subject of racial profiling that is at the forefront of the civil liberties debate. The University Of Texas defines profiling in many different categories of interest, in particular is this definition; "A technique whereby a set of characteristics of a particular class of person is inferred from past experience, and data-holdings are then searched for individuals with a close fit to that set of characteristics" (EBT Glossary). The question is, should racial, ethnic, or nationality based profiling systems be used by our Department of Homeland Security even to defend our national interest?

Homeland Security:

A Question of Necessity?

There is no question that profiling is used in our country and around the world. There is no question that law enforcement and intelligence agencies use profiling to accomplish missions. The question is; "Has profiling become an ethical necessity in this age terrorism, and will our freedom loving society call for a more extensive use of profiling?" The answer to both questions is yes. Through research and deductive reasoning, I will attempt to show why we as a society must give up some of our unrestricted freedoms in order to safeguard, what remains of our way of life. In addition I will show why profiling, no matter how distasteful, may be the only way to stop terrorist attacks before they happen.

Homeland Security:

Profiling Acceptable to, or Tolerated by Our society

Many groups in our society currently use profiling in order to benefit their everyday business. These groups include; employers, lawyers, sales people and the military. All these entities use profiling in one form or another to make their job easier. Employers use profiling to screen their potential employees. Companies like Dell Computer, General Electric, Motorola, Bristol Myers, Hewlett Packard, Nokia and other Fortune 500 Companies, extensively use Psychological evaluations (Abika.com, 2005). These companies use this information to help them understand the needs of the consumer. This information helps to develop the advertisements of their products to appeal to a larger demographic range. The military uses profiling to select their Special Forces candidates. Special Forces tryout (Selection) has remained a constant for the past 20 years. "First there is selection, a month long weeding out process, then follows the qualification course, which trains and tests soldiers in three phases (Robinson, 2004)." This process of weeding out and

selection involve a profiling technique, which points toward individuals who strive to accomplish, seemingly unachievable, missions. These men drive themselves, without external motivation to do near impossible tasks. Lawyers select jury members using agencies like Trial Behavior Consulting Inc. This particular agency specializes in jury selection and management. Under the Jury Selection section TBC Inc. says,

> "We accompany you to court for jury selection. If there are questionnaires, we
>
> make sure the appropriate questionnaires are handy as jurors are questioned. We
>
> take detailed notes on voir dire responses and ensure you have the jurors' own
>
> words to assist you in making cause challenges. Based on knowledge of juror
>
> attitudes and juror responses during voir dire, we make suggestions for peremptory
>
> and cause challenges. We also prepare and maintain seating charts to help keep
>
> track of jurors in the box (TBCI, 2005)."

It is common knowledge that these profiling techniques used to select or dismiss potential jurors are so successful, trials are often won even before the trial ever begins.

So why is profiling used by so many so often, simply because it works. Does this mean that average Americans accepts profiling, perhaps not.

As most people may have experienced, telephone solicitation can be an example of the profiling of our habits that we tolerate everyday. People willingly fill out questionnaires on web sites in order to meet new people, and what do they read before meeting them, they read the individual's profile. Therefore, it appears that our society, though guarded and personal in many respects, has come to accept profiling in our every day lives. Creditors have profiles, which estimate the amount of risk a creditor incurs by lending the borrower money. A credit score that is

derived from the borrower's spending, lending and payment habits measures this. Insurance companies compile mountains of data on an individual's driving habits and then calculate a profile, which then dictates how much the insurer must pay. So why is there such an outcry about using profiling in police work or for our national interests? I believe it could be that people are afraid of the abuse of power or, at very least, its misuse?

Homeland Security:

Unsuccessful Instances of Profiling

As we have seen thus far profiling can successfully be employed by companies, agencies, and even individuals to help them make choices to weed-out people who might not live up to their expectations. However, there are times when the information that might otherwise help these entities make right decisions is inappropriately used. Here is a case of profiling gone wrong. A 26-year-old business administration student traveling to Pittsburgh came up on the airlines hot sheet because his name had a phonetic similarity to a name on the FBI watch list. He was pulled aside and investigated by the FBI, and subsequently cleared (Jacinto, 2002). This incident, as it stands was not a problem; what happened afterward shows how tools like profiling, in the wrong hands could cripple a person's life. Even after clearing the individual of any wrongdoing, he was not allowed to board the aircraft. In fact, he was put on an airline 'black list" and was once again detained and investigated (Jacinto, 2002). Although this type of situation does not happen often, it only needs to happen to a person once for them to appreciate how profiling can disrupt an individual's life. This is something every American can or should relate to. No person wants their information in a database that allows innocent people to be targeted for investigation and scrutiny. Even though it may not be intentional, the fact that being in the database may provoke such action

is reason enough to worry. Next, we will examine the other end of the spectrum, the times that profiling does work.

Homeland Security:

Successful Cases of Profiling

Profiling, though not an exact science, has been proven to be effective in it its detection of those who would do us harm. This was demonstrated prior to September 11, 2001. According to the research conducted by Linda Robinson, senior writer for U.S. News and World Report; on December 11, 1999, the State Department issued a warning about travel overseas and the possibility of a terrorist attack. About three days later, Ahmed Ressam was caught trying to cross the U.S. and Canadian border. He was transporting 130 lbs. of Royal Demolition explosives (RDX) and timers made from Casio watches along with maps of Washington, Oregon and California. Here was an example of intelligence, diligence and a little luck saving the day. This is case was declassified and made accessible to the public. According to accounts of those involved in the anti-terror operations, there have been many more foiled attempts, and it has resulted in the saving of countless lives. There is little doubt that the inconvenience that one might suffer in a mishandling of profile information is nowhere as harmful as 130lb. of high explosives. These anti terror operations keep watch on the goings on of citizens that display a high probability to support terror networks. Further more, the investigative techniques used by Scotland Yard to ferret out the London bombers resulted in the capture of the remainder of the cell. The profile used for the terror cell and its supporters was instrumental in their capture and possibly to thwart future terrorist endeavors. The success of these operations would indicate that the successful use of profiling out weighs its potential misuse. What kinds of people are committing such acts of violence and

inhumanity? Is there a common thread among these individuals or are the attacks being committed

by a random cross-section of the world community? Is it truly possible to use large scale profiling

to thwart the suicidal attacks of these mad men? Let us see what kind of profile we can build based

on attacks that have already happened.

<div align="center">

Homeland Security:

Profiles of Suicide Bombers

</div>

For American citizens the threat of terror attacks hit our shores on 11 September 2001. That

is when American liberties changed forever. No longer can New Yorkers enter the subway free

from the thought of a suicide bomb attack. American citizens now wait in long security lines

hoping to make their flights in time and yet remain safe from another highjacking. There have been

many suicide bomb attacks throughout the world, but this was the first on American soil. How do

we prevent another such disaster from occurring again? In order to fight an enemy you must first

know them. What are they like? What do the look like? With whom do they associate? What is the

basis for their belief systems? These questions when asked individually do not seem improper, but

put them all together and you have the beginnings of a terrorist profile. Let us look at what these

individuals have in common with each other. Stefan Sharansky compiled the following list from

attacks reported in the world news. It gives a description of suicide bombers from Israel and

Palestine:

> "Muhammad Al-Ghoul suicide bomber killed 19 people, injured 74 on a
> Jerusalem bus, June 18, 2002.
>
> Abdul Baset Odeh suicide bomber killed 29 people, injured 140 at the Park Hotel
> Passover Seder in Netanya, March 27, 2002.
>
> Sa'id Al Hotary suicide bomber, killed 21 people, injured 120 at the Dolphinarium
> Disco in Tel Aviv, June 1, 2001" (Sharansky, 2002).

This was a small example of some international suicide bombers, let us compare the September 11 hijackers and see if we can find a commonality between them. The 6 primary organizers among them were Khalid al-Mihdhar, Nawaf al-Hazmi, and the pilots (Mohammed Atta, Marwan al-Shehhi, Ziad Jarrah, and Hani Hanjour). According to Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, this distribution reflects the proportions of trainees at al-Qaida camps and the relative ease of obtaining U.S. visas for Saudi Arabian citizens (*Wikipedia,* July 2005). Well, at first glance it would seem that they are of Middle Eastern descent, male, Muslim and willing to die in a fiery explosion for their cause. It would also appear that their citizenship tends to be from the Middle East. On 07 July 2005, 5 bombers struck the London transportation system. The perpetrators were United Kingdom citizens living most if not all their lives in the country, they did not commit suicide and one of the attackers was Jamaican born (BBC, 2005). These men seemed to have been totally integrated into the British culture and society. They were well educated and from the middle class. These men differ somewhat from the previous attackers mentioned but there is still a commonality, they are all Muslim and it would appear that they have some connection to Pakistani Militants. One of the men is even reported to have been on government assistance (a British form of welfare). So did these men attack the citizens of the United Kingdom because the government treated them poorly? I think not, the United Kingdom has placated its Muslim citizens for years. It has allowed radical clerics to preach in the Mosques. They thought they had a "pact" with Muslim groups as was reported in the New York Sun. "An Islamist British group called Al-Muhajiroun - "the immigrants" in Arabic - for some time publicly stated that Britain was immune from Islamist violence because of its acceptable behavior toward Muslims within the country's borders" (Pipes, 2005). On 7 July 2005, the London Bombers demonstrated that no amount of appeasement could stop terror from invading England's shores. Are citizens ready to give up some of their civil liberties in

order to prevent such attacks from occurring again? In the next segment, we will weigh the loss of civil liberties against the possible loss of life if these attacks continue.

Homeland Security:

Decreased Civil liberties or Terror Proliferation

In this great nation, we are blessed with great liberties. With these great liberties often comes great sacrifice. One of the goals of any terrorist group, as taught in the John F Kennedy Special Warfare Center, is to disrupt and destroy the way of life of the target nation. If we change our way of life, erode our freedoms and live in a police state, then in a sense, the terrorists have already won a major victory. If we refuse to act and continue to allow the type of attacks that have been inflicted on our nation by these Muslim Extremists, we will also lose many freedoms and in the process lose many of our loved ones. We will loose the freedom to place our children on school busses without fear of loosing them to a bomb attack. We will loose many of the same freedoms given up by Israeli Citizens because of the, almost daily bomb attacks which plaque their nation. Therefore, the key is to allow our citizens their freedoms and take the freedoms from those who would do us harm. This would require a type of profiling that would not target freedom-loving and peaceful citizens, but target those who, not only, would do us harm, but also those who provide support to the terrorists. It would require an extraordinary amount of restraint and tempered judgment by our law enforcement officials in order to safeguard its citizens and the American way of life.

Homeland Security:

Conclusion

In the latest terror tragedy, the London Underground was targeted by, what appears to be, an Al Qaeda Terror Cell. Because of England's excellent camera network, these suspects were quickly apprehended. We know that these terrorist are of the Muslim faith, have Middle Eastern or North African ties and are male. Although the attempts failed to inflict the desired amount of damage, the attack forever changed the way British citizens view their Muslim neighbors. Historically, the United Kingdom is known for its positive view of multiculturalism and high tolerance of Muslim religious practices. As was reported by CNN, Londoners did not even expect those who sought citizenship to hold any allegiance to the country as long as they lived in peace. They were allowed to cloister together, form their own communities and preach anti-western rhetoric in their Mosques. As anyone who has watched the news since 7 July 2005 knows, Tony Blair, England's Prime Minister, announced a new direction for English tolerance of its Muslim neighbors. Now it seems that the British people are far less likely to tolerate extremist rhetoric from these *madras's (*religious schools). This is, without a doubt, an infringement of civil liberties. In a single act of terrorism, freedom of speech was reduced. This is the first step toward controlling the violent actions that would destroy western civilization or possibly the first step toward destroying our freedoms. It is a difficult road to travel, non-the-less it is a journey that must be made.

To be fair we should assume that not all Muslims are terrorist sympathizers, but we know that almost all the terror acts committed since September 11, 2001 have been by Muslims. Why then would a security checkpoint randomly check a 67-year-old German woman while allowing a

25-year-old Muslim male with a backpack to pass by? This action would make no sense, but the

ACLU advocates these actions. This was posted on the World Net Daily web site:

> "The American Civil Liberties Union and Council on American-Islamic Relations
>
> are teaming up today to decry what they see as a federal screening process that
>
> discriminates against Muslim Americans (2005)."

However, the times that the profiling works may outweigh the inconvenience one faces by

its potential misuse, especially if these watch lists help to save lives. Americans must understand

that the freedoms to go to work, to play with your children and to enjoy the every day life in our

society are in danger. Do we want to live with terror in our streets like Israeli citizens? In order to

keep many of our freedoms we must be willing to sacrifice a few. Why should any of the law-

abiding citizens have to put up with the actions of those who would harbor terrorists and promote

violence in our society? We refuse to tolerate these actions from Nazi's and from White separatists,

should we not do the same with Muslim extremists. The longer we wait to do what must be done

the harder things will become in the future. We tolerate longer lines at the airports, we tolerate

sending our loved ones to fight these men-of-terror in foreign lands and we tolerate illegal

immigrants crossing our southern border by the thousands. Why then can't we tolerate the profiling

of those types of individuals which are determined to destroy the freedoms which makes it possible

for them to commit these acts of violence in the first place? America will awaken as they have

done in the past, when they do, it will be with a vengeance. Maybe if we start now, we can do what

is right with moderation and prudent action. In the process, maybe we can save the lives of those

we love. Will profiling in order to stop these Muslim extremists take place? Rest assured that

profiling of this type will happen and will succeed. The only question is how many more

Americans, men, women and children will have to lose their lives before lawmakers and the

American public wake from their coma of political correctness?

Works Cited

Abika.com. Who *uses Psychological Profiles & Background Checks?* July, 2005.
        http://www.abika.com/Reports/benefits.htm

BBC News. London Attacks: *Bombers.* July 22, 2005
        http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/spl/hi/uk/05/london_blasts/html/bombers.stm

Electronic Benefits Transfer and Public Policy. LBJ School PRP, 1997-98
        University of Texas at Austin
        http://www.utexas.edu/lbj/21cp/ebt/glossary.htm

Jacinto, Leela. *Profiling May Be a Dirty Word, But Some Say Targeting Certain Ethnic Groups
        is a Good Thing.* August 14, 2002. U.S. Border Control ABC News,
        http://www.usbc.org/profiles/profiles2002/0802profiling.htm

Pipes, Daniel, British "Covenant of Security" with Islamists Ends
        New York Sun, July 8, 2005
        http://www.danielpipes.org/article/2742

Robinson, Linda (2004). *Masters of Chaos: The Secret History of The Special Forces.* New
        York, NY: Public Affairs.

Sharkansky, Stefan. Shark Blog, *Psychotic Death Cult Photo Album.* Sept.12, 2002
        http://www.usefulwork.com/shark/psychodeathalbum.html

Trial Behavior Consulting, Inc.
        http://www.trialbehavior.com/pages/services/serv3.htm#js

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. (Redirected from September 11, 2001 Terrorist
        Attack/Hijackers) *July 18, 2005.*
        http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/September_11,_2001_Terrorist_Attack/Hijackers

WorlNetDaily, April 20, 2005, *Homeland Insecurity*
        http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=43881