

90

by 90 90

Submission date: 02-Dec-2021 06:15PM (UTC-0500)

Submission ID: 1718847870

File name: The_Counterterrorism_policy_assignment_final.docx (22.77K)

Word count: 1727

Character count: 9918

Professor

Student

Course

Date

The Comparison of U.S. and French Counterterrorism Policies

Terrorist activity is among the most severe dangers to safety, stability, and prosperity and the realization of human rights and socio-economic growth. Terrorism attempts to destroy the fundamental principles that unify the country. At the same time, participating States categorically deny the connection of terrorism with any particular ethnicity or religion. As a result, substantial efforts are utilized to avoid and stop terrorism in its incarnations as brutal acts with no legitimacy, regardless of its purpose or origin. The purpose of this study is to contrast the U.S. and French counterterrorism policies.

Counterterrorism policies in the U.S.

The United States of America tried to combat terrorism by using of Patriot Act. This was a policy signed by George .W. Bush, who was president those days. The U.S. used this policy as an extremely aggressive national defense effort and a measure to counterterrorism after the terrorist attacks of September 11. The Patriot Act as counterterrorism policy rendered antiterrorism measures that were more simplified, economical, and successful. Federal officials used covert surveillance to follow overseas terrorists trained to evade detection by quickly shifting places and communications gadgets. A reasonable delay in alerting suspected terrorists of a court order allowed law enforcement time to locate the criminal's connections, reduce imminent public

dangers, and organize prosecutions without tipping off the defendants. Police departments had greater unity via many messaging services.

The America's Patriot Act focused on enabling the government of America to be ready for terrorist attacks. The USA Patriot Act worked toward improving surveillance to combat terrorism. This increased the rapid tracking of terrorists (Alexander, 37). The United States Act is a policy, and it was utilized to handle terror activities by Americans. This policy enabled those enforcing the law to have subpoena power associated with the communication of alleged terrorists. The Subpoena could also be permitted to access payment information like bank account numbers and credit cards for any suspected terrorist using the internet. Besides, those who could be caught helping terrorists or harbor them were punished.

Another policy utilized in the U.S. was Aviation Security. The Aviation Security Policy (ASP) and Efficiency Office were essential for implementing new and updated Guidelines for the safety of civil aviation. Among other things, the ASP Department oversaw its creation and amending Annex 17 to the International Air Transport Convention (often referred to as the Chicago Convention), directing and supervising the Aviation Security (AVSEC) Committee's vocational rehab and work teams. Besides, the ASP Branch encouraged security collaboration with other United Nations agencies and international institutions.

The immigration policies were also the best strategies used in the United States to deal with terrorism. The immigration policy was a directive issued by Bush aimed at improving immigration policies. This policy appeared to be effective in that it made it difficult for terrorists to find their way to America. Besides, the policy did allow them to remain in the United States. After Bush's Directive, the immigration policy supported tracking task force to fight against foreign terrorism.

This denied any aliens to enter into the American states in that any individual coming in America was treated as a suspect for terror attacks. It was easy for America to ² locate, detain, prosecute, and deport aliens with this policy.

² Emergency funding and other financial support was a strategy that worked on controlling terrorism. This strategy was a financial measure to fight against terrorism. For instance, around \$40 billion were offered by the American administration to help respond to damages that the attack caused and eventually supported national security needs in the United States of America. It is clear that under the Bush administration, several steps were taken to ensure that the terrorist organization did not get any financial support to plan attacks, and also, no funds were raised to finance terror attacks. As per the law requirement, the U.S. redesigned foreign terrorist organizations under Colin Powell, who was the state secretary. This was a strategy that supported counterterrorism in that it was used as a policy or strategy that required viewed it as illegal for people in America to offer any material support to a group of terrorists.

The antiterrorism Act of 1996 was a very effective policy in counterterrorism. This policy focused on several measures. The policy called for the authorization of funding that worthy \$1 billion that aided the efforts of law enforcement on antiterrorism. The policy made it easy such that police service could trace any bombs made by criminals. With this policy, it was difficult for a terrorist to get funding or raise money to support their terror attacks. The antiterrorism Act of 1996 streamlined procedures of executing and expulsing aliens linked to terrorists. The president was allowed by this policy to ensure the withholding of aids from foreign countries and ensure there that no assistance was provided by those supporting terrorism. The antiterrorism Act of 1996 also increased fines if one was engaged in conspiracy or committed to violating explosives policies

or crimes related to explosives. It was very easy for the sponsor's terrorism of foreign state to be sued by terror victims.

Another policy was Defense against Weapon of Mass Destruction. The policy was put in place in 1996, and it put more emphasis on training associated with weapons used for mass destruction following terrorist incidents. It supported programs for preparedness to train first responders like police, fire, and medical technicians in case of an attack.

Counterterrorism policies in France

In France, most offensive and repressive policies were applied to deal with terrorism (Alexander, 59). The legislative innovation came up with a law in September 1986. This policy started by establishing legislation that dealt with terrorism. Besides, it created SCLAT as well as the 14th section of antiterrorism with an office in Paris. This policy gave police mandates to work with a pool of specific magistrates. This helped the police to specialize in inquiries associated with antiterrorists. Besides, France used repressive policies that were put in place in 1988. The policy was a Right-left agreement and fought against terrorism. This policy involved the modernization of police, where they specialized and worked with a coordinated effort to combat terrorism.

Policy against terrorism Terrorist organizations such as ISIS, al-Qaida, and Hizballah continued to use France to plan attacks against the United States and its partners and friends. With time these groups' dangers changed, and therefore, the State Department struggled to forge a global agreement on degrading and defeating their enemies. The Agency collaborated with other governments to develop the capacities required to prevent, lessen, detect, and react to threats of terrorism via a mix of diplomacy interaction and international assistance. This included initiatives to increase law enforcement and judicial capacities, extend aviation and border protection, promote

global exchange of information, combat international terrorism, enhance rapid response, and combat international terrorism. The Department of justice advocated for more responsibility distribution to combat terrorist activity and enable nations to develop counterterrorism capabilities in their respective areas via internationalization.

The Legislative and Judiciary Power was used to fight terrorism in France. French legislation policy prohibited conspiracy to commit terrorism and ecological terrorism. Countless individuals died due to the Paris assault, just as they did in the America; the Paris assault had more bad consequences than good consequences, just as it did in the United States (Alexander, 57). Many people lost their lives following the terror attack. The assailants murdered 130 people and 90 deaths due to the assault at the exact location and stood as one of the worst terrorist acts in France, with more than 100 people killed. In addition, the incident resulted in the injuries of about 413 individuals.

The operational antiterrorist structure of 2002 explores how France was combating terrorism. The Interministerial Committee for Antiterrorist Liaison, generally referred to as (CILAT), formed under the administrative organization, emerged to combat terrorism effectively. The prime minister, Home Security Council, headed the political process. Several ministers of interior participated in developing (CILAT). The interior ministers took part in this committee and presided and brought together different heads of ministries and antiterrorist services. In CILAT, there was a group for Coordination of antiterrorist acts with national police that directed and helped in centralizing rules and responsibilities of different services.

France used Intelligence Services and Police to combat terrorism (Alexander, 54). This strategy effectively combats domestic terrorism and some authority over terror activity related to

separatist groups or political radicals. It was concerned with foreign populations in France, notably those associated with Islamic extremist movements. Three thousand eight hundred employees operated in a highly hierarchical system that included regional colonies and centralized leadership. Based on their authorization, they may manage informants, collect intelligence, or install monitoring equipment. Terrorist attacks in France have often resulted in extensive damage (Alexander, 45). In addition to the terrorists blowing themselves up, the property was being demolished due to the effect of the terror bombs on it. Several buildings damaged during the terrorism assault were outside the arena when a jihadist detonated his suicide vest after being apprehended by security agents. Because the attackers fired randomly before blowing themselves up, two restaurants structures were also partly demolished. The Baltacan theatre was also devastated when the explosions blasted pieces of it off.

In conclusion, terrorist attacks had terrible consequences in both the United States and France, resulting in the deaths of individuals and the deterioration of the economy. However, both organizations put tactics that were quite successful in dealing with terrorist incidents. The American strategy in counterterrorism ultimately won their understanding of how support in the home and abroad was important in combating terrorism. Besides, in France, it is clear that authorities are convinced that fighting terrorism requires a repressive stance and a strong military team. Both France's and America's fight helps understand that terrorist's network depends on patience and deploying different strategies and policies. Finally, it can be argued that, the for those countries that are civilized they can take America and France an example and learn from their experience. From these two countries, we can conclude that, their mission was to gain national security and this is why they all developed coordinated strategies to defeat terror attacks and secure counterterrorism hence fostering international cooperation.

Works Cited

Alexander, Yonah, and Michael Kraft, eds. Evolution of U.S. Counterterrorism policy.
Greenwood Publishing Group. (2007).

ORIGINALITY REPORT

1 %	1 %	1 %	%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	www.austintxgensoc.org Internet Source	1 %
2	Yonah Alexander, Dean C. Alexander. "Terrorism and Business: The Impact of September 11,2001", Brill, 2002 Publication	1 %

Exclude quotes	Off	Exclude matches	Off
Exclude bibliography	On		