

Comparison and Contrast of Security Entities in the USA

Student's Name

Institutional Affiliation



Comparison and Contrast of Security Entities in the USA

Homeland security organs are combined forces that expend effort to prevent or lower country's vulnerability to crime, terrorism among other vices. They are responsible for law enforcement, response to catastrophes, terrorism as well as overseeing immigration (Reese, 2013). This implies that they are presented across the board as their roles are not restricted to security but extend to humanitarian efforts as their input is required in times of catastrophes. On the other hand, American military forces were primarily formed to protect America from external aggression and to a limited degree support border security, and participate in immigration control efforts in collaboration with federal and state authorities (Mason, 2013). However, military participation in domestic affairs is limited as it is thought that their behavior will be the same as in war fronts.

Federal, state and local law enforcements mainly operate under federal or state level. They comprise of sheriffs, local police departments, state law enforcement agencies, among others (Reaves, 2011). Their functions range from maintaining law order to the protection of vital state resources; however, they do collaborate with other state and federal institutions in their effort to bolster security in the US. The aim of this discussion is to



compare and contrast the intelligence methods, duties, and responsibilities of the U.S. military, federal, state and local law enforcement, as well as homeland security entities to protect the homeland.

COMPARISON AND CONTRAST OF THE INTELLIGENCE METHODS

Information Sharing

Entities at different levels collect information, which they analyze, and determine how useful it is to them presently and in future. In order to create awareness and ensure effective use of the information, the source entity shares it with other agencies through existing protocols and without breach of the governing laws (Carter, 2012). This actually occurs in a multi-directional way whereby it can originate from any direction of security organs regardless of their status or esteem in the country. This provides a good comparison among security organs in terms of the means they use to gather intelligence. In order to effectively fight terrorism, key components towards the fight are identified as the ability to gather, analyze and share intelligence on likely targets, attackers and tactics to be used (National Strategy for Information Sharing, 2007). It further emphasizes that this has



to be accomplished at the federal, state and local level, without ignoring both private sector and foreign partners as well. This brings to the eventual conclusion that intelligence sharing cuts across all sections of the armed forces.

Training on Criminal Intelligence

Homeland security organs undergo training on intelligence standards to enable them to execute their duties effectively. Training helps them collect quality information, analyze and make meaningful conclusions as to whether there is a genuine threat or a possibility of one in future. Training further helps them collect raw data, study it, and establish relationships as well as piece it to form a logical database about an individual or phenomenon, which can later be retrieved for use or reference purposes (Carter, 2012). In the case of the military forces, it is not different as they are required to evolve with the threats. Their focus should be primarily on emerging hostilities and enemy capabilities in order to develop suitable battlefront tactics (Carter, 2012). This requires training as well monitoring of probable enemies in order to be effective.

Foreign Instrumentation Signals Intelligence



This tool involves collection of data for intelligence purposes using reconnaissance aircraft or signals from fighter jets, missiles, and spying satellites. This is mostly applied by the military at the battle fronts so that they can have a clear view of the movement of enemy soldiers, their establishments and their critical infrastructures such as command centers, armory depots and training bases (Clark, 2015). FISI provides an opportunity to plan accordingly and approach enemies tactically in the battlefronts. A case in point of successful use of this technology was Kosovo and Afghanistan whereby predator drones were used to constantly surveil the activities of their targets until sufficient information was available to warrant their destruction (Chizek, 2003). This tool is largely used by armies due to the scale of operations involved and threats faced; however, it cannot be used domestically by other security organs.

Human Intelligence

It is another form of intelligence collection that relies on the use of human beings. It is usually employed both at state and national levels. It solely relies on human ability though it cannot be relied upon fully as it is subject to bias and may not be able to capture all the required information (Randol, 2010). Its input requires being fused with those from other sources in order to overcome its shortcomings. In 1960s, National Guard, Police and Federal Troops were used to cool down chaos in cities such as



Detroit after the assassination of Martin Luther Jr. They used to infiltrate demonstrations, identify troublemakers and report to the authorities when demonstrations turned chaotic (Dycus, 2004). From the case above, human intelligence is seen as a tool used both at military and homeland security levels.

Measurement and Signature Intelligence

This tool involves intercepting and analyzing signals emanating from communication gadgets such as radios, mobiles and radar systems, among others. This technique was widely used in battle fronts during World War I. However, with the evolution of technology, various measures, such as encryption, have been developed to frustrate it as countermeasures, such as cryptanalysis, have emerged as well (Clark, 2015). This intelligence technique has been employed successfully to pinpoint, track and strike the targets before they do more harm. This method is widely used by the military forces in their operations at war zones but not at homeland level.



GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data is collected, analyzed and circulated to the authorities concerning a geographical area. This technique is widely used by local authorities, especially policemen, to understand genesis and depth of a given crime in an area as well as means to effectively tackle it (Esri, 2008). Homeland security is known to use this technique in their pursuit for crime solutions as they operate based on the belief that crime must be traced to a given location as well as the suspects. In the case of the military forces, an advanced form of geographical information system known as geospatial intelligence is used. It analyses satellite imagery to understand features and activities in a given area (JCAT, 2015). As a result, similarity in use can be seen.

COMPARISON AND CONTRAST OF DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

State and local police are responsible for maintenance and enforcement of law at the state and local level. They make arrests, patrol state, and community borders as well as ensure



that governance and security prevail both at neighborhoods and within state borders (Mason, 2013). This part of a national strategy is designed to make America secure and safe to live in. This is not different from what the military does, it is only that they operate at different levels. The military does participate in the security of America though mostly under supportive roles. They can be called upon to help patrol borders, especially to curb crimes such as drug and human trafficking, but this is achieved mostly in collaboration with respective state security, either under the request of governor or order of the president (Shanahan, 2002). In the case of homeland securities, they remain a unified effort to prevent and lower attacks within America in collaboration with other agencies, both public and private (Office of Homeland Security, 2002). When the duties of the above security organs are compared, they all point to one thing of maintaining security and order in the homeland that is similarity.

In regard to immigration and citizenship services, homeland security is the organ that is responsible for processing citizenship requests, residency and asylum requests. In addition, they are responsible for immigration checks at the points of entry such as airports and ports. Federal Bureau of Intelligence (FBI) is a branch of Homeland security that operates an integrated automated fingerprint identification system, which keeps records on criminals identified by federal, military and other state organs (Office of Inspector General, 2005). This is



performed to curb illegal immigration and ensure only legitimate moves and residence in America. The participation of military along state, federal and local security organs in border patrols, manning of border points as well as in securing some of the state ports and airports point to their participation also fall under immigration control responsibilities (Mason, 2013). This draws some similarities in their roles.

With respect to enforcement of the customs laws and border protection, homeland security implements checks on cargo as well as individuals transiting into and out of the country. It ensures goods entering into the country are legal, not harmful to the nation and properly declared, and all custom duties are paid for in accordance with customs laws. Further, it checks people entering and exiting carried to net criminals, ensures correct documentation, without flouting of immigration procedures (Jones et al., 2015) This implies that its representatives are usually stationed at key entry and exit points of the country such as ports, airstrips, and border points. State and local forces perform similar duties at their respective states' points of entry though within homeland security. On the other hand, the military performs similar duties though under special circumstances, mostly under the instruction of the president (Mason, 2013). This features some element of similarity in their duties but at different degrees.

Homeland security has an emergency response department



specifically trained to respond to emergencies and disasters at the federal level. The department known as Federal Emergency Management Agency works in collaboration with state and local agencies in the effort to provide an effective response (FEMA, 2010). They further work to develop strategies to minimize loss of life and destruction of property in times of emergencies. In an effort to enhance coordination to minimize loss or to avoid being caught unprepared in the event of a disaster, other state organs need to be involved. They include the private sector, military, state and local governments, among others (Young, 2012). This means that the role emergency response was not left as the preserve of homeland security to other organs in question; therefore, there is a similarity in roles.

The primary duty of the US military is to protect the USA from external aggression. Its participation in home defense is limited to a supportive role. Through its arm of Army National Guard, it provides direct assistance to agencies concerned with domestic security (Shanahan, 2002). Mostly, their participation is called in times of disasters and extreme crimes such as terrorism. However, their function is different in regard to state and local enforcement agencies law. They are charged with the responsibilities of prevention of crimes, public protection, gathering intelligence on crimes and responding to emergencies at the state and local level (Waxman, 2008). They investigate crimes, arrest and carry out patrols both at the state and community level. In the case of federal security, their work is to



cut across the states. They deal with high profile crimes such as terrorism, which are beyond the state level. In addition, they enforce the law and prevent crime at the national level (Waxman, 2008). Federal security work in collaboration with state security organs and extend state boundaries to the national level.

Military duties can be federal or state in nature. Federal duties arise when called into action under directive and control of the president. Under these circumstances, payment and benefits are received at the federal level. However, they may be called into state active duty under the command of the state governor to perform state duties under its pay (Mason, 2013). This may include duties such as assisting in fighting drug trafficking, protecting key state infrastructure, manning of border points and control of illegal immigration especially if local state agencies are overwhelmed. For the local and state law enforcement agencies, their activities, control, and pay remain in hands of their respective state governors.

Homeland security operates under three broad areas of operations, with each area having its own manpower specifically trained for it. The areas in question are home defense, civil support, national disaster preparedness and response. The department of homeland defense is responsible for dealing with such threats as incursions, attacks on defense systems, among others, whereas civil deals with chaos and disasters. On the other hand, the military is an all-



inclusive institution capable of supporting the above three areas without departmentalizing (Shanahan, 2002). This portrays the military as more accomplished and equipped compared to other security organs.

Homeland security, state security organs are equipped to protect the nation from attacks at the domestic level. These attacks may range from a threat to tranquility and governance to infiltration of borders, destruction of key government installations, among others. This calls for their positioning in all areas of the nation to be able to deal effectively with the possible threats (Randol, 2010). However, there are areas, which are exclusively under the military control. They are the protection of key personnel, military installations and as well as capabilities such as missile defense systems (Shanahan, 2002). This points to differences in some of their roles in the security arena.

CONCLUSION

The paper highlights forms of intelligence methods employed by the military, homeland security, and federal, state and local security organs. It further compares and contrasts their use in each. Methods discussed are information sharing, training on criminal intelligence, foreign instrumentation signal intelligence,



human intelligence, measurement and signature intelligence and geographical information systems. The paper compares and contrasts duties and responsibilities of the above-mentioned organs, which largely appear to be the same, with the only difference in degree, level or extent to which each organ performs. They include immigration control, securing of borders, emergency response, enforcement of customs laws and maintenance of law and order. Regardless of their status or the level of their operations, these security organs need to work together in order to achieve their main objective to provide security in the USA.

