



Salutations fellow civil servants,

Welcome to the 32nd annual UC Irvine Model United Nations Conference! My name is Nima Movahedi, and I will serve as the Director of The Department of Homeland Security. Going through my 7th consecutive year in Model UN, I have had many enjoyable experiences chairing numerous conferences while actively competing in our Travel Team.

Outside of MUN, I am a third-year Political Science, History, and International Studies student working towards law school and am active in various campus organizations, such as serving as an Associate Justice for our student government, competing in Moot Court, and working on my own startup. In my free time, I enjoy gaming, improving my photography skills, and drawing here and there. I have enjoyed my college experience thoroughly, and activities such as UCIMUN have contributed significantly to my personal growth.

Moving onto our committee, despite the Department of Homeland Security being an inter-governmental agency under the Executive Branch, for purposes related to this committee and the goals to be solved, DHS will be spearheading this conference with various federal agencies on matters relating to national security that most relevantly fall under their umbrella. To this end, as there will be a consortium of differing-ranking public servants in this committee, from DHS employees to representatives from the DOJ and national guard, it is critical to recognize that the goal of this committee is to recommend a policy brief for the President of United States. As such, all representative members will have ‘equal power’ in regard to deciding on what the recommendations shall be, with differing blocs arising with different interpretations of what course of action the President should take.

With that said, our two topics for this upcoming conference will be *Topic A: The Southern Border: Responding to the massive influx of undocumented migrants*, and *Topic B: Combating Domestic Terrorism and Extremism*.

For Topic A, I chose to cover one of Homeland Security’s largest fields of jurisdiction and responsibility: managing the US-Mexico Southern Border. As a record-breaking 2.76 million undocumented migrants entered the US from the south last year alone, it is certainly a top priority for DHS and other involved agencies to find a solution to recommend to the Oval Office as soon as possible. With the expiration of Title 42 from the previous administration and record high levels of illegal border crossings, it is the center goal of this committee to enact a set of replacement policies and recommendations to mitigate this ongoing issue while taking into account certain humanitarian and civil rights obligations to these families seeking asylum.

Extending well beyond the South, for Topic B, this committee will delve into the complex and pressing issue of domestic terrorism, a significant concern within Homeland Security's purview. The historical roots of domestic terrorism stretch back centuries, but it has seen a marked increase in visibility and urgency following events such as the Oklahoma City bombing, 9/11 attacks, and the January 6th insurrection. This committee's goal is to craft policies that not only counteract the immediate threat but also address the underlying factors contributing to the growth of domestic terrorism, ensuring a safer and more secure homeland for all citizens.

Nima Movahedi
Director, Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
dhsuci2024@gmail.com



Topic A: The Southern Border: Responding to the migrant influx

Introduction

The concept of border security in the United States is not new, with origins being traced back to the earliest days of our nation's foundation. From the late 18th to early 19th century, American borders were predominantly policed for economic purposes, with a focus on closing illegal smuggling operations and controlling cross-national trade routes (U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 2023). However, with the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act and the increased flow of migrants from the South, the United States Border Patrol was created in 1924.

Following the onset of the Great Depression in the 1930s, the US Border Patrol became more heavily focused on the Southern Border held with Mexico, as unemployed Mexican immigrants attempted to cross in the tens of thousands, desperate for work. As World War II began, the Bracero Program was launched to allow Mexican laborers to enter the United States temporarily to address labor shortages, remaining in effect to help industry for over 22 years (White House Archives, 2008).

The Southern Border would later be discovered as a major conduit for the flow of illegal marijuana and cocaine. In response, President Nixon declared the War on Drugs and tightened southern ports of entry, with an expansion of Border Patrol and expedited migrant deportations. Despite this, by the early 1970s, it was declared that the Southern Border migrant crisis was out of control, as the number of illegal aliens had tripled since 1965, and four out of five illegal immigrants that arrived to the US came from Mexico (USA Gov). Despite future attempts by the following presidential administrations and Congress, illegal crossings continued on the rise with the emergence of human smugglers known as 'coyotes' moving in migrants from remote areas.



As the 21st century approached, the number of illegal immigrants apprehended reached 1.7 million in 2000, and it that there were an additional 2.1 million successful unlawful entries (U.S. Customs and Border Patrol). With the September 11 attacks and the later inception of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, US Border Patrol became consolidated under the DHS umbrella and became equipped with new resources, with immigration becoming a key political topic for the Bush Administration. Almost two decades later, illegal border crossings have reached an unprecedented high, with Border Patrol having a record-breaking 2.4 million migrant encounters in 2022 (MPI, 2022). While the Biden Administration has rolled out new policies that have lowered illegal crossings, the current state of the border crossings, along with the illegal trafficking of humans and controlled substances, remains a critical issue for the United States Government.

Description

When understanding the complex current events of the Southern Border and illegal migrants, it is quintessential to grasp, in greater detail, past measures, ongoing threats and concerns, and the current state of events before attempting to draft solutions to resolve the issue. Thus, this part of the synopsis will highlight the dangers of human trafficking and narcotics smuggling, past border enhancement measures, expulsions, and Title 42, and the current state of the Southern Border under the Biden Administration and Secretary Mayorkas.

Human Smuggling and Drug Trafficking

Human smuggling and drug trafficking across the Southern Border has been a historically prevalent issue for the US, as the geographic proximity of Mexico, coupled with economic



disparities and political instability, has contributed to the flow of people and illicit goods across the border.

Human trafficking, becoming an attractive option to illegally enter the US, often stems from desperate migrants seeking work for an improved livelihood or asylum seekers fleeing from violence, political persecution or other instability in their native country. The rise of organized human traffickers has made apprehending migrants significantly more difficult for Border Patrol. Organized in groups led by the previously mentioned ‘coyotes’, migrants are often taken on risky pathways to elude law enforcement, going to extreme measures to avoid detection. As a consequence, these perilous journeys often result in extreme dehydration and death of travelers, with the further risk of smugglers financially exploiting and abusing these migrants. In both a logistical and humanitarian realm, it is thus essential to recognize the impact smuggling has, and the urgency to discover new solutions to reduce human smuggling across the Southern Border.

In addition to human trafficking, the Southern Border has historically been the primary route for drug trafficking into the United States. Cartels and criminal organizations exploit porous border areas to transport illegal narcotics, such as cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, and fentanyl, into the country. The enormous profits generated from drug trafficking fuel violence, corruption, and instability in both source and transit countries, while contributing to the domestic opioid crisis in the United States and posing a grave public health threat. Despite the deployment of partner agencies, such as the DEA, ATF, FBI and DOJ, decades after the inception of the War on Drugs, the Southern Border remains the most favored method of transporting illegal substances. Homeland Security remains committed to intercepting drug trafficking with its partner agencies, but the tenacity and adaptability of smugglers pose an ongoing threat to national security with intense violence and corruption centered around these nefarious operations.



Past Border Security Enhancement Measures

Whilst examining past border security measures and technology, it is important to understand the wide breadth of measures that are currently employed, as advancements in technology have supplemented law enforcement with critical applications aimed at enhancing surveillance and detection capabilities. Firstly, with Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS), commonly known as drones, have been used to provide real-time aerial views of remote and vast border areas, aiding in the tracking of illegal crossings, smuggling activities, and potential threats. UAS tools, in tandem with CBP's array of helicopter and low-flying aircraft, have offered rapid response and surveillance capabilities. Despite their in-use efficacy, employing drones and aircraft across the border is an extremely costly practice, and limited in the scope of terrain that can be covered before extenuating its operational range.

As much of the Southern Border is unpatrolled and unprotected by physical barriers, Integrated Fixed Towers (IFT) have represented another transformative technology, combining radar, cameras, and sensors to create comprehensive surveillance platforms. IFT systems, though limited in scale, have offered real-time views of the border environment, extending CBP's reach across expansive terrain. Finally, in a more recent turn of events, thousands of National Guard troops were deployed in May to help DHS secure the border, performing 'non-law enforcement duties, such as aiding CBP with monitoring and miscellaneous logistics. Despite the aforementioned technological integrations and more recent support from the Department of Defense, the present situation underscores the worsening cases of migrant crossings that have yet to be deterred from these measures and thus demonstrates a need for more affirmative policy recommendations to adequately secure the border.



Expulsions and Title 42

The United States' approach to migrants and asylum seekers has a deep-rooted history marked by various policies aimed at regulating their entry and stay. Prior to the Trump administration, the nation's stance was characterized by a consistent practice of expelling migrants and asylum seekers. The early 2000s saw the Bush administration introducing the "expedited removal" policy, a mechanism to swiftly deport migrants caught crossing the border unlawfully. This policy facilitated the expulsion of over a million migrants between 2004 and 2008, setting a precedent for future developments in immigration policy.

The Trump administration, however, took a significant step in March 2020 by invoking Title 42, a public health law, to justify the expulsion of migrants and asylum seekers at the border. Citing the COVID-19 pandemic, the administration argued that these individuals posed a public health threat. The impact of Title 42 was considerable, with more than 2.8 million migrants having been expelled and a majority of asylum requests denied. In May 2023, with a significant reduction in COVID-19 transmission cases in the US, the Biden administration announced its intention to terminate the use of Title 42. With the cessation of Title 42, an upsurge in the number of migrants and asylum seekers arrived at the Southern Border, overflowing DHS processing and detention centers, and overrunning board patrol's apprehension and operational controls. While Senators have proposed creating a bill to recreate large-scale expulsions similar to Title 42, the Biden administration stated they would veto such a measure.



Current State under the Biden Administration and Sec. Mayorkas

The southern border of the United States has been a focal point of the Biden administration's agenda since taking office in January 2021. With the appointment of Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas to lead the Department of Homeland Security, a noticeable shift in policy from the prior administration became evident. In addition to the abolishment of Title 42, the Biden administration significantly expanded the role of parole in addressing backlogs and asylum system processing. Parole, a legal process permitting temporary entry into the United States even for individuals who do not meet the conventional criteria for a visa or asylum, has emerged as a critical tool in the Biden administration's border strategy, expanding use for migrants and asylum seekers and alleviating the backlog of cases at the border. Under this policy, the Biden administration has allowed migrants and asylum seekers to enter the United States and stay while their cases are pending, with the goal of diverting illegal migration away from the southern border by offering would-be migrants a traceable and safe alternative without the help of smugglers. However, this new use of parole has not been accepted without controversy. Many critics have argued that it has been applied too liberally and inadvertently creates a perceived pathway to illegal immigration. With a record 500,000 migrants on parole from this new measure, the US House of Representatives Judiciary Committee has called for the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas, as the central figure to be blamed for DHS's incapability to curb the rise of recent illegal crossings, failure to apprehend and dispel migrants, and role in facilitating an 'easy-to-cheat' parole system.

In addition to the expansion of parole, simultaneously, the Biden administration has furthered previous investments in border infrastructure and technology, including the deployment



of drones, sensors, and other surveillance tools. Despite this, securing additional funding for border infrastructure has been a contentious issue, Congress has shown reluctance to allocate additional resources for border security given its present use. This strain of funds further permeates into CBP's operational capabilities, with present difficulties in recruiting and retaining adequate personnel to fulfill the demanding task of border security. Even with the assistance of the National Guard and local law enforcement agencies, there is an ongoing struggle to both properly patrol the border and engage in migrant apprehension in the event of an interaction.

Bloc Positions

Military and National Guard

With a paramount concern for national security, this bloc would prioritize a strong and controlled border environment. The Military and National Guard entities would likely advocate for enhanced border security measures, including deploying additional personnel, technology, and resources to deter and intercept unauthorized border crossings. While supporting humanitarian efforts, this bloc might emphasize the importance of ensuring that border security remains a top priority to safeguard, seeking to increase its presence to deter criminal activities and illegal crossings. This bloc's background in strategic planning and resource management further aids any of its approaches to bolster the border's defense mechanisms.

Law Enforcement

With a primary commitment to maintaining law and order, members of the Law Enforcement bloc would likely focus on combating not only unauthorized immigration but also criminal activities that often exploit vulnerable migrants. This bloc would advocate for bolstered



border patrol efforts, advanced surveillance technologies, and increased manpower to detect and apprehend individuals involved in human trafficking, drug smuggling, and other illicit enterprises. This stance would reflect a strong desire to crack down on criminal elements that exploit the border crisis, safeguarding both the integrity of the nation's borders and the safety of citizens residing near the Southern border. By collaborating closely with intelligence agencies and other stakeholders, they likely seek to disrupt and dismantle criminal networks that take advantage of the vulnerable situation at the border.

National Security and Intelligence

The National Security and Intelligence bloc is centered on maintaining a secure and well-maintained country, which the ongoing crisis at the Southern border poses concern to. Their immediate focus would be on preventing unauthorized border crossings and establishing complete situational control to preserve national sovereignty. This bloc would advocate for improving intelligence-sharing mechanisms and enhancing monitoring to better manage border activities effectively while reliving authority from more local levels to federal agencies. By leveraging their expertise in analyzing potential risks and threats, this bloc would play a pivotal role in crafting strategies to stabilize and control the border environment, contributing to the overall security and integrity of the nation.

Legal and Justice Oversight

Grounded in their dedication to upholding legal principles and ensuring justice, the Legal and Justice Oversight bloc has a large stake in the Southern border crisis. While emphasizing fair and humane treatment of migrants, their primary concern would be to enforce immigration laws



and prevent unauthorized border crossings. Additionally, this bloc would be particularly concerned with apprehending individuals who exploit the border crisis for criminal activities, such as human trafficking and drug smuggling. They would advocate for stronger cooperation between law enforcement agencies, border patrol, and intelligence organizations to identify and apprehend those who seek to exploit vulnerable migrants for personal gain. By aligning their expertise in legal oversight with the urgency of maintaining border security, this bloc would work to ensure that justice is served, interagency cooperation ensues, and the rule of law is upheld while addressing the complex challenges of the Southern border crisis.

Committee Goals

This committee, tasked with managing the Southern Border and addressing the migrant influx, must firstmost ensure the security, integrity, and well-being of the United States. In the pursuit of enhanced border security, delegates should explore various means from additional personnel, advanced surveillance technologies, and other strategies that deter unauthorized crossings and prevent criminal activities. Furthermore, as it is critical to recognize the humanitarian crisis, this committee will strive to strike a balance between border security and the humane treatment of migrants. Policies presented may also explore safe and traceable alternatives for migrants, reducing reliance on illicit pathways facilitated by human traffickers.

Given this committee's wide integration of various federal and state bodies, collaboration among various agencies may be key to accomplishing the goals of this committee. Members present here in the Department of Homeland Security will aim to improve intelligence-sharing mechanisms, uphold legal principles and justice, enforce or revise immigration laws, address



challenges related to resource constraints, and uphold national security concerns associated with the Southern Border.

After a thorough review of existing policies and consideration of the historical context of past policies, delegates are encouraged to adapt and innovate proposals to address emerging threats and trends. Members are encouraged to engage in constructive dialogue, leveraging their respective bloc perspectives to achieve consensus on actionable measures that can address the complexities of the Southern Border situation.

Research Questions

1. How has the historical evolution of border security measures influenced the current state of the Southern Border, considering milestones like the creation of the US Border Patrol and recent policies like Title 42?
2. What is the effectiveness of past border security enhancement measures, such as the deployment of Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) and Integrated Fixed Towers (IFT), in deterring unauthorized border crossings and criminal activities?
3. What are the policy implications of invoking Title 42, and how has its cessation under the Biden administration affected the number of migrants and asylum seekers arriving at the Southern Border, as well as the operational capabilities of DHS?
4. To what extent has the Biden administration's use of parole as a tool in border strategy affected the dynamics of illegal migration, and what controversies and challenges arise from its liberal application?



5. What challenges does the committee face in terms of resource allocation, funding, and personnel recruitment for border security measures, and how do these challenges impact the overall effectiveness of border control?
6. What is the global impact of drug trafficking across the Southern Border, particularly in terms of violence, corruption, and public health, and how effective are partner agencies like the DEA, ATF, FBI, and DOJ in countering these challenges?
7. What strategies can the committee propose to strike a balance between addressing humanitarian concerns, such as the well-being of migrants, and ensuring the security and integrity of the nation's borders?

References

1. “2023 Trafficking in Persons Report - United States Department of State.” *U.S. Department of State*, U.S. Department of State, 15 Dec. 2023, www.state.gov/reports/2023-trafficking-in-persons-report/.
2. “Along U.S. Borders.” *U.S. Customs and Border Protection*, www.cbp.gov/border-security/along-us-borders.
3. “Securing America’s Borders Fact Sheet: Border Security.” *National Archives and Records Administration*, National Archives and Records Administration, georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/homeland/01.html.
4. “U.S. Customs and Border Protection.” *USAGov*, www.usa.gov/agencies/u-s-customs-and-border-protection.



5. U.S. Customs and Border Protection. "Human Trafficking." www.cbp.gov. Accessed February 14, 2024. <https://www.cbp.gov/frontline/human-trafficking>.
6. United States Department of State. "2023 Trafficking in Persons Report." www.state.gov. Accessed February 14, 2024. <https://www.state.gov/reports/2023-trafficking-in-persons-report/>.
7. The World from PRX. "Report: Human rights abuses by US immigration officials are rampant at the southern border." theworld.org. Accessed February 14, 2024. <https://www.theworld.org/stories/2024-02-14/report-human-rights-abuses-us-immigration-officials-are-rampant-southern-border>.
8. The White House. "FACT SHEET: Biden-Harris Administration Announces New Border Enforcement Actions." whitehouse.gov, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2024/02/14/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-announces-new-border-enforcement-actions>
9. U.S. Department of Homeland Security. "Fact Sheet: U.S. Government Announces Sweeping New Actions to Manage Regional Migration." dhs.gov, <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2024/02/14/fact-sheet-us-government-announces-sweeping-new-actions-manage-regional-migration>
10. Reuters. "Title 42: what is the US border policy and what happens when it ends?" reuters.com, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-immigration-title42-explainer>
11. Pew Research Center. "Title 42 and immigration enforcement at U.S.-Mexico border: Key facts." pewresearch.org, <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2022/04/26/title-42-and-immigration-enforcement-at-u-s-mexico-border-key-facts>



Topic B: Combating Domestic Terrorism and Extremism

Introduction

Domestic terrorism, characterized by acts of violence committed by individuals or groups within a country against their own citizens, poses a significant and evolving threat to our national security. Prevalent for centuries with a wide spectrum of motivations and perpetrators, domestic terrorism's unpredictable and diverse threads of grievances and ideologies have made countering acts of domestic terrorism extremely difficult. Though domestic terrorism has deep roots in American history from the 18th century, the federal government previously played a limited role in counterterrorism within its own borders, entrusting most tasks to state and local law enforcement.

However, in the aftermath of high-profile incidents like the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995 and the 9/11 attacks in 2001, the American government intensified its efforts to combat domestic terrorism through legislative action. Most notably, the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 (Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act) expanded law enforcement's authority to investigate and prevent potential acts of terrorism, allowing for enhanced surveillance, information sharing, and intelligence gathering. This legislation granted law enforcement agencies the power to conduct wiretaps, monitor financial transactions, and engage in electronic surveillance under strict judicial oversight (Britannica, 2001). Two years after this, the Department of Homeland Security was created, consolidating almost two dozen federal agencies in an effort to streamline the government's capabilities to detect and prevent threats more effectively (U.S. Department of



Homeland Security, 2017). Since its inception, with the powers of the PATRIOT Act, DHS, in collaboration with various agencies such as the FBI, NSA, and DOJ, has successfully engaged in thousands of operations preventing and responding to domestic terrorism. Despite significant strides, the dynamic and widespread nature of extremism and radicalization has made domestic terrorism remain a forefront concern of the government. With a rise of hate-based attacks and the January 6th insurrection at the Capitol, it is clear there is a dire need for new solutions to engage these emerging threats proactively.

Description

As defending the homeland from new and unpredictable forms of domestic terror has never been more challenging, it is paramount to recognize the significant hurdles and key concerns prior to drafting resolutions to address the issue. As such, this section will highlight the ongoing debate about balancing civil liberties and national security, the emergence of radicalization and variants of extremism, and limitations on intelligence sharing due to jurisdictional boundaries.

Balancing Civil Liberties and Security

History serves as a stark reminder of the potential consequences when intelligence power is unchecked, and civil liberties are disregarded. The excesses of programs like COINTELPRO (Counter Intelligence Program) in the 20th century, when government agencies targeted and surveilled civil rights activists and dissidents, and the more recent 2013 Snowden leak, where the NSA illegally wiretapped and spied on millions of citizens, cast an unremitting shadow over the importance of protecting individual freedoms in lieu of national security. While most in



government acknowledge a need for a balance between civil liberties and security crucial in, the prevalent post-9/11 view has remained that it is imperative to deploy extensive surveillance measures that may safeguard citizens from harm.

Regardless of one's position, it is with great fairness to acknowledge how expanded surveillance capabilities can be classified as a double-edged sword, in its capability to both better equip the state to respond to threats and open a Pandora's box of possibly violating civil liberties and engaging in government overreach, corruption or abuse of power. Advocates for enhanced government surveillance to track potential terror threats often cite the rise of 'lone-wolf' attacks, hate-based violence, and online radicalization, threats to national security that remain incredibly difficult to prevent even with the strongest surveillance tools. As such, this philosophy orbits their view that domestic terrorism can only be properly prevented through expanded government capabilities and broader law enforcement jurisdiction in monitoring and tracking citizens in the name of public safety.

On the other side of the aisle, skeptics of enhanced surveillance call for a greater need of government oversight and accountability, regardless of the eminence of future threats. Through transparency to the public, effective judicial review, and strong legal safeguards to protect civil rights, some argue that the instrument of surveillance must be wielded judiciously.

Emerging extremism and radicalization

The United States has a long history of experiencing extremism within its populace. From nativist movements in the 19th century to organized formations of the Ku Klux Klan, the US has a deeply rooted past of dangerous radicalization. In contemporary times, extremism stems from various roots, differing in intention and complexity for authorities to mitigate. One of the most



relevant forms of extremism is political extremism, where incidents of extreme violence are utilized as a means to omit differences rather than through peaceful venues. Examples of this include the storming of the U.S. Capitol in 2021, the rise in killings of Judges, and proliferation plans and threats made to kidnap/execute politicians. In addition to political extremism, there has similarly been a noticeable rise in racial and ethnic extremism, particularly white supremacy and general hate crimes. Recent cases of this include the Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville in 2017, the Charleston Church Shooting, and the Buffalo Shooting. Finally, with religious extremism, some instances of this domestic terrorism motivated by extremist interpretations of religion can be seen through the Tree of Life Synagogue Shooting, the San Bernardino Attack, and the Wisconsin Sikh Temple Shooting.

The implications of this surge are profound, as these extremist ideologies and radicalizations have a direct lead to the spike in domestic terrorism, raising serious concerns for national security. It is critical when analyzing how to adequately deter domestic terrorism, to understand the roots of radicalism and extremism, as the need to prevent these is a pillar of national security.

Limited intelligence sharing and the role of jurisdictional boundaries

One of the most colossal inhibitors in efficiently combating terrorism is a lack of interagency information sharing. With over 73 federal law enforcement bureaus, in tandem with state, county, and local police agencies, significant gaps of information in counterterrorism operations can have catastrophic consequences. Despite the lessons of 9/11, where a failure to share crucial information among various US intelligence and law enforcement agencies contributed to the tragedy, over two decades later, limited intelligence sharing remains a critical shortcoming in the nation's fight against domestic terrorism.



The first persistent challenge in this is the rigid jurisdictional boundaries that define the operational spheres of law enforcement agencies, creating territorialism and inhibiting the free flow of intelligence. This is often seen via agencies such as the FBI, NSA, DHS, and ATF withholding or delaying the transfer of critical information for their investigations to other relevant federal and local law enforcement agencies. With this barrier of access, the consequences of limited intelligence sharing can be profound. Timely sharing of critical information is the linchpin of thwarting potential terror threats, and when such intelligence remains trapped within silos, the ability to connect dots and recognize patterns may be jeopardized. This labyrinthine bureaucracy, which can be broadly characterized by layers of red tape, administrative processes, and territorialism, can lead to an impaired response, potentially missed opportunities for prevention, and, increase the likelihood of catastrophic consequences.

Bloc Positions

Military and National Guard

Representatives of the Military and National Guard bloc recognize the gravity of domestic terrorism as a significant threat to national security. These members would likely advocate for a robust military and National Guard presence to counter this menace effectively, emphasizing the role of non-civilian assets to work with domestic agents. This bloc would likely contend that domestic terrorism requires a proactive and strong response, similar to the approach taken with international threats, and thus should extend outside of previous conventional methods of handling violence within our nation's borders. The Military and National Guard would likely similarly focus on enhancing intelligence-sharing mechanisms between federal, state, and local



agencies to identify and disrupt domestic terrorist activities while strengthening cybersecurity measures to protect critical infrastructure from potential attacks by domestic extremist groups.

Law Enforcement

The Law Enforcement bloc underscores the significance of federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies in addressing domestic terrorism within the United States. They argue that these agencies possess the expertise and local knowledge necessary to effectively combat terrorism on American soil. This bloc advocates for greater coordination among law enforcement entities to share intelligence and resources.

Furthermore, they emphasize the importance of proactive investigations and surveillance to prevent acts of domestic terrorism. This includes monitoring online activities and radicalization efforts by extremist groups. The Law Enforcement bloc is committed to upholding the rule of law while preventing acts of violence and extremism.

They also stress the need for community engagement and building trust with local communities to counteract radicalization. Collaboration with community leaders and organizations is viewed as essential to identifying and addressing emerging threats from domestic extremist groups.

National Security and Intelligence

Members of the National Security bloc prioritize the protection and preservation of the nation's security against domestic terrorism. They argue for a comprehensive and proactive approach, drawing parallels with the strategies employed against international threats. Through leveraging non-civilian assets, such as military and intelligence community resources, this bloc



believes that addressing domestic terrorism may require non-conventional methods, extending beyond traditional approaches used for handling violence within the nation's borders. The bloc also calls for the improvement of intelligence-sharing mechanisms between federal, state, and local agencies, with the goal of identifying and disrupting domestic terrorist activities through better collaboration and information exchange. Additionally, this bloc highlights the importance of strengthening cybersecurity measures to protect critical infrastructure from potential attacks by domestic extremist groups.

Legal and Justice Oversight

The Legal and Justice Oversight bloc emphasizes the importance of legal frameworks and oversight in addressing domestic terrorism. With most its members from the Department of Justice (DOJ) and state Attorney Generals, this bloc acknowledges the necessity of intelligence gathering while ensuring alignment with legal and ethical standards. Key points include advocating for counterterrorism activities to adhere to a robust legal framework, and prioritizing the protection of individual rights and civil liberties. The bloc calls for increased government oversight and accountability in counterterrorism operations, emphasizing the need for effective judicial review, transparency to the public, and mechanisms to prevent government overreach, corruption, or abuse of power. Furthermore, the bloc stresses the judicious use of surveillance tools, asserting that these capabilities, though essential for national security, should be wielded carefully to avoid violating civil liberties.



Committee Goals

The committee, tasked with addressing the threat of domestic terrorism and extremism, has established comprehensive goals to enhance national security, safeguard citizens, and uphold democratic principles. In pursuit of these objectives, the committee aims to develop and implement a comprehensive and proactive counterterrorism strategy that effectively addresses the evolving threats posed by domestic terrorism. This strategy encompasses preventive measures, intelligence sharing, and response mechanisms.

A key focus is on striking a delicate balance between safeguarding civil liberties and ensuring national security. The committee seeks to establish guidelines and mechanisms that prevent overreach, corruption, or abuse of power while empowering law enforcement agencies to protect citizens from harm. Acknowledging historical instances such as COINTELPRO and the Snowden leak, there is an emphasis on the judicious use of surveillance tools and legal safeguards to prevent potential abuses.

Understanding the roots of extremism and radicalization within the United States is another critical goal. The committee aims to deepen this understanding and develop strategies to prevent radicalization, counteract extremist ideologies, and contribute to broader national security efforts. Recent incidents like the Capitol insurrection underscore the need for effective measures against hate-based attacks and violence rooted in extremist beliefs.

Addressing challenges related to limited intelligence sharing is a priority. The committee aims to foster collaboration among diverse blocs, including Military and National Guard, Law Enforcement, National Security, and Legal Oversight. The goal is to break down jurisdictional



boundaries among federal law enforcement agencies and improve information exchange to identify patterns and thwart potential terror threats.

Strengthening legal safeguards and oversight is further crucial to ensuring that counterterrorism activities align with legal and ethical standards. The committee advocates for transparency, government oversight, and accountability in all aspects of counterterrorism operations. This includes effective judicial review, protection of individual rights, and mechanisms to prevent government overreach or abuse of power.

Research Questions

1. How can this committee effectively balance civil liberties and national security in the context of combating domestic terrorism, considering historical instances of overreach and abuse of power?
2. In what ways can the committee enhance intelligence-sharing mechanisms among federal, state, and local agencies to overcome challenges related to jurisdictional boundaries and bureaucratic obstacles?
3. What strategies can be employed to prevent and counteract the roots of extremism and radicalization within the United States, addressing various forms such as political, racial, and religious extremism?
4. How can the committee ensure legal safeguards and oversight are strengthened to align counterterrorism activities with legal and ethical standards, promoting transparency, government oversight, and accountability?
5. Considering the unique perspectives of blocs like Military and National Guard, Law Enforcement, National Security, and Legal Oversight; how can the committee foster



effective collaboration and leverage diverse viewpoints in formulating cohesive strategies?

6. What innovative approaches can the committee propose to address challenges related to limited intelligence sharing, particularly in the context of preventing potential terror threats and recognizing patterns?
7. In what ways can the committee evaluate and adapt existing policies, considering historical context and effectiveness, to address emerging threats and trends in domestic terrorism, such as human smuggling, drug trafficking, and unauthorized border crossings?

References

1. "FACT SHEET: National Strategy for Countering Domestic Terrorism." The White House,
www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/06/15/fact-sheet-national-strategy-for-countering-domestic-terrorism/
2. "The First U.S. National Strategy for Countering Domestic Terrorism." Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS),
www.csis.org/analysis/first-us-national-strategy-countering-domestic-terrorism
3. "The Rising Threat of Domestic Terrorism in the U.S. and Federal Efforts to Combat It." U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO),
www.gao.gov/key_issues/ensuring_security_safety/issue_summary#t=0
4. DHS Releases Report on Internal Review of Domestic Violent Extremism." Department of Homeland Security,



www.dhs.gov/news/2022/03/11/dhs-releases-report-internal-review-domestic-violent-extremism.

5. Domestic terrorism is evolving. It needs imaginative counterterrorism." Brookings Institution, www.brookings.edu/articles/domestic-terrorism-is-evolving
6. Counter-Terrorism and Homeland Security Threats." Department of Homeland Security, www.dhs.gov/counterterrorism-and-homeland-security-threats.
7. Countering Domestic Terrorism May Require Rethinking U.S. Intelligence Strategy." RAND Corporation, www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB10096.html
8. "The Military, Police, and the Rise of Terrorism in the United States." Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS), www.csis.org/analysis/military-police-and-rise-terrorism-united-states
9. "The War Comes Home: The Evolution of Domestic Terrorism in the United States." Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS), www.csis.org/analysis/war-comes-home-evolution-domestic-terrorism-united-states.
10. "Terrorism." FBI, [www.fbi.gov/investigate/terrorism\(https://www.fbi.gov/investigate/terrorism\)](http://www.fbi.gov/investigate/terrorism(https://www.fbi.gov/investigate/terrorism)).
11. The Challenges of Combatting Domestic Terrorism." Center for Security Policy Studies, George Mason University, csps.gmu.edu/2021/04/11/the-challenges-of-combatting-domestic-terrorism/
12. "Preventing Terrorism and Targeted Violence." Department of Homeland Security, www.dhs.gov/preventing-terrorism-and-targeted-violence
13. What is the FBI's role in combating terrorism?" FBI, www.fbi.gov/about/what-we-investigate/terrorism