Ethnic profiling at the airport is deliberately racist. Ethnic profiling makes generalizations about entire communities. In criminal cases the Supreme Court has condemned ethnic profiling against African-Americans for a long time, because of its injustice. If ethnic profiling were used again in this way, there would be uproar. However, 'Islamaphobia' is still a socially acceptable form of racism. When one considers the number of Muslims or ethnic Middle Easterners and South-East Asians in proportion to the number of terrorists, one sees that this fear is founded on a few cases. The State should not allow institutionalized bigotry based on little evidence. The fact that other security measures have failed does not suggest that this one will succeed. Perhaps it proves that no security measures are entirely effective.

Despite anomalies, the majority of terrorist organizations threatening us today are based on a form of Islamic ideology that is mostly prevalent in the Middle East and South-East Asia. Profiling is based on a reasoned assumption that it is people within these organizations, situated in these countries, who are the most likely suspects of terrorism.

The purpose of this study is to examine ethnic profiling being used at the airports against Muslims or ethnic Middle Easterners and South-East Asians people. How that has impacted on religious tourists visiting scared sites around the world. The study will analyse the data how racial profiling works, the evidence shows many
terrorists come from Europe or from within the United States, who don't fit the profile. The study will develop framework how to avoid harassment and bigotry can be prevented with a system of accountability and proper supervision. Security personnel needs to be trained specifically for the role, so that they know what behavioural signs to look out for and learn to use ethnic profiling sensitively.

Traditionally profiling has always been a practice by the law enforcement officers to describe an individual who had already committed a crime (Schildkraut, 2009). Generally, criminal profiles created by the law enforcement officers included a physical description, behavioural classifications and social or criminal associations which were given to officers and the public to find a suspect (Newman & Brown, 2009). The traditional criminal profile was replaced with racial or ethnic profiling in the 1980s and 1990s (Newman & Brown, 2009).

David Harris described racial profiling as “the use of race or ethnic appearance as a factor in deciding who merits police attention as a suspicious person” (Harris, 2002, p. 8)

In a broader sense, profiling means the use of any of the prohibited grounds, such as race, religion, national, or ethnic origin as the sole factor to stop, search, or detain a person for investigation in the context of law enforcement. (Chowdhury & Roach, 2003) In contrast in a narrower sense, profiling occurs when a person’s race, religion, or ethnicity is used as one of multiple factors to stop, search, or detain him or her (Chowdhury & Roach, 2003). Regardless of race, religion or ethnicity being the sole factor or one of many factors to stop search or detain a person, the moment someone is targeted based on any of the racial religious or ethnic factors it amount to profiling and should be condemned.

Some scholars, (Kennedy, 2002 for example) argue that race, religion or ethnicity shouldn’t be the sole factor to target someone however it may be justified to target someone if race, religion or ethnicity os one of many other factors to target someone. The authors argue that as the dominant factor for a law enforcement officer to target someone is notoriously difficult to establish any use of race religion or ethnicity should be condemned unless there are some well articulated information that justifies the target. Appropriateness of law enforcement officers targeting people on the basis of race, religion or ethnicity is questionable on many levels.
Until the disastrous terrorist event of September 11, 2001 mostly Blacks and Latinos were being profiled by the police for drug related crimes. Since 9/11, however, the norm has shifted to targeting Arabs, Muslims, and people of Middle Eastern descent by law enforcement in order to prevent terrorism related crimes.

Johnson et al (2011) had used a survey-based experiment to examine approval for the use of racial/ethnic profiling to prevent crime and terrorism. One of the questions this survey asked was “does approval for the use of racial/ethnic profiling vary depending on whether it is used in the context of preventing crime versus the context of preventing terrorism?”. Unsurprisingly the results from public opinion polls and academic studies suggest that the public may be more approving of law enforcement officers using racial/ethnic profiling in the context of preventing terrorism than in the context of preventing crime (Johnson et al 2011). Racial/ethnic profiling is actually more justified by public for terrorism related crimes which is evident for the fact threat directly after 9/11, public opinion polls demonstrated a sharp increase in support for the use of racial profiling by law enforcement to prevent another terror attack (Jadallah & el-Koury, 2010; Jonson et al, 2011; Newman & Brown, 2009).

However the attitude towards the broader or the narrower sense of racial profiling largely depends on the race of the person asked. For example, Whites are most likely to approve the process in preventing crime and terrorism (Johnson et al., 2011; Schildkraut, 2009). On the other hand, minority group members are significantly less likely to justify the use of racial profiling at airports (Gabbidon et al., 2009).

In order to deal with such inappropriate practice of racial profiling Billlah (2016) has suggested that There should be a rebuttable presumption of profiling once the victim of profiling proves a prima facie case. The current practice of targeting people based of race. Religious or ethnic factors are problematic due to the difficulties to prove conscious or subconscious motive of a racially motivated search or detention. If the burden could be shifted to the law enforcement officers, that would create a platform for the victims to challenge biasness of the officers. In particular, in terrorism related cases the courts seem to be reluctant to label any harassment caused to the target as profiling. This study would focus on real life scenarios to examine the context of ethnic/racial profiling.
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