
The Effects Of Racial Profiling On Human Rights

What is racial profiling? Why is it involved? Why does it typically occur with police officers? Why it must end? "Racial profiling" has become a big issue for many years in the United States, and still occurs today. In fact, it refers to the discriminatory practice by law enforcement officials of targeting individuals for suspicion of crime based on the individual's race, ethnicity, religion, or national origin. In other words, it observes or assumed characteristics of suspicious behavior. Usually, when a police officer or officers in such are involved, they typically stop or do searches based upon someone's will of race appearance and ethnicity. However, threatening the police by using characteristics may reduce the effectiveness of policing. In other words, they say those who engage in certain criminal activities often tend to share their characteristics of ethnic backgrounds.

In some states racial profiling is prohibited, they may be filed as a complaint and investigated by employee supervisor. In fact, if an incident occurred from racial profiling, the complaints must be reported within 60 days, and it also goes for witnesses as well.

The effectiveness of racial profiling on human rights typically involves the fourth amendment upon every citizen's protection against unreasonable searches as well as unjustifiable seizure. Generally, the amendment made it a must that all citizens must face a fair trial in accordance with the law without considering their racial backgrounds. Unfortunately, some states avoid going by the fourth amendment for the protection of citizens, they rather base their argument on variance demographic factors to higher crime rates in certain communities made up of larger percentages and minority populations. I say that racial profiling should be handled a better way, I honestly think it shouldn't matter the color of skin or nationality of people is. I also believe that police officers nor society should not be able to be assumed that some aren't the same color should determine if they're wrongdoing.

An example of an article I found in the New York Times, about two black men that walked into Starbucks and sat down to wait on a friend, officials said they asked to use the restrooms, but they had not bought anything. An employee refused the appeal, allegedly assumed the men looked suspicious. The staff then reportedly called the police because Starbucks does "not allow nonpaying people from the public to come to use the restroom". When the police officers got to the scene, he then arrested the two men for trespassing Starbucks in Philadelphia, the two men were just two innocent people that were being assumed. I believe that two men were being accused by the color of their skin, and the employees automatically thought that they were criminals. In other words, if they weren't doing anything to hurt anyone why were they arrested. After they've got arrested the video of someone recording the situation, had been surfing all around the Internet and so that caught everyone's attention and the corporate of Starbucks. The Starbucks company decided that they wanted to apologize to the two men, which was from the CEO, and told them that this situation will never happen again some of the stores had been closed because of boycott situations which were racial profiling from the employees of Starbucks and from the police officers which believe that the two men were as soon of performing wrongdoing situations.

My point of view from the situation that occurred, The employees were very wrong for calling the

police officer assuming that they were bad people because of the color of their skin, I agree that the two men were right that they stayed inside the building because they did nothing wrong but just waiting on a friend Because Starbucks is a public restaurant. After reading this article, I felt very devastated and thought that this situation was very disgraceful because no one shouldn't be treated based upon the color of their skin nor nationality, or ethnicity. In the employee's dot, they were right with calling the police because they assume did the two men were minding their business Furthermore if Starbucks wasn't a public place I feel as though they should have signs for certain people to enter that restaurant or why should they have lounging areas for people meet and discuss things amongst each other. If I were involved in the same situation with two men we're in, I believe I would have done the same thing they did and continue to fight every right as to why Starbucks employees felt the need to kick people of color out, being that it was public restaurant/ lounging place. However, it doesn't matter what race or that you are anybody is welcome into any public restaurant or should want to feel like they're welcome. Racial profiling should not be able to decide public places to lounge, to walk, to communicate with another race or ethnicity. I believe everyone should come together as one unit because everyone deserves to be treated nicely not based upon color or assumed actions. When police officers are typically involved, they tend to force people against their color, which could also lead to death. In other words, people of color are the ones who are usually killed by police officers at a disorporate rate. My point of view is that I think it's very wrong all people tend to make mistakes daily, honestly, it doesn't matter the color all people of color aren't criminals. The biggest problem is that law enforcement does not address profiling issues, they just feel like it's the right to do instead of solving the issues. However, when they tend to ignore those issues local policies design their own plans of how they perform their display actions towards citizens. another problem with their guidelines is that they accept many activities in which they avoid homeland security and they expect to abide by rules. Typically, the rules don't make their guidelines, ethnic minorities skepticism the government.