

9/11

One of the effects after the immediate shock the nation felt after 9/11 was a perceived need for increase in national security.

This came in the form of the USA-PATRIOT act, which stands for Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism, which basically means "law enforcement will have more power and people less rights to privacy when it is in the name of terror deterrence.

The act's actions include:

- Legally justifying the tapping of suspect phones
- The greenlighting of the transmission of information about suspects between govt agencies.
- The mass collection of data on the Internet and whatnot.

Whether the act was effective or not is debatable, however, there is a main idea that is important:

**Government laws and policies balancing order and liberty are based on the U.S. Constitution and have been interpreted differently over time?**

**Or:**

**What rights may we exchange for safety?**

It is up to the people and government to decide what rights and liberties the Constitution grants WITHOUT disrupting civil order and safety. In the 9/11 context, people and lawmakers naturally interpreted the law differently as a result of prior experience. In the context of tyranny after Britain, it may have been deemed more necessary to grant individual rights.