

Good limitations placed on freedom after 9 11 essay example

[Philosophy](#), [Freedom](#)



The freedom of movement using a plane was restricted to those only in the 'fly' list. This was also enforced by increasing the surveillance electronic gadgets in both airports and bus stop stations. The individual freedom of privacy was breached due to the increase of electronic surveillance by intelligence agencies. Anyone entering or leaving the country had to be inspected and was to provide legal identification. All the foreigners had to provide a clear and understandable reason as to why they were entering the country. However, the ability of the citizens to move around the country did not have a wide scale of changes but it had only few restrictions. Critics claimed that there were over searching in bus stops and plain stations of people from the Middle East.

On top of that, another limitation on the individual constitution rights occurred when the government became more involved in people's lives. There was also passing of legislative laws which allow government to silence and dissent voices with the aim of developing a strong, consolidated and united centrality. American government hindered the freedom of speech. By doing this, the government was limiting the liberty rights of citizens to communicate what they wanted to communicate. In addition, the government through the intelligence agencies began tapping all the calls from cell phone communications in order to track any communications by terrorist which may happen on the American soil. The idea of tapping all the calls and messages was limitation to freedom of privacy. Moreover, in a case where the national security was at stake, logically, it was a great idea. There were laws which allowed the intelligence agencies to install secrets cameras in homes of individuals suspected to be terrorists. The aim was to monitor

any activity which may interfere with national security. These laws were limiting individual privacy.

Another limitation of citizens' freedom was when the patriotic act expanded the government power giving the government power to be able to scoop out some criminal laws. There was also the formation of the terrorist act of the 2001 which became shorthand and government abuse of power where members from the Muslim religions were frequently arrested. The government was holding people without charges almost for decades. It also sent people abroad for questioning and even involved in torturing of people. The United States criminal law changed slightly after the attack, but the method of enforcing the law did not change.

After September 11, 2001, prosecutor arrested more than 100 people who were either believed to be supporting or funding the terrorist. Individuals who were arrested claimed that their freedom was violated because instead of using the law in making sure that people with information about the wrong doings of others were given opportunity to testify, the prosecutors were holding these people and suspecting them to have the links with the terrorist. All these restrictions on the freedom of movement and speech lead to limitation of freedom of the individuals targeted while increasing the freedom of the government. The restrictions lead to insertion of fear among individuals and increasing the loyalty and obedience to authority. Insertion of fear limits the liberty of the citizens.

A comparison of the surrounding circumstances of the limitations of the freedom of citizens to those which happened in the McCarthy era and World War I can be discussed below. During the McCarthy error and the world war I,

there was the creation of the un-American committee which had intentions of investigating all the disloyal activities of private citizens, organizations suspected to have communists ties and the public employees. This event is compared to the one that happened after September 11, 2001. There were increased investigations in all the private citizens and all the committees which were believed to be communist and from the Middle East, especially the Muslim nations. Although the government was doing this to ensure they curb the national insecurity by knowing all the agendas and obligations of any group in the American soil. This was seen as a breach to the freedom of privacy and discrimination of some individual from a certain religion.

During the McCarthy era, anybody who attempted to speak out risked his life because there was a possibility of either being blacklisted and hauled in front of the whole congregation of hearing. There was also arising of being termed as a traitor of the nation. However, after the September 11, the strong rules which restricted the freedom of speech of the citizens during the McCarthy and World War 1 era were reduced. Only few Americans who found themselves being held up and imprisoned for the violation of the civil rights. This was a lesser number as to those of the people who were hounded, prosecuted and imprisoned during the McCarthy era. After the September 11, a larger number of the people who were imprisoned in connection to either funding or providing the terrorist with information were non-citizens of the United States of America. This was in contrast to the time of McCarthy era and the World War 1 time whereas a great number of individuals found themselves being arrested for sedition and denied their freedom and constitutional rights.

In both September 11 and during the McCarthy era there was the establishment and increased rules in the enforcement of the patriotic act. the desire to centralize the whole nations focus, by ensuring the existence of centralized nation focusing on punishing and torturing anyone suspected to be a terrorist was a limitation of individual rights. In both cases, the freedom of speech was curtailed with the notion that it was during the wartime and the enemy. The primary intention was to instill fear among the citizens hence making them to be obedient and compliant to the rules set by the authority. On top of that, in both the world war I and September 11, the government obtains a greater role in ensuring that they made a clear assertion that concerned with the idea that the nation was under siege and in a state of war. This led to decrease in freedom and constitutional rights of individuals being targeted. It also increased the freedom of the government. The freedom of not talking openly served in the name of control and being obedience to the authority hence hindering the freedom and liberty of the citizens.

During war times, the balance between security and freedom is usually uncontrollable. In most cases, it favors security and not the freedom of the individual. The citizens during the war time are usually ready to surrender their freedom and some of their constitution rights. This is usually seen as a patriotic act especially when the national security is at stake. In the United States of America, the military forces are enough to conduct the war while the citizens within the nation enjoy their full freedom rights. Since the nation was born of war and declaration of independent, it has avoided the fate of the nation that trade freedom for security. In addition, there is always the

healthy fear that occurs in every era. This explains the need for a nation to balance security and civil liberty of the citizen.

The question of whether the Constitution protects citizens' rights during wartime is usually very challenging. This is because the American constitution says nothing about the rights of the citizen being violated or reduced during war times. In contrast to that, one of the great presidents of America, Abraham Lincoln, suspended the habeas corpus and reduced the other constitutional rights of the American citizen during the American civil war. Technically, the constitution should protect the rights of the citizens even during the war times. Citizens should show their patriotism by not demanding so much from the government during the war times.

The American constitution does not contain any clause that allows suspension of the citizens' freedom and constitutional rights. The nation is usually ambivalent during the war times but also the price must be paid for the freedom of its citizens. The evidence on whether the constitution protects the citizens' rights during the wartime can be seen after September 11 when the nation went to war against the al-Qaida. The terrorists were not attacking the American military, but they were attacking the innocent civilians. The American military went into war yet the constitutional rights of its citizens were still being protected. After the war on al-Qaida, their nation was still in another war with Iraq. The nation had been in war for decades yet the security of its citizens was still strong.

In any democratic and free nation, dissent should never be equated with patriotism. This is because the individuals can disagree with any set of policies governing a government. Expressing personal thought is an

individual's constitutional rights. However; in many occasions, opposition is usually taken as a lack of patriotism, and something which violates the individual freedom of expressing themselves. Generally, not unless individuals makes clear statements or become other individual mind readers, it is difficult to determine whether the disagreement is a full demonstration of patriotism or a complete reflection of individuals' dislike and lose of hope in the government.

In conclusion, the basic factor of any government is to ensure that the security of all its citizens is stable. In the case where a nation is at war the citizens should show their patriotism by not revealing any confidential information to the enemy. In addition, any suspect should not be detaining without being proven guilty. The government should protect individual with information about terrorist instead of detaining and torturing them. The protection of such individuals is crucial because it will help them to testify in a court against the terrorist.

Works cited

Pfiffner, James P. Power Play: The Bush Presidency and the Constitution.

Washington, D. C: Brookings Institution Press, 2008. Internet resource

Mastered, Aniceto. Post 9/11 and the State of Permanent Legal Emergency: Security and Human Rights in Countering Terrorism. Dordrecht: Springer, 2012. Print.

Sharma, Arvind. The World's Religions After September 11. Westport, Conn.

[u. a.: PraegerPubl, n. d.. Print.

Ullman, Harlan. Finishing Business: Ten Steps to Defeat Global Terror.

Annapolis, Md: Naval Institute Press, 2004. Print.

<https://assignbuster.com/good-limitations-placed-on-freedom-after-911-essay-example/>

-
-