

VISUAL 17.1

**USA TODAY POLL ON THE PATRIOT ACT**

“Based on what you have heard or read about the Patriot Act, do you think all of its provisions should be kept, that it needs minor changes, that it needs major changes, [or that] it needs to be eliminated completely?”\*

Keep all provisions	Minor changes	Major changes	Eliminated completely	No opinion
13	50	24	7	7

\* Poll conducted January 6-8, 2006. <http://www.usatoday.com/news/polls/2006-01-09-poll.htm#patriot>. All numbers are percentages of poll respondents and have been rounded.

## VISUAL 17.2

**LEAGUE PRESSES SENATE TO OPPOSE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT**

December 15, 2005

Washington, D.C. – The League of Women Voters today urged the U.S. Senate to oppose ... the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act.

“We are very concerned that the conference agreement does not sufficiently protect civil liberties,” said Kay J. Maxwell, President of the League of Women Voters of the United States. “It fails to restore the vital checks and balances taken away by the USA PATRIOT Act.”

“The bill goes too far and must be stopped,” Maxwell said. “It provides for more government secrecy in the name of homeland security and anti-terrorism without the checks and balances needed to protect civil liberties. Medical, banking or library records of Americans can still be obtained by law enforcement without necessary safeguards...,” stated Maxwell.

“For the past 85 years, members of the League have been steadfast in their conviction that the need to protect against security threats to America must be balanced with the need to preserve the very liberties that are the foundation of this country. There are fundamental principles that guard our liberty – from independent judicial review of law enforcement actions to prohibitions on indiscriminate searches – that must be preserved,” Maxwell said.

Source: [http://www.lwv.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Individual\\_Liberties&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=4113](http://www.lwv.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Individual_Liberties&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=4113). Emphasis added.

## VISUAL 17.3

### NATIONAL SECURITY: LET'S PLAY OUR STRENGTHS

*The Washington Times*, October 9, 2006

by Michael E. O'Hanlon, *Senior Fellow*, Foreign Policy Studies, Brookings Institution

“The Patriot Act, whatever its problems in insufficiently guaranteeing civil liberties, on balance has been good legislation. Critics of the administration need to acknowledge that updating wiretap authority for the era of the Internet, allowing roving wiretaps not fixed to one phone or location, breaking down barriers between the FBI and CIA, requiring that banks report suspicious money transfers, requiring visa-waiver countries to have biometric indicators on their passports, prohibiting possession of dangerous biological materials in the absence of good research or medicinal reasons, and similar measures, were overdue and prudent.”

Source: <http://www.brookings.edu/views/op-ed/ohanlon/20061009.htm>. Emphasis added.

## VISUAL 17.4

**TRADE-OFFS**

Most government policy decisions involve a trade-off: a policy choice requires giving up some of one or more desired goals in order to gain some of one or more other goals.

What's the trade-off in the case of the Patriot Act?

Disagreements about trade-offs occur when one person thinks that you give up too much of one or more goals to get more of other goals. Also, people tend to value goals differently.

How do these points apply to assessing the Patriot Act? It is crucial to decide how much more security we are getting in exchange for a loss, in some measure, of civil liberties. If the loss of civil liberties is large while we gain very little in additional security, the Patriot Act might be a bad idea. On the other hand, the Patriot Act might be good policy if we gain a great deal of security at a small cost in civil liberties.

Information about this trade-off is subject to interpretation. Opponents of the Patriot Act will try to emphasize the civil liberties threat and minimize the national security value. Proponents of the Act will do the opposite.

Be mindful of the point of view of sources of disagreement.