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**Answer 1:**

The USA PATRIOT (Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools to Restrict, Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism) Act became law on 26th October 2001 in wake of the 9/11 attacks. Its purpose was to provide law enforcement agencies with greater powers having the implied objective of countering terrorism in America. The Patriot Act further expanded many historical restrictions on civil liberty, privacy and the right to be protected from unnecessary governmental intrusion. The new act provided national intelligence and law enforcement agencies with the power to conduct searches without warrant on account of suspected terrorist activity. This sneak and peek warrant resulted in quick searches that happened without a prior notification. Law enforcement agencies also obtained the power to share their information with intelligence agencies even without a court order hence removing most of the barriers historically placed to prevent it. Another glaring expansion in the power of the American law enforcement was the approval of tapping communications that were oral, electronic or through wires. This could be done over suspected terrorist activity and without the oversight of a judicial court. (Evans, 2002) The definition of material support was expanded to contain advice and counsel. Even though the bill was controversial and had many questionable provisions for law enforcement agencies, it passed without any solid opposition and was law in a few days because of the political atmosphere following 9/11.

**Answer 2:**

The current trend in the market for security is witnessing a spectacular growth in demand for private security firms over government mandated public security agencies. There has been historical incentive for the hiring of private sector security over public sector security. One reason for this is that the private sector is profit-oriented and will therefore focus on providing better results as compared to the public sector. Bureaucracy makes the public sector lag behind in gaining trust comprehensive enough to maintain a solid lead over private security. This has resulted in the private security firms being hired for everything ranging from locating terrorists in foreign lands to protecting local water facilities. Amenable requirements for the licensing of private security firms has made the situation even easier for them.

Licensure regulation for private security firms in the USA is markedly lenient as compared to Europe. (Button, 2007) Across the fifty states, the requirements for licensing in the private security sector vary. Some states require only a few hours of training for unarmed guards and a more rigorous training course, background checks and weapons training for armed guards. Even the states with the most stringent criteria for licensing private guards do not go much farther than the average. As an example, Virginia has an 18-hour training program for unarmed and a 50 to 53-hour training program for armed guards. The only problem with the existing system of licensure regulation of private security firms in USA is insufficient hurdles for a private security firm or its employees to be licensed and regulated. Scandals during military interventions on foreign lands have already prompted a range of measures by the government to hold private security firms accountable. However, the trend of self-accountability in private security firms needs to be challenged more vehemently. (Krahmann, 2016) If private security firms and their employees face stricter conditions before gaining a license and stay under state-approved regulations, the morality or ethical standard of private security firms can be raised.

Considering the growing relevance of private security firms, it is imminent that federal institutions partner with private ones for improved homeland security. Both the sectors can efficiently work together to ensure a secure country.
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