

Comparing Federalist 10 and Brutus No. 1
Primary Source Analysis Activity

Grade Level: 7-12

Subject: Civics, U.S. History

Time Required: One 60-minute class period

Historical Thinking Skills: Primary Source Analysis, Compare and Contrast

Objective: Students will be able to compare Federalist and Anti-Federalist perspectives on government power and individual rights.

Lesson Plan:



Part 1: Bell Ringer (5-10 minutes): Write-Pair-Share

Ask students: *Is a large, diverse country better governed by a strong central government or by small, local governments? Why?* Have select pairs share out their opinions.

Part 2: Setting the Stage (15 minutes)

Federalists (Madison, Hamilton) <i>The Federalist Papers - Fed. 10</i>	Compare	Anti-Federalists (Jefferson, Yates) <i>Brutus No. 1</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Many of the founding fathers who were at the constitutional conventionWealthy, well-educated, elites	Who were they?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Represented more common person who liked government under the Articles of Confed.Afraid the new Constitution made the central government too strong



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weaker state governments, stronger national • Indirect election of officials (representative democracy) • Government by the elite 	What did they want in the American government?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong state government, weaker national • Direct elections of officials • Rule by the "common man"
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support as written at Convention • <i>Remember, many of the authors of the Constitution were Federalists</i> 	What did they think of the new Constitution?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not support Constitution as written • <i>Remember, they feared the national government would be too powerful</i>
	Should a declaration of individual rights be included in the Constitution?	

Part 3: Primary Source Analysis Activity (30 minutes)

- Federalist 10 & Brutus 1 (attached)

Part 4: Discussion and Reflection (15 minutes)

Either in small groups, or as a class, complete the comparison table in the student handout.

Part 5: Assessment

Exit Ticket: Which argument—Madison's or Brutus'—do you think has proven more accurate over time? Explain your reasoning using evidence from the primary sources.

Founding Civics

STUDENT WORKSHEET

Name _____

Federalist vs. Anti-Federalist Debates: *Federalist No. 10* & *Brutus No. 1*

Objective: Compare Federalist and Anti-Federalist perspectives on government power and individual rights.

Bell Ringer: Write-Pair-Share

Is a large, diverse country better governed by a strong central government or by small, local governments? Why?

Setting the Stage:

Federalists (Madison, Hamilton) <i>The Federalist Papers - Fed. 10</i>	Compare & Contrast	Anti-Federalists (Jefferson, Yates) <i>Brutus No. 1</i>
	Who were they?	
	What did they want in the American government?	
	What did they think of the new constitution?	
	Should a declaration of individual rights be included?	



Primary Source Analysis

Primary Source Analysis: *Brutus No. 1* – 1787

"Brutus" was the pseudonym for one of the most forceful Anti-Federalist voices during the ratification (approval) debates over the U.S. Constitution. While scholars still debate the author of the Brutus Essays, most believe that they were written by New York Anti-Federalist Robert Yates. For Brutus, the ratification debates turned on one key question: Do the American people want a system driven by the states or one organized around a powerful national government? Brutus feared that a republican form of government could not succeed in a large nation like America. As a result, he favored placing most key powers in the governments closest to the American people: their state and local governments.

Brutus No. 1 Excerpts	Analysis
<i>[1] Let us now proceed to enquire, as I at first proposed, whether it be best the thirteen United States should be reduced to one great republic, or not? It is here taken for granted, that all agree in this, that whatever government we adopt, it ought to be a free one; that it should be so framed as to secure the liberty of the citizens of America, and such a one as to admit of a full, fair, and equal representation of the people. The question then will be, whether a government thus constituted, and founded on such principles, is practicable, and can be exercised over the whole United States, reduced into one state?</i>	Identify the characteristics government should have, according to Brutus:
<i>[2] ... This government is to possess absolute and uncontrollable power, legislative, executive and judicial, with respect to every object to which it extends, for by the last clause of section 8th, article 1st, it is declared "that the Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this constitution, in the government of the United States; or in any department or office thereof."</i>	Source Analysis: Highlight the claim Brutus makes about the U.S. government established under the new Constitution.
<i>[3] Now, in a large extended country, it is impossible to have a representation, possessing the sentiments, and of integrity, to declare the</i>	Source Analysis: Highlight the places in this paragraph where Brutus uses the size of the United States to support his argument.



<p><i>minds of the people, without having it so numerous and unwieldy, as to be subject in great measure to the inconveniency of a democratic government.</i></p> <p><i>The territory of the United States is of vast extent; it now contains near three millions of souls, and is capable of containing much more than ten times that number. Is it practicable for a country, so large and so numerous as they will soon become, to elect a representation, that will speak their sentiments, without their becoming so numerous as to be incapable of transacting public business? It certainly is not.</i></p>	
<p><i>[4] In a republic, the manners, sentiments, and interests of the people should be similar. If this be not the case, there will be a constant clashing of opinions; and the representatives of one part will be continually striving, against those of the other. This will [set back] the operations of government, and prevent such conclusions as will promote the public good.</i></p> <p><i>If we apply this remark to the condition of the United States, we shall be convinced that it forbids that we should be one government...</i></p> <p><i>... The laws and customs of the several states are, in many respects, very diverse, and in some opposite; each would be in favor of its own interests and customs, and, of consequence, a legislature, formed of representatives from the respective parts, would not only be too numerous to act with any care or decision, but would be composed of such heterogeneous and discordant principles, as would constantly be contending with each other....</i></p> <p><i>The confidence which the people have in their rulers, in a free republic, arises from their knowing them, from their being responsible to them for their conduct, and from the power they</i></p>	<p>Source Analysis: Highlight the claim Brutus is making in this section.</p> <p>Source Analysis: For each of the remaining paragraphs in this section, underline evidence that the author uses to support the claim you identified above.</p> <p><i>Consider what we know about how states saw themselves under the Articles of Confederation ("firm league of friendship"), it may make it</i></p>



<p><i>have of displacing them when they misbehave: but in a republic of the extent of this continent, the people in general would be acquainted with very few of their rulers; the people at large would know little of their proceedings, and it would be extremely difficult to change them. . .</i></p> <p><i>In a republic of such vast extent as the United States, the legislature cannot attend to the various concerns and wants of its different parts.</i></p> <p><i>In so extensive a republic, the great officers of government would soon become above the control of the people, and abuse their power to the purpose of aggrandizing* themselves, and oppressing them. The trust committed to the executive offices, in a country of the extent of the United-States, must be various and of magnitude. The command of all the troops and navy of the republic, the appointment of officers, the power of pardoning offences, the collecting of all the public revenues, and the power of expending them, with a number of other powers, must be lodged and exercised in every state, in the hands of a few.</i></p> <p><i>*aggrandize -to increase the power, status, or wealth of</i></p>	<p><i>easier to realize what Brutus is arguing - the states are all too different to be united as one.</i></p>
<p>[5] These are some of the reasons by which it appears that a free republic cannot long subsist over a country of the great extent of these states. If then this new constitution is calculated to consolidate the thirteen states into one, as it evidently is, it ought not to be adopted.</p>	<p>Source Analysis: Restate the conclusion of the argument in your own words.</p>

Questions:

What is Brutus' claim or argument?

What are two of the strongest pieces of evidence Brutus uses to support his claim?

1)

2)



Primary Source Analysis: *Federalist No. 10* – 1787

After the Constitutional Convention adjourned in September 1787, heated local debate followed on the merits of the Constitution. Each state was required to vote on ratification of the document. A series of articles signed "Publius" soon began to appear in newspapers. These Federalist Papers strongly supported the Constitution. The Federalist Papers have since taken on immense significance, as they have come to be seen as the definitive explanation of the Constitution's meaning and give us the main arguments for our form of government.

<i>Federalist 10</i> Excerpts	Analysis
[1] Among the numerous advantages promised by a well-constructed Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its tendency to break and control the violence of faction.	Source Analysis: According to Madison, what advantage will "Union" bring the United States?
[2] Complaints are everywhere heard ... that the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties; and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice, and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority. These must be chiefly, if not wholly, effects of the unsteadiness and injustice, with which a factious spirit has tainted our public administrations.	Source Analysis: What usually drives decision-making, according to Madison?
[3] By a faction, I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community.	Source Analysis: Highlight Madison's definition of a faction. Check Your Understanding: Why are factions bad, according to Madison?
[4] There are two methods of curing the mischiefs of faction. The one, by removing its causes; the other, by controlling its effects. There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction. The one, by destroying the liberty which is	Check Your Understanding: According to Madison, how do we prevent factions from forming in society?



essential to its existence; the other, by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, and the same interests...	Is this solution realistic? Why or why not?
[5] ...The inference to which we are brought is, that the causes of faction cannot be removed; and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its effects.	Source Analysis: Since factions are inevitable, what <i>can</i> be done about them?
Check for Understanding: Summarize the main takeaway from Fed 10 so far →	
[6] If a faction consists of less than a majority, relief is supplied by the republican principle, which enables the majority to defeat its sinister views, by regular vote. It may clog the administration; it may convulse the society; but it will be unable to execute and mask its violence under the forms of the constitution.	Source Analysis: If a faction is a small group (minority of the public), what remedy is there?
<p>[7] When a majority is included in a faction, the form of popular government, on the other hand, enables it to sacrifice to its ruling passion or interest, both the public good and the rights of other citizens. To secure the public good, and private rights, against the danger of such a faction, and at the same time to preserve the spirit and the form of popular government, is the greatest object to which our inquiries are directed. ...</p> <p>...From this view of the subject, it may be concluded, that a pure democracy, by which I mean a society consisting of a small number of citizens, who assemble and administer the government in person, can admit of no cure from the mischiefs of faction. ...</p>	Source Analysis: Can a pure democracy guard against the dangers of factions? Why or why not? (Remember, for Madison pure democracy = participatory democracy)



<p>[8] A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect, and promises the cure for which we are seeking. Let us examine the points in which it varies from pure democracy, and we shall comprehend both the nature of the cure and the efficacy which it must derive from the union.</p>	<p>Source Analysis: What type of government is best suited to protect against factions? How does Madison define that type of government?</p>
<p>[9] In the first place, it is to be remarked, that however small the republic may be, the representatives must be raised to a certain number, in order to guard against the cabals* of a few;</p> <p>In the next place, as each representative will be chosen by a greater number of citizens in the large than in the small republic, it will be more difficult for unworthy candidates to practice with success the vicious arts, by which elections are too often carried; and the suffrages* of the people being more free, will be more likely to center in men who possess the most attractive merit, and the most established characters. ...</p> <p><i>*cabals - a plan secretly devised to accomplish an evil end</i> <i>*suffrages - the right to vote in political elections</i></p>	<p>Source Analysis: Why is a <i>large</i> republic better than a <i>small</i> republic, according to Madison?</p>
<p>Check for Understanding: Summarize the main takeaway from this section of Fed 10 →</p>	
<p>[10] .. Extend the sphere, and you will take in a greater variety of parties and interests; you make it less probable that a majority of the whole will have a common motive to invade the rights of other citizens ...</p>	<p>Source Analysis: What does Madison argue happens when the country is larger?</p>



	<p>Check for Understanding: Based on Madison's argument thus far, are factions more or less dangerous in a large republic? Why?</p>
<p>[11] Hence, it clearly appears, that the same advantage, which a republic has over a [pure] democracy, in controlling the effects of faction, is enjoyed by a large over a small republic - enjoyed by the union over the states composing it. ...</p> <p>In the extent and proper structure of the union, therefore, we behold a republican remedy for the diseases most incident* to republican government.</p> <p><i>*incident in this context means "likely to happen"</i></p>	<p>Source Analysis: According to Madison, how should the union be structured to safeguard against the dangers of factions?</p>

Circle the correct **bolded word or phrase** to complete the main takeaways of Madison's *Federalist 10*.

1. Factions are a **good or bad** thing in society.
2. Factions, or divisions within society, are **inevitable or preventable**.
3. A pure democracy **does or does not** properly guard against the dangers of factions.
4. Republics **do or do not** properly guard against the dangers of factions.
5. A **large or small** republic is best equipped to protect against factions.



Compare & Contrast:

<i>Brutus No. 1</i> (Anti-Federalist)		<i>Federalist No. 10</i> (Federalist)
	Size of Republic	
	Role of the Central Government	
	Safeguards for Liberty	

Exit Ticket:

Which argument—Madison's or Brutus'—do you think has proven more accurate over time? Explain your reasoning using evidence from the primary sources.

