



Essential Question: Should the document that came out of the Constitutional Convention have been ratified even though it was made in secret, was supposed to only to fix the Articles of Confederation and did not have a Bill of Rights?

Documents

Quick Facts: 1-The Constitution Strengthens the National Government p. 130, 2- Commentary on Shay's Rebellion, 3-Rawlin Lowndes' Speech, 4-Federalist Paper No. 10 p. 134, 5-Anti-Federalist: Brutus #1

1. **Create a chart** like the one below to show information that you already know

US Constitution

| Reasons to Support | Reasons to Oppose |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| | |

2. **Write an analysis** of the first document which includes:
 - a. How reliable is this source? Should it be trusted? (Consider the author, the type of document, any noticeable bias, etc.)
 - b. What you think are the 3 most important ideas, details or facts in the document
 - c. One idea, detail or fact that you think other groups might not notice or think about
 - d. Which side of the essential question does it support? Explain.
3. Repeat step 2 for the remaining documents.
4. Based on the evidence write your group's answer the essential question in an ARE (Assertion, Reason, Evidence) paragraph. Cite at least three pieces of evidence from your document analysis or your own learning in your response.

Assertion: The Constitution should / should not have been ratified without a Bill of Rights.

Reason: This is the case because...

Evidence: _____ shows...

Additionally, _____ shows...

Lastly, _____ shows...

Document 2: Commentary on Shay's Rebellion

Cartoon by Keith Hughes, 2007



Document 3: Report of Rawlin Lowndes' speech to the South Carolina House of Representatives, debating the adoption of the federal constitution (January 17, 1788)

Mr. Lowndes expatiated [talked in detail] some time on the nature of compacts . . . and solemnly [seriously] called on the house to consider whether it would not be better to add strength to the old Confederation, instead of adopting another; asking whether a man could be looked on as wise, who, possessing a magnificent building, upon discovering a flaw, instead of repairing the injury, should pull it down, and build another. Indeed he could not understand with what propriety [proper behavior] the Convention proceeded to change the Confederation; for every person with whom he had conversed on the subject concurred [agreed] in opinion that the sole object of appointing a convention was to inquire [ask] what alterations [changes] were necessary in the Confederation, in order that it might answer those salutary [healthful] purposes for which it was originally intended . . . Mr. Lowndes concluded a long speech with a glowing eulogy [funeral speech] on the old Confederation . . .

Document 5: Anti-Federalist Papers: Brutus No. 1, 18 October 1787

Let us now proceed to inquire, 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 an 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?

If respect is to be paid to the opinion of the greatest and wisest men who have ever thought or wrote on the science of government, we shall be constrained to conclude, that a free republic cannot succeed over a country of such immense extent, containing such a number of inhabitants, and these increasing in such rapid progression as that of the whole United States. Among the many illustrious authorities which might be produced to this point, I shall content myself with quoting only two. The one is the baron de Montesquieu, "It is natural to a republic to have only a small territory, otherwise it cannot long exist. In a large republic there are men of large fortunes, and consequently of less moderation; there are trusts too great to be placed in any single subject; he has interest of his own; he soon begins to think that he may be happy, great and glorious, by oppressing his fellow citizens; and that he may raise himself to grandeur on the ruins of his country. In a large republic, the public good is sacrificed to a thousand views. In a small one, the interest of the public is easier perceived, better understood, and more within the reach of every citizen; abuses are of less extent, and of course are less protected."

History furnishes no example of a free republic, anything like the extent of the United States. The Grecian republics were of small extent; so also was that of the Romans. Both of these, it is true, in process of time, extended their conquests over large territories of country; and the consequence was, that their governments were changed from that of free governments to those of the most tyrannical that ever existed in the world.

Letter from George Washington to James Madison, Nov. 5, 1786

...We are fast turning to anarchy and confusion! How sad is it, that in so short a space, we should have made such large strides towards fulfilling the prediction of England who said: "leave them to themselves, and their government will soon dissolve." Will not the wise and good strive hard to avert [prevent] this evil?

What stronger evidence can be given of the lack of power in our governments than these disorders [like Shays' Rebellion]?

If there exists not a power to check them, what security has a man for life, liberty, or property?