WHAT SO PROUDLY WE HAIL

Understanding *Federalist* 10: Analysis and Evaluation

By Charles Cooper

Objective | Students will understand the arguments set forth by Publius in *Federalist* 10 by reviewing and memorizing the document's terms. Students will also scrutinize the text by mapping the argument sequentially in a concept (tree) map. Finally, students will judge the overall message set forth in *Federalist* 10 by writing a letter to the editor either as a supporter or a detractor of the message.

Length | This lesson can be broken into two 45-minute sections. If teachers are on block scheduling (classes that meet for an hour and a half), then they will be able to complete this lesson, with proper preparation, in one session.

Common Core State Standards Addressed | Literacy in History/Social Studies, Grades 9–10:

- CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.9-10.1 Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.
- CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.9-10.2 Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of how key events or ideas develop over the course of the text.
- CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.9-10.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including vocabulary describing political, social, or economic aspects of history/social science.
- CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.9-10.5 Analyze how a text uses structure to emphasize key points or advance an explanation or analysis.
- CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.9-10.7 Integrate quantitative or technical analysis (e.g., charts, research data) with qualitative analysis in print or digital text.

Literacy in History/Social Studies, Grades 11–12:

- CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.11-12.1 Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, connecting insights gained from specific details to an understanding of the text as a whole.
- CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.11-12.2 Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary that makes clear the relationships among the key details and ideas.

- CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.11-12.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including analyzing how an author uses and refines the meaning of a key term over the course of a text (e.g., how Madison defines *faction* in *Federalist* No. 10).
- CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.11-12.5 Analyze in detail how a complex primary source is structured, including how key sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text contribute to the whole.

Materials | Copies of *Federalist* 10 (PDF) for each student, legal-sized sheets of paper for student groups or online flow chart creators if technology is available, teacher key

Teacher Background Information

James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay wrote the *Federalist Papers* under the penname Publius. Publius Valerius Publicola (died 503 BC) was one of the first republican statesmen of ancient Rome. He helped to overthrow the last king of Rome, Tarquin the Proud, and to establish the Roman Republic. Later, when the people of Rome began to mistrust him for flaunting his power and riches by building his home on a well-known landmark, he tore down his house and rebuilt it on lower lands.

The *Federalist Papers* were a series of 85 essays written by Publius with the goal of convincing the pivotal states of New York and Virginia to ratify the new U.S. Constitution, drafted after the failure of the Articles of Confederation. *Federalist* 10 (written by Madison) is perhaps the best known of the essays. It continues the discussion of a question first broached in *Federalist* 9 (written by Hamilton): how to address the destructive role of faction in popular government (that is, a political society where the people rule).

As defined by Madison, a **faction** is a number of citizens, whether a majority or minority, who are united and activated "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." It is important to note that Madison does not suggest that all political groups (for example, political parties) are factions. Rather a faction is a group of citizens with interests that are contrary to the rights of others or the interests of the community as a whole.

The tendency to form factions is deeply woven into human nature, Madison argues. It is an outgrowth or consequence of people being born with different physical and mental capacities. To remove the causes of faction, there are only two options: destroy the liberty that allows for differences of opinion *or* give every citizen the same opinions, passions, and interests. The first cure is worse than the disease, and the second is neither desirable nor possible.

Property rights originate from the diverse faculties and abilities of men, and the protection of these rights is the first object of government. But the resulting "various and unequal distribution of property" is also the cause of the oldest and most common form of faction. The rich and poor, creditors and debtors, have different interests from

one another. Madison feared that these various **economic factions** might band together and attempt to subvert the law to promote their own interests. In a democracy, where the poor are more numerous, they might plunder the wealthy few. Alternatively, the rich might use their political power to exploit the poor.

This analysis leads to a dilemma: How can self-interested individuals administering governmental powers be prevented from using those powers to destroy the freedoms that government is supposed to protect? Madison warns against relying on impartial and "enlightened statesmen" to solve the problem. We must assume that less disinterested leaders will sometimes occupy the seats of power. Thus, a "system" of government is needed to take the place of enlightened individuals. In this system, no man should be a judge in his own plight. People who judge cases of which they are a part cannot be trusted. The system of government must act to limit the power of all players and, thereby, limit the power of the government itself.

How can government address the problem of factions? If the causes of faction cannot be removed, Madison argues, then we must try to control the negative effects of faction.

Minority factions can be controlled by the majority, and are thus not a threat to civil society. However, if a faction is or becomes a majority, it can threaten the legitimate rights of the minority. **Majority faction**, then, is the biggest threat to popular government. The rest of *Federalist* 10 addresses the need to control majority factions.

The solution is not to be found in **direct democracy**, Madison warns. A "pure democracy"—where every citizen gets to vote on every issue—is especially susceptible to majority faction. In order to work, direct democracies must be small, making it easier for a majority faction to arise and to influence government.

This leads Madison to his solution to the problem of faction: **republican government**. Republican (or representative) government has two advantages: 1) Representatives can help to "refine and enlarge the public views," and 2) Republics can be larger than pure democracies, making it more difficult for a majority faction to emerge.

This latter solution (called the "**enlargement of the orbit**" in *Federalist* 9) is Madison's most novel argument. By "extend[ing] the sphere" to "take in a greater variety of parties and interests," republican government makes it less likely that any one faction will achieve majority status and power. (In other words, the solution for the problem of faction is the multiplication of factions.) A large republic is harder to subvert or tyrannize than a smaller one. A large republic will also be more economically diverse. Factions therefore proliferate. With so many differing and varied interests, no one group of people will be able to overtake the others. Instead, large republics are governed by fleeting and loosely adhering majorities.

A number of advantages result from this enlargement of the orbit:

- A larger population makes it more difficult for a corrupt candidate to woo a large number of voters by devious means.
- A more expansive country ensures that local or statewide biases do not spread to other parts of the country.
- A large number of representatives, from different parts of the country, and who are held accountable by frequent elections, will have a difficult time conspiring together to the detriment of the people they represent and the country as a whole.

In sum, under this new system of government, "ambition [is] made to counteract ambition" (*Federalist* 51). As the editors of WSPWH write:

> Political struggle will be moderated not by moral and religious instruction aimed at making citizens more moderate and virtuous, but instead by the moderating effects of multiplicity and the requirements of effective commercial activity. By design, America's greatest bulwark against the danger of majority faction is the large commercial republic and competition of rival interests in pursuit of gain and personal advancement.
>
> What assumptions about human nature inform this ingenious solution? Why is heterogeneity preferable to homogeneity, and what, if any, might be its defects or costs? What sort of human character—with what sorts of passions, virtues, and vices—is produced by a large commercial republic? The Anti-Federalists, who opposed the large federal union, held that freedom can be experienced and preserved only in small communities, in which citizens know one another, are like-minded, and actively participate in public life. Might they have been right? Does our federal system, through its division of authority among national, state, and local powers, manage to secure the advantages of both bigness and smallness? What should we think today about the relation among commerce, freedom, and stability?

Class Activity

Warm-Up (10 minutes) | Students will spend a timed three minutes addressing the following prompt: To how many different groups or possible factions, defined by common passions, opinions, or interests, do you belong? Give examples, like male/female, region, race, religion, ethnicity, favorite sport, and so on. Ask students to rank these groups from "most important" to "least important" according to their own views. Which ones do they identify with the most? Why? Have your students trade papers with a partner. Students will read their partners' responses.

Give students two minutes and have each write down how many potential "factions" (according to Madison's definition) he or she shares with his or her partner. Also ask them to identify areas where they do not overlap with their fellow classmates.

Finally, spend five minutes leading a whole-class discussion. How many groups are present in the class? Does the entire class belong to the same group or hold a common belief that all share (e.g., love of country or freedom, for example)? Where do these similarities and differences originate? How might a potential tyrant or ambitious politician play on these similarities and differences? What danger might this represent to the nation if no common ground is found?

Teachers should then provide context to students by delving into the background information on the *Federalist Papers*, in general, and *Federalist* 10, in particular.

Examining the Primary Source (35 minutes) | Break students into a few groups. Have each group tackle a few paragraphs, moving from the beginning of the paper to the end. Students should do a quick scan of their part of the document with a highlighter, pen, or pencil in hand. Students should read through their section of the paper and make note of words that stand out or may hinder comprehension. Come back together and discuss the terms that they made note of as well as the following key terms:

- Faction
- Republic
- Democracy
- Impulse of passion or interest
- Latent
- Enlightened
- Zeal

Students should still be in their sequenced groups. Give each group a legal-sized sheet of paper, or larger, to make a flow map of Madison's argument. (If technology is available, you might replace the sheets of paper with online flow chart makers, such as Padlet.com or Prezi.com, an online presentation resource). The first paragraph describes the crisis of the Articles of Confederation and the resulting infighting between the states. This serves as an introduction to the problem of faction that Madison will address, and helps create a sense of urgency that compels us to take the solutions offered by Madison seriously.

Each group should be an expert in their portion of *Federalist* 10. Their sectional flow maps of *Federalist* 10 will be put together with the other groups' sections so the entire argument is mapped (alternatively, if students are able to, or if you have enough time, you may want each group mapping the entire *Federalist* 10 essay and comparing their results afterward). Taking the first paragraph as an introduction, the flow chart should start with the second paragraph, which defines "faction," and branch out from there. It

should end with the republican form of government as the solution to faction. Students should not read each paragraph in minute detail. They should keep in mind the key points of each passage and fit that into their flow map.

When complete, flow maps should be organized on a wall so they can be viewed and presented. With teacher guidance, students should present one group at a time with an eye to the sequential argument. Does the flow map, indeed, flow? Is there a logical sequence behind the essay? Is the argument convincing? Why or why not? Is Madison, himself, an agent of a faction? How can you tell?

Among the questions you will want to answer are:

1. What is a faction, according to Madison?
2. Madison suggests that factions may be based on passions, on interests, and on opinions. Explain the differences, giving an example of each.
3. What is the most common and durable cause source of faction, according to Madison? Is this cause prevalent today? Explain your response.
4. Explain the two ways Madison proposes for removing the causes of faction and the two ways of remedying the mischiefs of faction. Explain the challenges that lie in each proposal.
5. Why is majority faction a serious problem for popular government?
6. Why is the "republican principle" better at controlling the effects of a minority faction or a majority faction?
7. Why is an extensive republic with more factions better than a small republic with few factions?
8. Explain what is unique about the republic proposed by the Constitution. Why does Madison regard it as well suited to control the effects of faction? How is it, in his words, "a republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government"?

Analyzing a Primary Source (45 minutes) | Warm Up – Using the flow maps created earlier, students should be prepared to take notes and answer questions:

1. What were the historical circumstances of the *Federalist Papers* being written?
2. Why were New York and Virginia targeted by the *Federalist Papers*?
3. Would Madison agree with this statement: Might makes right? Explain.
4. Why would Madison reason with the American people in this manner (i.e., publishing essays in a newspaper)? Why not simply gather supporters and overpower the opposition?
5. Why does Madison employ a seemingly distrusting rhetoric? How does this further the cause of his message?
6. (*Assuming you've covered the Declaration of Independence*) *Federalist* 10 seems to take the history of democracies into account when offering a solution to the

present problem. How does this correlate with the conceptions of natural right and the need for limited government in the Declaration of Independence?

7. Is Madison's argument that the root of faction is found in human nature persuasive? Why or why not? Are there modern examples of this?
8. Can human nature be changed to allow for a more positive or enlightened foundation of government to be established?
9. The surprising solution that an increase in factions (along with frequent elections and the expanded scope of our republic) is the solution to the problem of faction catches many first-time readers off guard. Is this really the only solution to the problem? Have we, hundreds of years later, found a better answer to the problem of faction? If your answer is yes, what is it or what might it be?
10. Shadows of this "low but solid ground" of mistrust of faction can be seen in our system of checks and balances, frequent elections, recalling elected officials, and federalism. It seems to work well for government. Does this distrust of power in our government institutions also trickle down and poison the cultural or social structure of society? If so, in what way(s)?
11. Does technology and the ability to contact and organize people quickly through social networking help to make our "extended republic" a little less extended? Does it subvert Madison's argument or strengthen it?

This final discussion question will lead to an activity. Give students the remainder of class time to update *Federalist* 10 into modern language. Have students "report" back to Madison giving evidence of the successes and failures of the *Federalist* 10 solution in modern times. What has worked and what hasn't worked concerning its thesis? Does expanding faction through an extended republic and containing it via frequent elections, a larger population, and representatives still work?

Students don't actually have to act out or film the assignment, but if an extra credit assignment or extension assignment is needed you might suggest the following:

- If Madison were to attempt the same scheme today, what would it look like?
    - Where do you see big divisions in our society that may be problematic to the future of our republic?
    - Have students use modern media to replicate *Federalist* 10. Remember, the *Federalist Papers* were a series of essays. How would that translate into today's world? Would it be a commercial, a song, an infomercial, or something else? Who would pitch the argument? Who would the audience be? What tone (formal, informal) would be used? Which of the key terms mentioned above would need to be translated? How would Madison's complaints and solutions be translated to today?

If technology is available, have some groups reinterpret *Federalist* 10 taking advantage of the following resources:

- Online poster resources – canva.com, smore.com, padlet.com or StoryBird.com
- Videos – TouchCast App for iOs or TouchCast.com (only works in the Google Chrome Browser on laptops/desktops and any Apple product)
- Free Website Builder – Wix.com and Google.Site
- Blogs – Wordpress.com, Kidblog.com, Blogger.com

Exit Ticket (5 minutes) | Fully address the following prompt: *Federalist* 10 attempts to find a solution to the friction that naturally occurs in all societies by building upon "low, but solid ground." In your estimation, did they succeed? Please fully explain your answer by matching one example from the text with one historical or current event.

About the Author | *Charles Cooper is the recipient of the 2012–13 Northwest ISD Teacher of the Year, 2012 Humanities Texas Outstanding Teacher of the Year, and 2011 Outstanding Educator of North Texas (North Central Texas College) awards. He is a high school and college government course instructor who incorporates philosophy, technology, and humor into his lessons whenever he can.*

WHAT SO
PROUDLY
WE HAIL

Federalist 10

Publius (James Madison)

To the People of the State of New York:

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. The friend of popular governments never finds himself so much alarmed for their character and fate, as when he contemplates their propensity to this dangerous vice. He will not fail, therefore, to set a due value on any plan which, without violating the principles to which he is attached, provides a proper cure for it. The instability, injustice, and confusion introduced into the public councils, have, in truth, been the mortal diseases under which popular governments have everywhere perished; as they continue to be the favorite and fruitful topics from which the adversaries to liberty derive their most specious declamations. The valuable improvements made by the American constitutions on the popular models, both ancient and modern, cannot certainly be too much admired; but it would be an unwarrantable partiality, to contend that they have as effectually obviated the danger on this side, as was wished and expected. Complaints are everywhere heard from our most considerate and virtuous citizens, equally the friends of public and private faith, and of public and personal liberty, that our governments are too unstable, 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. However anxiously we may wish that these complaints had no foundation, the evidence of known facts will not permit us to deny that they are in some degree true. It will be found, indeed, on a candid review of our situation, that some of the distresses under which we labor have been erroneously charged on the operation of our governments; but it will be found, at the same time, that other causes will not alone account for many of our heaviest misfortunes; and, particularly, for that prevailing and increasing distrust of public engagements, and alarm for private rights, which are echoed from one end of the continent to the other. These must be chiefly, if not wholly, effects of the unsteadiness and injustice with which a factious spirit has tainted our public administrations.

By a faction, I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or a 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.

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 essential to its existence; the other, by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, and the same interests.

It could never be more truly said than of the first remedy, that it was worse than the disease. Liberty is to faction what air is to fire, an aliment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be less folly to abolish liberty, which is essential to political life, because it nourishes faction, than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life, because it imparts to fire its destructive agency.

The second expedient is as impracticable as the first would be unwise. As long as the reason of man continues fallible, and he is at liberty to exercise it, different opinions will be formed. As long as the connection subsists between his reason and his self-love, his opinions and his passions will have a reciprocal influence on each other; and the former will be objects to which the latter will attach themselves. The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to a uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors, ensues a division of the society into different interests and parties.

The latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man; and we see them everywhere brought into different degrees of activity, according to the different circumstances of civil society. A zeal for different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, and many other points, as well of speculation as of practice; an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for pre-eminence and power; or to persons of other descriptions whose fortunes have been interesting to the human passions, have, in turn, divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to co-operate for their common good. So strong is this propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities, that where no substantial occasion presents itself, the most frivolous and fanciful distinctions have been sufficient to kindle their unfriendly passions and excite their most violent conflicts. But the most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many

lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government.

No man is allowed to be a judge in his own cause, because his interest would certainly bias his judgment, and, not improbably, corrupt his integrity. With equal, nay with greater reason, a body of men are unfit to be both judges and parties at the same time; yet what are many of the most important acts of legislation, but so many judicial determinations, not indeed concerning the rights of single persons, but concerning the rights of large bodies of citizens? And what are the different classes of legislators but advocates and parties to the causes which they determine? Is a law proposed concerning private debts? It is a question to which the creditors are parties on one side and the debtors on the other. Justice ought to hold the balance between them. Yet the parties are, and must be, themselves the judges; and the most numerous party, or, in other words, the most powerful faction must be expected to prevail. Shall domestic manufactures be encouraged, and in what degree, by restrictions on foreign manufactures? are questions which would be differently decided by the landed and the manufacturing classes, and probably by neither with a sole regard to justice and the public good. The apportionment of taxes on the various descriptions of property is an act which seems to require the most exact impartiality; yet there is, perhaps, no legislative act in which greater opportunity and temptation are given to a predominant party to trample on the rules of justice. Every shilling with which they overburden the inferior number, is a shilling saved to their own pockets.

It is in vain to say that enlightened statesmen will be able to adjust these clashing interests, and render them all subservient to the public good. Enlightened statesmen will not always be at the helm. Nor, in many cases, can such an adjustment be made at all without taking into view indirect and remote considerations, which will rarely prevail over the immediate interest which one party may find in disregarding the rights of another or the good of the whole.

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.

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. 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 then the great object to which our inquiries are directed. Let me add that it is the great desideratum by which

this form of government can be rescued from the opprobrium under which it has so long labored, and be recommended to the esteem and adoption of mankind.

By what means is this object attainable? Evidently by one of two only. Either the existence of the same passion or interest in a majority at the same time must be prevented, or the majority, having such coexistent passion or interest, must be rendered, by their number and local situation, unable to concert and carry into effect schemes of oppression. If the impulse and the opportunity be suffered to coincide, we well know that neither moral nor religious motives can be relied on as an adequate control. They are not found to be such on the injustice and violence of individuals, and lose their efficacy in proportion to the number combined together, that is, in proportion as their efficacy becomes needful.

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 for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will, in almost every case, be felt by a majority of the whole; a communication and concert result from the form of government itself; and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. Theoretic politicians, who have patronized this species of government, have erroneously supposed that by reducing mankind to a perfect equality in their political rights, they would, at the same time, be perfectly equalized and assimilated in their possessions, their opinions, and their passions.

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.

The two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic are: first, the delegation of the government, in the latter, to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; secondly, the greater number of citizens, and greater sphere of country, over which the latter may be extended.

The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations. Under such a regulation, it may well happen that the public voice, pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves, convened for the purpose. On the other hand,

the effect may be inverted. Men of factious tempers, of local prejudices, or of sinister designs, may, by intrigue, by corruption, or by other means, first obtain the suffrages, and then betray the interests, of the people. The question resulting is, whether small or extensive republics are more favorable to the election of proper guardians of the public weal; and it is clearly decided in favor of the latter by two obvious considerations:

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; and that, however large it may be, they must be limited to a certain number, in order to guard against the confusion of a multitude. Hence, the number of representatives in the two cases not being in proportion to that of the two constituents, and being proportionally greater in the small republic, it follows that, if the proportion of fit characters be not less in the large than in the small republic, the former will present a greater option, and consequently a greater probability of a fit choice.

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 centre in men who possess the most attractive merit and the most diffusive and established characters.

It must be confessed that in this, as in most other cases, there is a mean, on both sides of which inconveniences will be found to lie. By enlarging too much the number of electors, you render the representatives too little acquainted with all their local circumstances and lesser interests; as by reducing it too much, you render him unduly attached to these, and too little fit to comprehend and pursue great and national objects. The federal Constitution forms a happy combination in this respect; the great and aggregate interests being referred to the national, the local and particular to the State legislatures.

The other point of difference is, the greater number of citizens and extent of territory which may be brought within the compass of republican than of democratic government; and it is this circumstance principally which renders factious combinations less to be dreaded in the former than in the latter. The smaller the society, the fewer probably will be the distinct parties and interests composing it; the fewer the distinct parties and interests, the more frequently will a majority be found of the same party; and the smaller the number of individuals composing a majority, and the smaller the compass within which they are placed, the more easily will they concert and execute their plans of oppression. Extend the sphere, and you 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; or if such a common motive exists, it will be more difficult for all who feel it to discover their own strength, and to act in unison with each other. Besides other impediments, it may be remarked that, where there is a consciousness of unjust or dishonorable purposes, communication is

always checked by distrust in proportion to the number whose concurrence is necessary.

Hence, it clearly appears, that the same advantage which a republic has over a democracy, in controlling the effects of faction, is enjoyed by a large over a small republic,—is enjoyed by the Union over the States composing it. Does the advantage consist in the substitution of representatives whose enlightened views and virtuous sentiments render them superior to local prejudices and schemes of injustice? It will not be denied that the representation of the Union will be most likely to possess these requisite endowments. Does it consist in the greater security afforded by a greater variety of parties, against the event of any one party being able to outnumber and oppress the rest? In an equal degree does the increased variety of parties comprised within the Union, increase this security. Does it, in fine, consist in the greater obstacles opposed to the concert and accomplishment of the secret wishes of an unjust and interested majority? Here, again, the extent of the Union gives it the most palpable advantage.

The influence of factious leaders may kindle a flame within their particular States, but will be unable to spread a general conflagration through the other States. A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the Confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national councils against any danger from that source. A rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property, or for any other improper or wicked project, will be less apt to pervade the whole body of the Union than a particular member of it; in the same proportion as such a malady is more likely to taint a particular county or district, than an entire State.

In the extent and proper structure of the Union, therefore, we behold a republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government. And according to the degree of pleasure and pride we feel in being republicans, ought to be our zeal in cherishing the spirit and supporting the character of Federalists.

Publius.