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The Federalists and the Anti-Federalists were two major groups which took opposite stances in approval of ratifying the Constitution. The Federalists believed that the Constitution was the best choice, and that ratifying it would bring order and peace to the country. Their position was that a republic was the best form of government, and that there should be a small number of elected representatives making decisions for the good of the majority of those who elected them. The Anti-Federalists believed the converse: that the Constitution would result in the wealthy ruling the country, and that your average citizen would have little representation under the the Constitution. They thought that a pure democracy was the proper type of government, in which every citizen gets a say in what happens to them and their country.

In my opinion, the Anti-Federalists are *more*, but not fully, correct. Looking back over the years since the Constitution has been made, wealthier citizens and corporations have dominated the political arena. Very few prominent politicians are or were poor, and the results of elections are heavily influenced by the intervention of enormously rich superpacks and corporations. While the Constitution was made with good intentions, bills and Supreme Court decisions like Citizens United have made it so that the average citizen has very little say in what politicians do or don't do, and government policies are determined largely by private donors. The reason that I'm not totally on the side of the Anti-Federalists is that a pure democracy is infeasible, because it would require the approximately three hundred million people in the United States to vote on every decision that was being made. I think that a government that is a very democratically leaning republic is the way to go. It's much faster than a full democracy, but has greater representation than a republic. After all is said and done, however, a strong case could be made for both democracy or republic.