

By: paul

[Countries](#), [United States](#)



By: Paul City on a hill: A new nation is born The city on a hill idea was first taught by the puritans that came from Europe, that wanted America to be a shining example to all the world. It was to be a place built on new rules and new ideas. Overall, it was supposed to be a nation that rose above all the others so that it could be marveled at and copied. In this paper it will be proven that the federalist approach to how the " City on a Hill" idea should be put into action was superior to the ways of the anti-federalists because of three things that they did: 1. Protected the people from tyranny, 2. Provided opportunity, 3. Insured liberty, 4. Protected individual rights and liberty, and 5. Had a more lasting effect on the methods used for ruling our country. The federalists definantly protected the people of their country from tyranny. Before the federalists, the anti-federalists ruled the states, and they were very tyrannous. For example, they wanted all of the states to each take up a portion of the debt from the revolutionary war. This was easily payable by the larger states that had much industry, but for the smaller or less industrially developed states, this was a debt that they were just not able to handle. The federalists finally decided when they had the power that they would assume the debt as a part of a deal to move the capitol to Washington, D. C. This is just one example of how the anti-federalists tried to control the citizens while the federalists wanted to free the people and give them a chance to lead a free life. The federalist party definantly gave the people of the United States opportunity. The anti-federalists, however, did not. They not only jailed those in debt, but also they never set up a national bank to make loans so that people could cope with their debt. From setting up a national bank to helping people in debt, the federalists were able to

lend money and keep people from being imprisoned for owing money. This allowed for the opportunity to grow and to expand to many of the peoples of the U. S. The federalists insured liberty by putting an end to being jailed for debt. While the anti-federalists put the law into effect that allowed people to be jailed for their debts, until the people were so tired that they staged a rebellion, the federalists got rid of this and set up the bank and took over state debts from the war. Finally, the federalists protected all the things that they gave to the people. They maintained the army and made sure also that they had a militia that was ready to defend the country when the time called for it. The anti-federalists tried to do the same, but they were not able to get rid of the threats of the Indians on the western and southern fronts. Finally, at the end of the war of 1812, when the federalists were still in power, the Indians were all either conquered or they signed treaties that allied them with the Americans. In this way, the federalists were able to better protect the people. Another few points that prove that the federalists were superior to the anti-federalists are that the federalists were successful in their attempt to rule the country and to keep it running, while the anti-federalists failed, and they were able to draw up a constitution that lasted for a very extended length of time. This meant overall that the federalists had a more lasting effect on the way that our country was run, and in this way displayed the kind of strong, long-lasting government that would be worthy of the title " City on a Hill". In conclusion, the ways that the federalists were superior to the anti-federalists were: 1. They protected the people from tyranny, 2. Provided opportunity, 3. Insured liberty, 4. Protected individual rights and liberty, and 5. Had a more lasting effect on the methods used for ruling our

country. In these ways, they were able to outlast and in general outclass those against them to form a strong central government that is still standing today. Word Count: 709