



Week One: Vocabulary

Lesson & Assignments: Introduce New List

Assignment 1: Read the list of vocabulary words below. Then, using a dictionary as needed, match the vocabulary words with their definitions listed in the definition bank on the next page. Write each vocabulary word, follow it with a punctuation mark such as a hyphen or colon, and then write the definition.

e.g.

1. *to eat* – to put (food) into the mouth and chew and swallow it

Vocabulary Words –

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1. alight | 11. incriminate |
| 2. ameliorate | 12. perfunctory |
| 3. asylum | 13. perplexity |
| 4. cacophony | 14. proclivity |
| 5. centrifugal | 15. recondite |
| 6. convoluted | 16. repugnance |
| 7. derelict | 17. stolid |
| 8. disinclination | 18. stratum |
| 9. exploitation | 19. trajectory |
| 10. impetus | 20. variegated |

Definition Bank

reluctance or lack of enthusiasm	a harsh discordant mixture of sounds
inability to deal with or understand something complicated or unaccountable	calm, dependable, and showing little emotion or animation
the path followed by a projectile flying or an object moving under the action of given forces	the force or energy with which a body moves; the force that makes something happen or happen more quickly
to make something bad or unsatisfactory better	moving or tending to move away from a center
in a very poor condition as a result of disuse and neglect	to make someone appear guilty of a crime or wrongdoing; to strongly imply the guilt of someone
the action or fact of treating someone unfairly in order to benefit from their work	to descend from a train, bus, or other form of transport; to descend from the air and settle
extremely complex and difficult to follow	carried out with a minimum of effort or reflection
a tendency to choose or do something regularly; an inclination or predisposition toward a particular thing	protection granted by a nation to a political refugee; OR an institution offering shelter and support to mentally ill persons
little known; obscure	intense disgust
a layer or a series of layers of rock in the ground	exhibiting different colors, especially as irregular patches or streaks; marked by variety



Week One: Grammar

Lesson & Assignments: Nouns & Pronouns

THE NOUN –

A noun names a person, place, thing, or idea.

We can separate nouns into two main groups: **concrete nouns** and **abstract nouns**.

Concrete nouns are nouns that we can touch with our hands, see with our eyes, smell with our nose, hear with our ears, or taste with our tongue. In other words, we use one or more of our five senses to experience the concrete noun. Concrete nouns name people, places, and things.

The other type of noun is an abstract noun. This is a noun that we cannot see, hear, feel, touch, or taste.

Happiness is an example of this. We cannot see, hear, smell, touch, or taste happiness. It is an idea or a concept. You cannot say what color happiness is or what it tastes like. If you tried to touch happiness, you would have a very hard time doing so because there is nothing to touch. Does happiness have a smell? No. *Happiness* is an abstract noun. *Freedom* and *liberty* are two other examples of abstract nouns. Abstract nouns do not have color, sound, taste, etc. Abstract nouns name ideas.

We can also categorize nouns in another way: **common nouns** and **proper nouns**.

COMMON NOUNS –

Person	Place	Thing	Idea
• mother	• home	• cup	• love
• brother	• store	• bananas	• hope
• clerk	• street	• table	• happiness
• policeman	• bedroom	• book	• fear
• athlete	• warehouse	• computer	• anger

Notice that the nouns in the table above do not start with a capital letter. That is because they are not naming a specific person, place, thing, or idea. *We call these types of nouns common nouns or improper nouns.* We use common nouns when we are not referring to someone, someplace, or something by a specific name.

Assignment 1A: Study this poem, “Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening” by Robert Frost. Underline all of the common nouns. Ask yourself for each word: “Does this name a person, place, thing, or idea?”

Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening

Robert Frost

Whose woods these are I think I know.
His house is in the village though;
He will not see me stopping here
To watch his woods fill up with snow.

My little horse must think it queer
To stop without a farmhouse near
Between the woods and frozen lake
The darkest evening of the year.

He gives his harness bells a shake
To ask if there is some mistake.
The only other sound is the sweep
Of easy wind and downy flake.

The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep.

PROPER NOUNS –

Person	Place	Thing
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mom• Aunt Susan• Grandpa Chuck• President Anderson	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highland Park• Walgreens• King's Dominion• France	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Empire Apples• Bible• Android• Nile River

Note that all of the nouns in this table begin with a capital letter. These nouns are naming a specific person, place, or thing (note that ideas – abstract nouns – can never be made proper.) ***We call these types of nouns specific or proper nouns. We use proper nouns when we are referring to something by a specific name.***

The following categories are always proper nouns.

1. Names of people and pets:

Mrs. Edwards David Snoopy Garfield

2. Names of places and buildings:

Madrid, Spain Main Street Washington Monument
Lake Ontario Alaska Pacific Ocean

3. Names of books, movies, newspapers, and magazines:

Charlotte's Web Toy Story The Orlando Times
Highlights Monsters, Inc.

4. Names of holidays, days of the week, and months:

Christmas Sunday April
Memorial Day Thanksgiving Friday

5. Names of languages:

Spanish English French Italian

6. Names of companies and brand names:

Google

Pepsi

Nike

Apple

7. Titles of people when used in front of their names:

President Lincoln

King George

Captain Hook

Judge Peterson

Prince William

Doctor McNeish

But do not capitalize these titles when used alone.

For example:

- “My uncle is a judge for the county.”
- “The doctor returned my phone call.”

8. Names of religions:

Baptist

Protestant

Jewish

Catholic

SOME CONFUSING NOUNS –

Two groups of nouns that can be confusing when it comes to capitalizing them are the seasons (spring, summer, fall, and winter) and directions (north, south, east, west).

- The general rule for seasons is that you do not capitalize them unless they start a sentence or are part of the name of an event such as the "Winter Olympics."
- The rule for directions is also easy. If you are referring to a specific part or location of the country (such as *the South*, *the Northwest*, *the East*), then you should capitalize the noun. But, if you are just referring to a general direction, then do not capitalize the noun (such as *north of town*, *southeast of my house*, *go west on Woolridge Rd.*).

Assignment 1B: Write ten proper nouns for each. Remember to capitalize each proper noun:

Person	Place	Thing
1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.
5.	5.	5.
6.	6.	6.
7.	7.	7.
8.	8.	8.
9.	9.	9.
10.	10.	10.

MAKING NOUNS PLURAL –

Making nouns plural is something you should already be familiar with as a growing writer. Most of the time, it is something you learn just by speaking. You know to turn *eyelash* into *eyelashes* or *chair* into *chairs*. You know that there are various plural forms such as *tomato* turned into *tomatoes* or *sheep* into *sheep*. For the sake of time, we will not review rules for making nouns plural here. If you feel you do not understand the rules, you can ask for review material from your instructor.

MAKING NOUNS POSSESSIVE –

Although this also should be something you are familiar with, making nouns possessive trips a lot of students up. Let us review the basic rules:

Rule #1 - If the noun ends in any letter other than S, we use an apostrophe and then the letter S to show possession.

- the dog - the dog's bone
- the men - the men's team
- the quiz - the quiz's answers

Rule #2 - If a singular noun ends in the letter S, we can use EITHER an apostrophe and the letter S or we can use ONLY an apostrophe to show possession.

- Charles - Charles's book OR Charles' book
- the boss – the boss' paperwork OR the boss's paperwork
- Jesus - Jesus's mother OR Jesus' mother

Rule #3 – If a plural noun ends in the letter S, we use only an apostrophe to show possession.

- guys – guys' night out
- dogs – the dogs' bones

Rule #4 - Acronyms form the possessive with an apostrophe and the letter S.

- NASA - NASA's spaceship
- USA - the USA's flag
- ABC - ABC's documentary

Rule #5 - If you have two nouns and two objects that are individually owned, then each noun is made possessive.

- John and Mary - John's and Mary's hats (they each have their OWN hat)
- James and Ann - James' and Ann's dinners (they each have their OWN dinner)

Rule #6 - If you have two or more nouns and all nouns own the same object, then just the last noun is made possessive.

- John and Mary - John and Mary's children (they have the same children)
- James and Ann - James and Ann's car (they own the same car)
- Kara, Dave, and Julie – Kara, Dave, and Julie's father (they all have the same father)

Assignment 1C: Turn each of the following words into its possessive form.

1. cars
2. window
3. Mike
4. Oscar
5. teachers
6. UVA
7. Hudson and Addie blankets
8. men
9. Maria and James house
10. Lewis

NOMINATIVE PRONOUNS –

Next up is the pronoun. We can study the pronoun immediately following the noun because it performs the same job as the noun. ***A pronoun is a word that takes the place of a noun.*** Pronouns are very useful because otherwise we would be repeating the same noun over and over again. There are several kinds of pronouns in English. Each type of pronoun is used in a specific way. This lesson will teach you how to use **nominative** and **possessive pronouns (You will learn about the other kinds of pronouns in the next class).**

Nominative pronouns are sometimes called *subject pronouns*, because they usually take the place of a noun that is functioning as the subject in a sentence (more about that in Lesson 4).

Here are the **nominative** or **subject pronouns**. The singular is given with its plural in the next column.

<u>Singular</u>	<u>Plural</u>
I	we
you	you
he	they
she	they
it	they

Remember, these pronouns are used as the subjects of a sentence. Below are some examples using each of these pronouns.

Singular

I drive a car.

You eat ice cream.

He speaks Russian.

She swims every day.

It keeps food cold.

Plural

We drive a car.

You (all) eat ice cream.

They speak Russian.

They swim every day.

They keep the food cold.

Imagine that two friends, Hannah and Ashley, are having a conversation about a field trip. The subjects are placed in parentheses to make it easier for you to see them.

(Hannah, speaking) went on a field trip.

(Ashley, being spoken to) went on a field trip.

(Caleb) enjoyed the field trip.

(Jane) arrived too late for the field trip.

(The car) was full.

(Jane and Caleb) bought some souvenirs.

Below are the same sentences with nominative pronouns in place of the nouns used above.

I went on a field trip.

You went on a field trip.

He enjoyed the field trip.

She arrived too late for the field trip.

It was full.

They bought some souvenirs.

POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS –

Lastly, we will move on to **possessive pronouns**. As you learned above, we can make nouns possessive to show that someone or something owns something. Possessive pronouns show ownership as well but are used at the end of a sentence.

Here are the **possessive pronouns**. The singular is given with its plural in the next column.

<u>Singular</u>	<u>Plural</u>
mine	ours
yours	yours
his	theirs
hers	theirs
its	theirs

We use possessive pronouns as substitutes for possessive forms of nouns, when these nouns are used at the end of a sentence.

For example –

- “This dog is Andrew's.” (possessive form of noun)
- “This dog is his.” (replaced with possessive pronoun)

Remember, these pronouns are only used to show possession. Look at some examples using each of these possessive pronouns.

<u>Singular</u>	<u>Plural</u>
The car was <i>mine</i> .	The car was <i>ours</i> .
The ice cream is <i>yours</i> .	The ice cream is (all of) <i>yours</i> .
The book will be <i>his</i> .	The book will be <i>theirs</i> .
The swimming pool is <i>hers</i> .	The swimming pool is <i>theirs</i> .
The tires were <i>its</i> .	The tires were <i>theirs</i> .

Assignment 1D: Underline all of the nominative and possessive pronouns in the following sentences.

1. Is this train his?
2. The cup is hers.
3. They will show us the skill.
4. It is ours.
5. Which one is yours?
6. He will never tell me his secrets!
7. Do you think that's funny?
8. Will you get me some medicine?
9. We are not feeling very well.
10. I don't understand why she is not tired.
11. Which phone number will be mine?
12. The cars are theirs.



Week One: Writing

Lesson & Assignments: Paraphrase Skills

So many advanced essays require you to respond to other works; therefore, you must be able to restate the information presented in the original text via paraphrase or summary – then critically evaluate or discuss this information. Paraphrase and summary skills are invaluable when it comes to almost any type of non-fiction writing.

While most students learn the art of paraphrasing and summarizing in grade school, applying those skills to longer works is a challenge. Admittedly, paraphrasing can be the greater challenge, because you must restate the original text without plagiarizing *or* simplifying. You also must remain entirely objective throughout, as a paraphrase leaves no room for your opinions or argument.

You will use the skills of paraphrasing and summarizing throughout this class, so we will begin with the concept of paraphrasing in the first two lessons.

A paraphrase is...

- *Your own version* of the main idea of and most important information in an original text.
- *A detailed rewriting* of an original, in contrast to a summary which is a simplified rewriting of an original.

Paraphrasing is a valuable skill because...

1. The process of paraphrasing requires significant attention to detail and mental skill, to fully grasp and convey the meaning of the original text.
2. It allows you to restate information or portions of a passage that may be difficult for the general audience to understand.
3. It allows you to explain abstract or unfamiliar terms in a more concrete and common way.
4. It helps you control the temptation to quote too much, but is still a useful means of evidence.

There are two types of paraphrase:

- **Literal:** A literal paraphrase copies the exact structure of the original text and substitutes synonyms for each word. Although this form of paraphrase can be useful for beginning drafts, literal paraphrase is not appropriate for final drafts because it often leads to awkward sentence structure and phrasing, plagiarism, and missing the main point of the original.
- **Free:** A free paraphrase focuses on expressing the main ideas of the original text, while substituting synonyms and rearranging structure. Free paraphrase creates more natural and fluid writing and allows you to focus more on expressing the main ideas of the original text instead of just switching out words.

Let's study an example:

ORIGINAL TEXT:

The origins of cotton candy trace back centuries, all the way to Renaissance Italy. Back then, chefs melted and spun sugar manually. The process included them pulling the candy into thin strands using forks and draping it over broom handles. These hand-spun candies were not only labor-intensive but also expensive. However, the cotton candy we know and love today didn't make its debut till the 19th century. Who introduced this sugary treat? Believe it or not, a dentist named Dr. William Morrison created cotton candy. In 1897, Dr. Morrison teamed up with candy maker, John C. Wharton, and invented a machine that heated sugar in a spinning bowl, which had several tiny holes in it. The sugar in the hot, spinning bowl caramelized and made its way through the holes turning the melted sugar into light strands. They called this sugary treat "Fairy Floss." In 1904, the two inventors introduced their machine and fun snack at the St. Louis World's Fair and sold 68,000 boxes over 6 months for 25¢ each (\$6.75 in today's money). The treat was so popular, a candy store purchased the electric machine and started selling the fairy floss just a year later. In 1949, Gold Medal Products created the first factory-made cotton candy machine. This helped cotton candy production become what it is today! **(219 words)**

Reference: "How Did Cotton Candy Get Started?" *Gold Medal*, <https://www.gmpopcorn.com/resources/blog/how-did-cotton-candy-get-started>. Accessed 11 June 2020.

LITERAL PARAPHRASE:

If we look back several centuries, to Renaissance Italy, we see the beginnings of cotton candy. At that time, chefs melted the sugar and spun it by hand. Cotton-candy making involved separating the candy into thin pieces using forks, then laying those pieces over broom handles. Naturally, since the process was completed

entirely by hand, this cotton candy took a lot of time to make and was quite costly. Later, in the 19th century, the modern-day cotton candy came into being. Surprisingly, a dentist named Dr. William Morrison invented the cotton candy we know today. In 1897, he worked with a candy maker named John C. Wharton to create a machine that heated the sugar in a rotating bowl filled with small holes. When the bowl was hot, the sugar caramelized and was sifted through the holes, thus creating thin strands of sugar. Morrison and Wharton dubbed their new treat “Fairy Floss.” Several years later, in 1904, the two men showed their machine and sweet treat at the St. Louis World's Fair, selling 68,000 boxes in six months. Because this delicious treat was so popular, a candy store decided to buy the machine so that they could start selling their own Fairy Floss. Finally, in 1949, Gold Medal Products designed a factory-made machine, making cotton candy production even more efficient and allowing cotton candy to become as popular as it is today. **(233 words)**

FREE PARAPHRASE:

Most of us have tasted cotton candy – sugar that is lighter than air, sweet and so delicious. Cotton candy is popular for good reason, but much time passed before it became the sweet treat we enjoy today. Cotton candy first appeared in Italy during the 1400s or 1500s. Italian chefs applied intensive efforts, melting the sugar and spinning it by hand. Although this treat was surely enjoyed by many locals, cotton candy was neither easy to make nor cost effective. Perhaps this is why several centuries passed before the idea of cotton candy surfaced again. Surprisingly, a dentist, Dr. William Morrison, helped introduce cotton candy into mainstream society. In the late 1800s, he worked with candy maker John C. Wharton to invent a machine that would perform the melting and spinning process which had before made cotton-candy making so difficult. The two men met great success with their machine, selling 68,000 boxes of cotton candy in just six months during the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair. A candy store caught on to this success, buying up the machine in order to sell their own cotton candy. Then, nearly fifty years later, a factory-made machine was built by Gold Medal Products. The increased efficiency of the cotton-candy-making process helped spur the popularity of this treat, so that we can now enjoy it at nearly any fair, festival, or amusement park we visit! **(232 words)**

IMPORTANT NOTE: Unless a literal paraphrase is specifically requested as part of an assignment, assume that any instance of paraphrase calls for free paraphrase. Again, this means that your main focus as the writer should be on expressing the main idea, without attempting to copy the exact structure or swap out each individual word with a synonym.

HOW TO WRITE A SUCCESSFUL (FREE) PARAPHRASE –

You may utilize a variety of methods to paraphrase a text; however, an effective paragraph utilizes more than one of these methods. If you find yourself using only one method, you are likely not paraphrasing well, and are perhaps on the edge of plagiarism. Follow these steps to write a successful free paraphrase.

- **Read the original text several times at first**, to ensure that you have a well-rounded understanding of the purpose and main ideas of the text.
- If necessary, **make an outline for each paragraph or section of the original, including notes for the main ideas.**
- Once you understand the full meaning and have taken some notes, **put the original away so you are not tempted to plagiarize.** Now try to write out the full meaning, *in your own words*. Write as if you were telling a friend about the original and what it says.
- **Compare your paraphrase with the original to ensure that you have clearly and appropriately expressed all of the essential information. However, do NOT use the original as a guide for structure and organization. If you are having trouble writing your paraphrase without following along with the text, you need to read the original several more times until you can put it away and then paraphrase.**
- Obviously, if you read a text a dozen times, you will likely remember some specific sentences and phrases and may be tempted to use these in your paraphrase. In addition, if you are referring back to the original occasionally for clarity or remembrance, you may be tempted to copy sentence structure and just swap out a few words. To avoid this, **try to think about variety.**
 1. Change the word order.
 2. Change word form: think “The girl danced beautifully” to “The girl performed a beautiful dance.”
 3. Change sentence structure. Turn a long sentence into two shorter ones, for example.
 4. Change the voice – active to passive or vice versa.
- When paraphrasing, you will need to **use synonyms to avoid copying exact words**. When looking for a synonym, choosing a word with the same meaning is necessary. A word with a close-enough meaning will not convey clearly the ideas of the original.

- **If you have used any unique terms or phrases exactly from the original, do place these in quotation marks. For words or phrases with no suitable replacement, quoting the original is acceptable.**
- Finally, double check the length of your paraphrase. Remember that a paraphrase is not a simplified re-writing of the original. Your paraphrase should be similar in word count to the original text.

Ultimately, your goal in a paraphrase is to write an entirely new version of the original, whilst retaining the meaning. The paraphrase is not about simplifying or cutting content; it is about expressing the main idea(s) *in your own words*.

Let's study one final example set:

The original passage:

Students frequently overuse direct quotation in taking notes, and as a result they overuse quotations in the final [research] paper. Probably only about 10% of your final manuscript should appear as directly quoted matter. Therefore, you should strive to limit the amount of exact transcribing of source materials while taking notes. Lester, James D. *Writing Research Papers*. 2nd ed., 1976, pp. 46-47.

A version considered plagiarized:

Students often use too many direct quotations when they take notes, resulting in too many of them in the final research paper. In fact, probably only about 10% of the final copy should consist of directly quoted material. So it is important to limit the amount of source material copied while taking notes. (Lester 46-47).

A legitimate paraphrase:

In research papers students often quote excessively, failing to keep quoted material down to a desirable level. Since the problem usually originates during note taking, it is essential to minimize the material recorded verbatim (Lester 46-47). (1)

ASSIGNMENT NOTES –

Before we begin with the first assignment for this week, we would like to discuss expected rules for all Level VII writing/literature response assignments. Now that you have so much experience writing essays, we expect effort and attention to detail for each assignment. Every assignment should meet the following requirements, unless otherwise stated:

Assignment Requirements:

- Standard font, size 12
- Double spacing
- Name and date at the top of assignment, formatted on the left-hand side of the page
- For essays, a title, centered above the essay
- As directed, citations (MLA Format) included in a works cited list following an essay along with proper textual citations

It is expected that you return assignments with the proper requirements without being asked. Points will be deducted from your grade if these requirements are not followed.

Assignment 1A: Read the following selections. Then, write a literal and free paraphrase for each one, as shown in the first example set of this lesson.

ORIGINAL TEXT 1: Brain scientists say that in order to speak a language as well as a native speaker, children must begin to study the language by age 10. A 2018 study found that this ability to more easily learn a language lasts until about age 17 or 18 – which is longer than previously thought – but then begins to decline.

Language immersion programs . . . represent one way to teach foreign language to children earlier. Research has shown that immersion students in Canada score higher in reading literacy than non-immersion students.

Research also shows immersion programs in general have many educational and cognitive benefits, as well as cultural, economic and social benefits both locally and globally. They have also been shown to be cost-effective.

Reference: Stein Smith, Kathleen. “Foreign Language classes becoming more scarce.” *American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 6 February 2019, <https://www.amacad.org/news/foreign-language-classes-becoming-more-scarce>. Accessed 11 June 2020.

ORIGINAL TEXT 2: ICÔNE, a new office complex in Belval Luxembourg designed by Foster + Partners has broken ground. The 18,800 square-metre office building, filled with light and greenery, encourages a spirit of co-creation and collaboration. Its flexible layout addresses the need for safe working environments and the changes to the workplace that will emerge in the future. It also references the rich industrial heritage of Belval, revitalising the area by making a positive contribution to the site and its surroundings.

Reference: “ICÔNE breaks ground in Belval.” *Foster + Partners*, 1 June 2020, <https://www.fosterandpartners.com/news/archive/2020/06/icone-breaks-ground-in-belval/>. Accessed 11 June 2020.

ORIGINAL TEXT 3: This model is based on many sketches of a flying apparatus by Leonardo da Vinci. It features two wings, each with two sections that move independently, a rudder, and a “pilot” that pedals as the wings move and moves its arms together with the rudder. Powered by a single PF M Motor, it's quite impressive, but it doesn't fly – just like da Vinci's original designs.

The primary challenge was cramming all the mechanical and electric parts inside the narrow body. Because the model was never built in da Vinci's time, the colors used in the model are simply a guess, based on the assumption that da Vinci would have worked with wood, canvas, and metal.

Reference: Kmiec, “Pawet “Sariel.” *Incredible LEGO Technic: Cars, Trucks, Robots, & More!* No Starch Press, San Francisco, 2015.

MORE ABOUT THE PARAPHRASE –

The concepts discussed above are useful for all types of paraphrase, but there are a few additional things to consider when paraphrasing a complete essay or article.

1. **Your paraphrase should include an introduction**, as with any standard essay. Your introduction should accomplish the main goals of any standard introduction: it should hook the reader, present a road-map of the essay's central details, and clearly state the main idea of the original text.

2. **Your introduction must also signal the author and the title of the original text.** (For example: In his essay, “Over the River and Through the Woods” author James Havern tells us about his opinions on traveling for the holidays.) The signal is an important part of a paraphrase of an essay, because we need to understand whose ideas you are paraphrasing as a whole.

3. **Your paraphrase should use third-person voice, not first-person voice.** Do not paraphrase as if you had written the original. Thus, if you are paraphrasing James Havern's (entirely fictional!) essay, you will refer to the author as *Havern* or *he*. You will not use the pronouns *I*, *me*, *my*, etc. as if the paraphrased ideas are actually your original ideas. (note: generally, you should also not refer to the author by his/her first name only, if you are not on a first-name basis with the author.)

Now let us discuss a problem we frequently see when students are paraphrasing longer texts. Often, we see that students will use free paraphrase for each individual paragraph of the longer text, while still following a literal paraphrase of the original essay's structure.

Consider this example:

ORIGINAL TEXT:

When is the best time for a hearing parent to start using sign language with a deaf child? Start when they're babies, says Peter Hauser. Deaf himself, this scientist reported new findings based on tests of deaf children. Learning sign language in infancy appears to boost brainpower in ways not related to language, he found.

Hauser is a brain researcher at the Rochester Institute of Technology in New York. “Most deaf children are born to hearing families,” he signed during a presentation of his data. “And,” he added, “most hearing parents do not sign with their newborn deaf children.” That means that these children “have very limited exposure to sign language.” This can slow how quickly these kids acquire language. More surprising, Hauser’s research now suggests, late exposure to sign language also appears to affect other types of mental tasks.

He and his colleagues tested 115 deaf children, all around 12 years old. Some had been exposed to sign language from birth. Others didn’t encounter it until they were about three years old. The researchers asked these kids to draw lines between circles with an ordered sequence of numbers. But to make the task tricky, the kids had to alternate colors of the circles they chose. So they had to think about what they were doing, and resist the urge to connect circles of the same color. This test probed something known as

executive function. It takes a high degree of mental effort. It involves, for instance, controlling attention, impulses and emotions.

Children exposed to signing from birth connected the dots about 17 seconds faster than the other children, Hauser noted. And late signers don't seem to ever catch up to those exposed to signing as babies. The evidence? In similar tests of 40 adults, signers-from-birth beat the times of late signers by 23 seconds, he reported.

Hauser shared his team's new data here on February 12 at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

This result shows that whatever changed is "something that's still there in adulthood," says Jenny Singleton of the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta. She's a psychologist and language expert. Earlier work by Singleton had tested classrooms of deaf children. There too, some had been exposed to signing from birth and some had only learned to sign later. Late signers required more help to follow signed conversations, her team found.

There's now strong and growing evidence in kids, she says, "to suggest that if they have not acquired [sign] language early, there can be lifelong impacts." And families of deaf children who receive *cochlear* (KO-klee-ur) implants to restore hearing shouldn't necessarily abandon attempts to sign, she adds. If a child doesn't succeed with the implant, then signing can ensure a child still has a language to use. **(467 words)**

Reference: Sanders, Laura. "Early intro to sign language has lasting benefits." *Science News for Students*, 17 February 2016, <https://www.sciencenewsforstudents.org/article/early-intro-sign-language-has-lasting-benefits>. Accessed 12 June 2020.

COMMON ATTEMPT AT PARAPHRASE:

In response to new findings by scientist Peter Hauser, author Laura Sanders discusses the benefits of introducing deaf infants to sign language. Her article, "Early intro to sign language has lasting benefits," Sanders presents evidence that supports the exposure of sign language as early as possible for deaf children.

Sanders begins by referring to a presentation of Hauser's data, in which he states that "most deaf children are born to hearing families." Unfortunately, these hearing parents are not always quick to sign with their deaf infants. Surprisingly, this lack of early language introduction has been shown to slow down the child's ability to gain language skills and maintain the same level of mental skill as their early-signing peers.

In a test of more than 100 deaf children, most of whom were near 12 years old, Hauser and fellow brain research colleagues from the Rochester Institute of Technology asked the children to complete a series of tasks involving circles, lines, numbers, and colors. Essentially, the children were to connect the

circles using the number sequence as a guide, whilst not connecting circles of the same color. Findings reported that deaf children who had been signed to from birth were able to complete the test more quickly than those deaf children who did not gain exposure to sign language until they were toddlers.

These findings are comparable to other tests that have been completed by adults. Those adults who have been exposed to sign language since birth are regularly able to complete the tests more quickly than late signers, thus demonstrating that children exposed to sign language later on rarely reach the same level of mental skill as those exposed to sign language in infancy.

Obviously, the mental difference between children signed to as babies versus children who waited longer to be exposed to sign language continues into adulthood. Psychologist and language expert, Jenny Singleton has confirmed many of these findings in her own tests of deaf children. Frequently, early signers were more easily able to follow conversations than their late-signing peers.

Singleton suggests that there is plenty of evidence demonstrating negative long-lasting effects for children who are exposed to sign language even as late as toddler-hood. Many parents delay or stop signing to their deaf children, when a cochlear implant is given; however, Singleton advises that parents should continue signing with their children, because if the implant is not a success, their children will still need a way to communicate. **(409 words)**

STRONGER PARAPHRASE:

Most deaf children are born to hearing parents; however, many parents wonder when they should begin signing with their deaf child. Perhaps because hearing parents are not entirely prepared for having a deaf child or do not realize the benefits of early exposure to sign language, not all deaf children receive the same introduction to language. In addition, many parents rely on the prospect of cochlear implants to improve or correct hearing problems. Because of these things, many deaf children are not exposed to sign language until they are two or three years old. This may not seem like a big deal, but as Laura Sanders discusses in her article, “Early intro to sign language has lasting benefits,” this lack of early exposure to a means of communication can affect the brain power of a hearing-impaired person for life.

In her article, Sanders compiles evidence from brain researcher Peter Hauser (Rochester Institute of Technology) and psychologist and language expert Jenny Singleton (Georgia Institute of Technology). Both Hauser and Singleton have conducted tests of deaf children, revealing that children who had been exposed to sign language from birth were able to complete a series of mentally-demanding tasks or comprehend a signed conversation more quickly than children who had late exposure to sign language.

Interestingly, both Hauser's and Singleton's findings are comparable to other tests completed by hearing-impaired adults. It becomes apparent then that the difference in mental ability and overall

comprehension does not disappear with childhood. Instead, hearing-impaired adults who had been exposed to sign language as infants also had faster test times and stronger mental skills than their later-signing counterparts.

Although it may be easy to postpone the introduction of sign language to deaf children, either for reasons of the parents' lack of knowledge of sign language or because of the potential of a restorative implant, Sanders points out that an early introduction to sign language creates a better opportunity for the success of deaf children. Her article presents compelling evidence by reputable researchers that this early exposure to sign language provides lifelong beneficial impacts to deaf children. Because deaf children who are signed to from birth gain stronger language skills and mental ability, parents should strongly consider introducing sign language in infancy. **(374 words)**

You will notice in the first paraphrase attempt that the student has essentially followed the same structure and order of the original article. The information is presented in generally the same way, although the student has paraphrased the individual paragraphs.

However, a strong paraphrase shows that you can express the main idea and most important details of an original without copying the structure of the original as a whole. You should notice in the second paraphrase example that the student has truly rewritten the original in a new way, while still maintaining the main idea and most important details of the original article.

Thus, we reiterate these two points:

- Once you understand the full meaning and have taken some notes, **put the original away so you are not tempted to plagiarize.** Now try to write out the full meaning, *in your own words*. Write as if you were telling a friend about the original and what it says.
- **Compare your paraphrase with the original to ensure that you have clearly and appropriately expressed all of the essential information. However, do NOT use the original as a guide for structure and organization. If you are having trouble writing your paraphrase without following along with the text, you need to read the original several more times until you can put it away and then paraphrase.**

Assignment 1B: Turn to your literature assignment to practice more paraphrase skills!

Source –

1. Driscoll, Dana Lynn; Brizee, Allen. “Paraphrase: Write It In Your Own Words.” *Purdue Online Writing Lab*, 2 August 2016.



Week One: Literature

Lesson & Assignments: Federalist Papers vs. Anti-Federalist Papers

This year, we are going to be covering a lot of challenging texts designed to encourage your critical thinking skills along with your ability to analyze and discuss various texts, styles, and arguments. We will be studying many different types of literature across varying cultures, continents, and centuries. Before you begin, you may wish to review some of our tips for successful reading experiences, attached with this week's lesson.

Ready? Let's get started.

Shortly after the American Colonies won their independence from England in the American Revolution, a governing document called the Articles of Confederation was created. This document was not put together nor adopted hastily or lightly. In fact, there were disputes over representation, state expansion into the West, and voting rights.

These Articles of Confederation were first adopted by the Continental Congress on 15 November 1777, but they were not ratified (officially agreed upon by all 13 colonies as being in force) until 01 March 1781. From this date until 1789, the Articles of Confederation functioned as the United States' first constitution.

This initial constitution officially named the Confederation of states as "the United States of America." It contained some key principles: a Congress with one vote per state, strong state governments, and a national government whose only power consisted of those areas not covered by state governments.

Missing from the Articles of Confederation was the ability of Congress to enforce any of the resolutions passed or finance itself. The Confederation also had no president, no system of judges, no executive agencies, and no ability to tax. To pay off state and national debts from the war, Congress had to resort to politely requesting that the states send money. This money was rarely sent.

Competition with foreign governments and manufacturers, worthless paper money printed by the Continental Congress, rebellions (such as Shays' Rebellion in 1787) against state governments, the inability

to protect shipping or the country's borders caused its leaders to propose the idea of revising the Articles of Confederation. In 1787, a Constitutional Convention was held in Philadelphia to discuss how to best revise them. Rather than revise them, a group of men wrote a new constitution. This caused the discussion to quickly become a robust debate between two camps: the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists. In the most basic terms, Federalists wanted a strong, powerful national government while the Anti-Federalists wanted strong, powerful state governments.

To convince the citizens of the country that the new constitution was necessary, the Federalists wrote a series of essays, known today as the Federalist Papers. These were written by three men all working together and using the pseudonym, Publius. These men were Alexander Hamilton of NY (age 32), James Madison of Virginia (age 36), and John Jay of NY (age 43). Alexander Hamilton and James Madison wrote the majority of the 85 essays (51 from Hamilton and 29 from Madison) with John Jay contributing only five. These essays were often written hastily (sometimes four per week) and published in New York newspapers.

Alarmed by this, the Anti-Federalists began writing responses to the essays under a variety of pseudonyms, publishing them in local papers, and reading them as speeches. While the essays were all written anonymously, we know the names of some of the famous Anti-Federalists. They include: Patrick Henry of Virginia (age 52), Samuel Adams of Massachusetts (age 66), Richard Henry Lee of Virginia (age 56), and John Hancock of Massachusetts (age 51).

The winners of the debate were, by and large, the Federalists, as the new constitution was adopted and signed on September 17th, 1787. However, some of the concerns raised by the Anti-Federalists were addressed in the final version. Even more of their concerns were addressed when the Bill of Rights was signed on December 15th, 1791.

Below you will find both Federalist and Anti-Federalist essays on the following topics:

1. Topic: Strong or Weak Central Government
2. Topic: Standing Army
3. Topic: Federal Government vs. State Governments
4. Topic: Presidential Powers
5. Topic: The Right of Recall: An Amendment proposed by New York State

Please read through all of the essays carefully before starting the homework.

Topic: Strong or Weak Central Government

Federalist Paper #9

<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-federalist-papers/the-federalist-9.php>

A FIRM Union will be of the utmost moment to the peace and liberty of the States, as a barrier against domestic faction and insurrection.

The utility of a Confederacy, as well to suppress faction and to guard the internal tranquility of States, as to increase their external force and security, is in reality not a new idea. It has been practiced upon in different countries and ages, and has received the sanction of the most approved writers on the subject of politics.

So far are the suggestions of Montesquieu from standing in opposition to a general Union of the States, that he explicitly treats of a confederate republic as the expedient for extending the sphere of popular government, and reconciling the advantages of monarchy with those of republicanism.

“It is very probable,” (says he) “that mankind would have been obliged at length to live constantly under the government of a single person, had they not contrived a kind of constitution that has all the internal advantages of a republican, together with the external force of a monarchical government. I mean a confederate republic.

This form of government is a convention by which several smaller states agree to become members of a larger one, which they intend to form. It is a kind of assemblage of societies that constitute a new one, capable of increasing, by means of new associations, till they arrive to such a degree of power as to be able to provide for the security of the united body.

A republic of this kind, able to withstand an external force, may support itself without any internal corruptions. The form of this society prevents all manner of inconveniences.

If a single member should attempt to usurp the supreme authority, he could not be supposed to have an equal authority and credit in all the confederate states. Were he to have too great influence over one, this would alarm the rest. Were he to subdue a part, that which would still remain free might oppose him with forces independent of those which he had usurped and overpower him before he could be settled in his usurpation.

Should a popular insurrection happen in one of the confederate states the others are able to quell it. Should abuses creep into one part, they are reformed by those that remain sound. The state may be destroyed on one side, and not on the other; the confederacy may be dissolved, and the confederates preserve their sovereignty. As this government is composed of small republics, it enjoys the internal happiness of each; and with respect to its external situation, it is possessed, by means of the association, of all the advantages of large monarchies."

Topic: Strong or Weak Central Government

Anti-Federalist Paper #9

<http://resources.utulsa.edu/law/classes/rice/Constitutional/AntiFederalist/09.htm>

Note: This response was written by the Anti-Federalists as if they were Federalists. It is designed to mock the Federalist viewpoint by pointing out its flaws in a sarcastic manner. In essence, the Anti-Federalists were trying to point out the real message the Federalists' actions conveyed.

We the Aristocratic party of the United States, lamenting the many inconveniences to which the late confederation subjected the well-born, the better kind of people, bringing them down to the level of the rabble -- and holding in utter detestation that frontispiece to every bill of rights, "that all men are born equal" -- beg leave (for the purpose of drawing a line between such as we think were ordained to govern, and such as were made to bear the weight of government without having any share in its administration) to submit to our Friends in the first class for their inspection, the following defense of our monarchical, aristocratical democracy.

1st. As a majority of all societies consist of men who (though totally incapable of thinking or acting in governmental matters) are more readily led than driven, we have thought meet to indulge them in something like a democracy in the new constitution, which part we have designated by the popular name of the House of Representatives. But to guard against every possible danger from this lower house, we have subjected every bill they bring forward, to the double negative of our upper house and president.

2d. They will from the perpetuality of office be under our eye, and in a short time will think and act like us, independently of popular whims and prejudices. For the assertion "that evil communications corrupt good manners," is not more true than its reverse. We have allowed this house the power to impeach, but we have tenaciously reserved the right to try. We hope gentlemen, you will see the policy of this clause -- for what matters it who accuses, if the accused is tried by his friends. In fine, this plebeian house will have little power, and that little be rightly shaped by our house of gentlemen, who will have a very extensive influence

-- from their being chosen out of the genteeler class ... It is true, every third senatorial seat is to be vacated duennually, but two-thirds of this influential body will remain in office, and be ready to direct or (if necessary) bring over to the good old way, the young members, if the old ones should not be returned...

We have frequently endeavored to effect in our respective states, the happy discrimination which pervades this system; but finding we could not bring the states into it individually, we have determined ... and have taken pains to leave the legislature of each free and independent state, as they now call themselves, in such a situation that they will eventually be absorbed by our grand continental vortex, or dwindle into petty corporations, and have power over little else than yoking hogs or determining the width of cart wheels.

We have so interwoven continental and state legislatures that they cannot exist separately; whereas we in truth only leave them the power of electing us, for what can a provincial legislature do when we possess the exclusive regulation of external and internal commerce, excise, duties, imposts, post-offices and roads; when we and we alone, have the power to wage war, make peace, coin money (if we can get bullion) if not, borrow money, organize the militia and call them forth to execute our decrees, and crush insurrections assisted by a noble body of veterans subject to our nod, which we have the power of raising and keeping even in the time of peace.

I repeat it, what have we to fear armed with such powers, with a president at our head who is captain -- general of the army, navy and militia of the United States, who can make and unmake treaties, appoint and commission ambassadors and other ministers, who can grant or refuse reprieves or pardons, who can make judges of the supreme and other continental courts -- in short, who will be the source, the fountain of honor, profit and power, whose influence like the rays of the sun, will diffuse itself far and wide, will exhale all democratical vapors and break the clouds of popular insurrection?

Now, can a question arise in the colonial courts, which the ingenuity or sophistry of an able lawyer may not bring within one or other of the above cases? Certainly not. Then our court will have original or appellate jurisdiction in all cases -- and if so, how fallen are state judicatures -- and must not every provincial law yield to our supreme fiat? Our constitution answers yes. . . . And finally we shall entrench ourselves so as to laugh at the cabals of the commonalty.

We have said nothing about a bill of rights, for we viewed it as an eternal clog upon our designs, as a lock chain to the wheels of government -- though, by the way, as we have not insisted on rotation in our offices, the simile of a wheel is ill.

We have for some time considered the freedom of the press as a great evil -- it spreads information, and

begets a licentiousness in the people which needs the rein more than the spur; besides, a daring printer may expose the plans of government and lessen the consequence of our president and senate -- for these and many other reasons we have said nothing with respect to the "right of the people to speak and publish their sentiments" or about their "palladiums of liberty" and such stuff.

We do not much like that sturdy privilege of the people -- the right to demand the writ of habeas corpus. We have therefore reserved the power of refusing it in cases of rebellion, and you know we are the judges of what is rebellion.... Our friends we find have been assiduous in representing our federal calamities, until at length the people at large -- frightened by the gloomy picture on one side, and allured by the prophecies of some of our fanciful and visionary adherents on the other -- are ready to accept and confirm our proposed government without the delay or forms of examination -- which was the more to be wished, as they are wholly unfit to investigate the principles or pronounce on the merit of so exquisite a system.

Impressed with a conviction that this constitution is calculated to restrain the influence and power of the LOWER CLASS -- to draw that discrimination we have so long sought after; to secure to our friends privileges and offices, which were not to be ... [obtained] under the former government, because they were in common; to take the burden of legislation and attendance on public business off the commonalty, who will be much better able thereby to prosecute with effect their private business; to destroy that political thirteen headed monster, the state sovereignties; to check the licentiousness of the people by making it dangerous to speak or publish daring or tumultuary sentiments; to enforce obedience to laws by a strong executive, aided by military pensioners; and finally to promote the public and private interests of the better kind of people -- we submit it to your judgment to take such measures for its adoption as you in your wisdom may think fit.

Signed by unanimous order of the lords spiritual and temporal.

Topic: Standing Army

Federalist Paper #24

<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-federalist-papers/the-federalist-24.php>

Though a wide ocean separates the United States from Europe, yet there are various considerations that warn us against an excess of confidence or security. On one side of us, and stretching far into our rear, are growing settlements subject to the dominion of Britain. On the other side, and extending to meet the British settlements, are colonies and establishments subject to the dominion of Spain. This situation and the

vicinity of the West India Islands, belonging to these two powers create between them, in respect to their American possessions and in relation to us, a common interest. The savage tribes on our Western frontier ought to be regarded as our natural enemies, their natural allies, because they have most to fear from us, and most to hope from them.

Previous to the Revolution, and ever since the peace, there has been a constant necessity for keeping small garrisons on our Western frontier. No person can doubt that these will continue to be indispensable, if it should only be against the ravages and depredations of the Indians. These garrisons must either be furnished by occasional detachments from the militia, or by permanent corps in the pay of the government. The first is impracticable; and if practicable, would be pernicious. The militia would not long, if at all, submit to be dragged from their occupations and families to perform that most disagreeable duty in times of profound peace. And if they could be prevailed upon or compelled to do it, the increased expense of a frequent rotation of service, and the loss of labor and disconcertion of the industrious pursuits of individuals, would form conclusive objections to the scheme. It would be as burdensome and injurious to the public as ruinous to private citizens. The latter resource of permanent corps in the pay of the government amounts to a standing army in time of peace; a small one, indeed, but not the less real for being small. Here is a simple view of the subject, that shows us at once the impropriety of a constitutional interdiction of such establishments, and the necessity of leaving the matter to the discretion and prudence of the legislature.

In proportion to our increase in strength, it is probable, nay, it may be said certain, that Britain and Spain would augment their military establishments in our neighborhood. If we should not be willing to be exposed, in a naked and defenseless condition, to their insults and encroachments, we should find it expedient to increase our frontier garrisons in some ratio to the force by which our Western settlements might be annoyed. There are, and will be, particular posts, the possession of which will include the command of large districts of territory, and facilitate future invasions of the remainder. It may be added that some of those posts will be keys to the trade with the Indian nations. Can any man think it would be wise to leave such posts in a situation to be at any instant seized by one or the other of two neighboring and formidable powers? To act this part would be to desert all the usual maxims of prudence and policy.

If we mean to be a commercial people, or even to be secure on our Atlantic side, we must endeavor, as soon as possible, to have a navy. To this purpose there must be dock-yards and arsenals; and for the defense of these, fortifications, and probably garrisons. When a nation has become so powerful by sea that it can protect its dock-yards by its fleets, this supersedes the necessity of garrisons for that purpose; but where naval establishments are in their infancy, moderate garrisons will, in all likelihood, be found an indispensable security against descents for the destruction of the arsenals and dock-yards, and sometimes of the fleet itself.

Topic: Standing Army

Anti-Federalist Paper #24

<http://resources.utulsa.edu/law/classes/rice/Constitutional/AntiFederalist/24.htm>

. . . . Standing armies are dangerous to the liberties of a people. . . . [If] necessary, the truth of the position might be confirmed by the history of almost every nation in the world. A cloud of the most illustrious patriots of every age and country, where freedom has been enjoyed, might be adduced as witnesses in support of the sentiment.

But, why is this provision so ridiculous? Because, says this author, it is unnecessary. But, why is it unnecessary? Because, "the principles and habits, as well as the power of the Americans are directly opposed to standing armies; and there is as little necessity to guard against them by positive constitutions, as to prohibit the establishment of the Mahometan religion."

It is admitted then, that a standing army in time of peace is an evil. I ask then, why should this government be authorized to do evil? If the principles and habits of the people of this country are opposed to standing armies in time of peace, if they do not contribute to the public good, but would endanger the public liberty and happiness, why should the government be vested with the power?

But this author supposes, that no danger is to be apprehended from the exercise of this power, because if armies are kept up, it will be by the people themselves, and therefore, to provide against it would be as absurd as for a man to "pass a law in his family, that no troops should be quartered in his family by his consent." This reasoning supposes, that the general government is to be exercised by the people of America themselves.

But such an idea is groundless and absurd. There is surely a distinction between the people and their rulers, even when the latter are representatives of the former. They certainly are not identically the same, and it cannot be disputed, but it may and often does happen, that they do not possess the same sentiments or pursue the same interests.

Besides, if the habits and sentiments of the people of America are to be relied upon, as the sole security against the encroachment of their rulers, all restrictions in constitutions are unnecessary; nothing more is requisite, than to declare who shall be authorized to exercise the powers of government, and about this we need not be very careful -- for the habits and principles of the people will oppose every abuse of power.

The idea that there is no danger of the establishment of a standing army, under the new constitution, is without foundation.

It is a well known fact, that a number of those who had an agency in producing this system, and many of those who it is probable will have a principal share in the administration of the government under it, if it is adopted, are avowedly in favor of standing armies. It is a language common among them, "That no people can be kept in order, unless the government have an army to awe them into obedience; it is necessary to support the dignity of government, to have a military establishment."

And there will not be wanting a variety of plausible reasons to justify the raising one, drawn from the danger we are in from the Indians on our frontiers, or from the European provinces in our neighborhood. If to this we add, that an army will afford a decent support, and agreeable employment to the young men of many families, who are too indolent to follow occupations that will require care and industry, and too poor to live without doing any business, we can have little reason to doubt but that we shall have a large standing army as soon as this government can find money to pay them, and perhaps sooner.

Topic: Federal Government vs. State Governments

Federalist Paper #45

<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-federalist-papers/the-federalist-45.php>

But if the Union, as has been shown, be essential to the security of the people of America against foreign danger; if it be essential to their security against contentions and wars among the different States; if it be essential to guard them against those violent and oppressive factions which embitter the blessings of liberty, and against those military establishments which must gradually poison its very fountain (*note: discussed in Federalist and Anti Federalist Papers #23*); if, in a word, the Union be essential to the happiness of the people of America, is it not preposterous, to urge as an objection to a government, without which the objects of the Union cannot be attained, that such a government may derogate from the importance of the governments of the individual States?

Was, then, the American Revolution effected, was the American Confederacy formed, was the precious blood of thousands spilt, and the hard-earned substance of millions lavished, not that the people of America should enjoy peace, liberty, and safety, but that the government of the individual States, that particular municipal establishments, might enjoy a certain extent of power, and be arrayed with certain dignities and attributes of sovereignty?

The State government will have the advantage of the Federal government, whether we compare them in respect to the immediate dependence of the one on the other; to the weight of personal influence which each side will possess; to the powers respectively vested in them; to the predilection and probable support of the people; to the disposition and faculty of resisting and frustrating the measures of each other.

The State governments may be regarded as constituent and essential parts of the federal government; whilst the latter is nowise essential to the operation or organization of the former. Without the intervention of the State legislatures, the President of the United States cannot be elected at all. They must in all cases have a great share in his appointment, and will, perhaps, in most cases, of themselves determine it. The Senate will be elected absolutely and exclusively by the State legislatures. Even the House of Representatives, though drawn immediately from the people, will be chosen very much under the influence of that class of men, whose influence over the people obtains for themselves an election into the State legislatures. Thus, each of the principal branches of the federal government will owe its existence more or less to the favor of the State governments, and must consequently feel a dependence, which is much more likely to beget a disposition too obsequious than too overbearing towards them.

On the other side, the component parts of the State governments will in no instance be indebted for their appointment to the direct agency of the federal government, and very little, if at all, to the local influence of its members. The number of individuals employed under the Constitution of the United States will be much smaller than the number employed under the particular States. There will consequently be less of personal influence on the side of the former than of the latter. The members of the legislative, executive, and judiciary departments of thirteen and more States, the justices of peace, officers of militia, ministerial officers of justice, with all the county, corporation, and town officers, for three millions and more of people, intermixed, and having particular acquaintance with every class and circle of people, must exceed, beyond all proportion, both in number and influence, those of every description who will be employed in the administration of the federal system.

Topic: Federal Government vs. State Governments

Anti-Federalist Paper #45

<http://resources.utulsa.edu/law/classes/rice/Constitutional/AntiFederalist/45.htm>

The state governments are considered in . . . [the new constitution] as mere dependencies, existing solely by its toleration, and possessing powers of which they may be deprived whenever the general government is disposed so to do. If then the powers of the state governments are to be totally absorbed, in which all agree, and only differ as to the mode -- whether it will be effected by a rapid progression, or by as certain, but

slower, operations -- what is to limit the oppression of the general government?

Where are the rights, which are declared to be incapable of violation? And what security have people against the wanton oppression of unprincipled governors? No constitutional redress is pointed out, and no express declaration is contained in it, to limit the boundaries of their rulers. Beside which the mode and period of their being elected tends to take away their responsibility to the people over whom they may, by the power of the purse and the sword, domineer at discretion. Nor is there a power on earth to tell them, What dost thou? or, Why dost thou so?

I shall now proceed to compare the constitution of the state of New York with the proposed federal government, distinguishing the paragraphs in the former, which are rendered nugatory by the latter; those which are in a great measure enervated, and such as are in the discretion of the general government to permit or not....

1 & 37

The 1st "Ordains, determines, and declares that no authority shall on any pretence whatever be exercised over the people or the members of this State, but such as shall be derived from and granted by them."

The 37th, "That no purchases or contracts for the sale of lands with or of the Indians within the limits of this state, shall be binding on the Indians, or deemed valid, unless made under the authority and with the consent of the legislature of this state."

What have we reasonably to expect will be their conduct [i.e., the new national government] when possessed of the powers "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes," when they are armed with legislative, executive, and judicial powers, and their laws the supreme laws of the land. And when the states are prohibited, without the consent of Congress, to lay any "imposts or duties on imports," and if they do they shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States -- and all such laws subject to the revision and control of Congress.

It is . . . evident that this state, by adopting the new government, will enervate their legislative rights, and totally surrender into the hands of Congress the management and regulation of the Indian trade to an improper government, and the traders to be fleeced by iniquitous impositions, operating at one and the same time as a monopoly and a poll-tax.

The 2nd provides "that the supreme legislative power within this state shall be vested in two separate and

distinct bodies of men, the one to be called the assembly, and the other to be called the senate of the state of New York, who together shall form the legislature."

The 3rd provides against laws that may be hastily and inadvertently passed, inconsistent with the spirit of the constitution and the public good, and that "the governor, the chancellor and judges of the supreme court, shall revise all bills about to be passed into laws, by the legislature."

The 9th provides "that the assembly shall be the judge of their own members, and enjoy the same privileges, and proceed in doing business in like manner as the assembly of the colony of New York of right formerly did."

The 12th provides "that the senate shall, in like manner, be judges of their own members," etc.

The 31st describes even the style of laws -- that the style of all laws shall be as follows: "Be it enacted by the people of the state of New York represented in senate and assembly," and that all writs and proceedings shall run in the name of the people of the state of New York, and tested in the name of the chancellor or the chief judge from whence they shall issue.

The powers vested in the legislature of this state by these paragraphs will be weakened, for the proposed new government declares that "all legislative powers therein granted shall be vested in a congress of the United States, which shall consist of a senate and a house of representatives," and it further prescribes, that "this constitution and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding; and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this constitution."

Topic: Presidential Powers

Federalist Paper #74

<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-federalist-papers/the-federalist-74.php>

THE President of the United States is to be "commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States."

The propriety of this provision is so evident in itself, and it is, at the same time, so consonant to the precedents of the State constitutions in general, that little need be said to explain or enforce it. Even those of them which have, in other respects, coupled the chief magistrate with a council, have for the most part concentrated the military authority in him alone.

He is also to be authorized to grant “reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.” Humanity and good policy conspire to dictate, that the benign prerogative of pardoning should be as little as possible fettered or embarrassed.

The criminal code of every country partakes so much of necessary severity, that without an easy access to exceptions in favor of unfortunate guilt, justice would wear a countenance too sanguinary and cruel.

Topic: Presidential Powers

Anti-Federalist Paper #74

<http://resources.utulsa.edu/law/classes/rice/Constitutional/AntiFederalist/74.htm>

A conspiracy against the freedom of America, both deep and dangerous, has been formed by an infernal junto of demagogues. Our thirteen free commonwealths are to be consolidated into one despotic monarchy. Is not this position obvious? Its evidence is intuitive . . . Who can deny but the president general will be a king to all intents and purposes, and one of the most dangerous kind too -- a king elected to command a standing army. Thus our laws are to be administered by this tyrant; for the whole, or at least the most important part of the executive department is put in his hands.

A quorum of 65 representatives, and of 26 senators, with a king at their head, are to possess powers that extend to the lives, the liberties, and property of every citizen of America. This novel system of government, were it possible to establish it, would be a compound of monarchy and aristocracy, the most accursed that ever the world witnessed. About 50 (these being a quorum) of the well born, and a military king, with a standing army devoted to his will, are to have an uncontrolled power...

The thoughts of a military officer possessing such powers, as the proposed constitution vests in the president general, are sufficient to excite in the mind of a freeman the most alarming apprehensions; and ought to rouse him to oppose it at all events. Every freeman of America ought to hold up this idea to himself: that he has no superior but God and the laws. But this tyrant will be so much his superior, that he can at any time he thinks proper, order him out in the militia to exercise, and to march when and where he

pleases. His officers can wantonly inflict the most disgraceful punishment on a peaceable citizen, under pretense of disobedience, or the smallest neglect of militia duty...

The President-general, who is to be our king after this government is established, is vested with powers exceeding those of the most despotic monarch we know of in modern times. What a handsome return have these men [the authors of the Constitution made to the people of America for their confidence!

Through the misconduct of these bold conspirators we have lost the most glorious opportunity that any country ever had to establish a free system of government. America under one purely democratical, would be rendered the happiest and most powerful nation in the universe.

But under the proposed one composed of an elective king and a standing army, officered by his sycophants, the starvelings of the Cincinnati, and an aristocratical Congress of the well-born -- an iota of happiness, freedom, or national strength cannot exist. What a pitiful figure will these ungrateful men make in history; who, for the hopes of obtaining some lucrative employment, or of receiving a little more homage from the rest of their fellow creatures, framed a system of oppression that must involve in its consequences the misery of their own offspring.

Assignment 1: Choose one of the topics presented. Decide whether you agree with the Federalist viewpoint or with the Anti-Federalist viewpoint.

Read the essay with which you agree several times. Then write a free (not literal) paraphrase. Use the concepts and examples provided in your writing lesson to guide you in writing a strong paraphrase. Use the editing checklist below to make sure that you have paraphrased successfully.

Ensure that your essay is formatted properly, according to the instructions provided above. (There are no citations required for this assignment.)

Choose One Topic & Viewpoint:

- Strong or Weak Central Government – Federalist or Anti-Federalist
- Standing Army – Federalist or Anti-Federalist
- Federal Government vs. State Governments – Federalist or Anti-Federalist
- Presidential Powers – Federalist or Anti-Federalist

Editing Checklist:

- Have I signaled the original author and the title of the original text in my introduction?
- Have I avoided first-person voice and instead used third-person voice?
- Do I understand the main idea and most important details of the original? And have I been able to express those in my paraphrase?
- Did I put the original away when I wrote my paraphrase, to ensure that I avoided plagiarism or identical copying of the original structure?
- Is my paraphrase similar in length to the original?
- Have I applied attention to using variation in my word choices, sentence structure, and voice, so that I am expressing the author's main idea(s) while still using my personal writing style?

Sources:

Amicus, et al. "Anti-Federalist Papers." Michigan State University Press, 1965.

<http://resources.utulsa.edu/law/classes/rice/Constitutional/AntiFederalist/antifed.htm>.

Publius. "The Federalist Papers." New York Press, 1787.

<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-federalist-papers/index.php>