4. Develop an argument that explains whether the federal bureaucracy operates with sufficient checks and balances or whether it has too much discretionary authority to be a fully democratic element of government.

In your essay, you must:

- Articulate a defensible claim or thesis that responds to the prompt and establishes a line of reasoning.
- Support your claim with at least TWO pieces of accurate and relevant information:
  At least ONE piece of evidence must be from one of the following foundational documents:
  — *Federalist No. 51*
  — *Federalist No. 70*
  — Article I of the Constitution
  — Article II of the Constitution
- Use a second piece of evidence from another foundational document from the list above or from your study of the federal bureaucracy.
- Use reasoning to explain why your evidence supports your claim/thesis.
- Respond to an opposing or alternative perspective using refutation, concession, or rebuttal.

**WRITING: RESPOND TO ALTERNATIVE PERSPECTIVES**

As you plan your argumentative essay, be aware of alternative perspectives from the beginning. Use them to help you choose the position you believe you are best able to defend with your evidence. You may even incorporate one of the stronger alternative perspectives into your claim, so your readers will know to anticipate your rebuttal to it later. For example, your claim might read:

Although there are some good reasons why discretionary authority is necessary in the federal bureaucracy, in more cases than not that authority goes too far and the bureaucracy operates with insufficient accountability.

Readers will expect you to address the “good reasons” and to show why, despite them, you argue for a different position.
Also famous is Madison’s **No. 51**, where he advocated for checks and balances and separation of powers to protect against abuse of power. After all, “if men were angels, no government would be necessary.” He illustrates that each branch should be independent of the other branches. For instance, if justices are appointed for life, they would not be influenced by those who appoint them. Madison points out that offices should check on each other to make sure public rights are protected. He acknowledges that the Legislative Branch was the most powerful at the time, yet it would be divided into two Houses that operate somewhat differently. Madison once again calls upon a discussion of factions. He reaffirms that in a large republic both majority and minority factions would be controlled, as the nation’s many voices would be a safeguard against tyranny. Divided government, as we shall see with federalism, and separation of powers both help prevent “usurpation” of the government. Madison’s key point is that the Constitution will promote the “preservation of liberty.”