



# START HERE: TEACHING LINCOLN-DOUGLAS



Have you ever wished you had a road map to help you teach a new event? The National Speech & Debate Association has consulted expert coaches to create the “Start Here” series to act as your guide while navigating a new event. These easy to follow lesson plans are backed up with ready-to-use resources and materials.

**LET’S GET STARTED!**



*These lessons were originally created by Renee Motter, Rita Pritchard, Tyler Unsell, and Dario Camara. In 2021, lesson plans were reimaged by Brian Shouse and Colten White.*

*We extend our sincere thanks to all contributors!*

## **ABOUT THE NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION:**

The National Speech & Debate Association was created in 1925 to provide recognition and support for students participating in speech and debate activities. While our organization has evolved over the decades, our mission is more relevant today than ever before. We connect, support, and inspire a diverse community committed to empowering students through competitive speech and debate.

As the national authority on public speaking and debate, the National Speech & Debate Association provides the infrastructure for speech and debate competitions around the world. We create a platform for youth voices to be heard and celebrated, which culminates with an annual National Tournament, the pinnacle of public speaking.

Speech and debate changes lives. NSDA membership builds confidence, boosts classroom performance, improves communication, and increases critical thinking skills to prepare students for college. Our activity provides life skills vital to a young person's success in the future.

### **MISSION:**

The National Speech & Debate Association connects, supports, and inspires a diverse community committed to empowering students through speech and debate.

### **VISION:**

We envision a world in which every school provides speech and debate programs to foster each student's communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and creative skills.

Learn more at [www.speechanddebate.org](http://www.speechanddebate.org)



## **NAVIGATING CRITICAL CLASSROOM CONVERSATIONS**

### **Connect. Support. Inspire.**

In your exploration of topics and arguments in these lessons, you may encounter issues concerning identity, social justice, and other critically important subjects. These issues are more than just topics for speeches or for debate rounds. They affect students, teachers, families, and communities daily. Increasingly, some are choosing violence instead of dialogue in relation to these topics. As an educator, you may feel overwhelmed and unsure how to foster these vulnerable yet critical classroom conversations. Thank you for committing to doing so!

### **Set shared expectations. Grow together.**

Solutions and paths to those solutions may be up for debate, but lived experiences are not. In these critical conversations, your students may want to share personal insights on these issues. These personal insights often come from a place of lived experience. Using these stories allows us to view issues through a critical lens. When having these critical conversations, some students may become uncomfortable. Although you want these conversations to be respectful, please be aware of any ground rules that may limit students from traditionally marginalized and disenfranchised communities from sharing their stories. Please also be aware that students may not feel comfortable sharing their lived experiences—that is okay. Respect their boundaries as you prepare for and engage in this critical dialogue.



# START HERE: TEACHING LINCOLN-DOUGLAS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LESSON 1: <b>The Fundamentals of Argument</b> .....	1
LESSON 2: <b>Research and Media Literacy: Part 1</b> .....	4
LESSON 3: <b>Research and Media Literacy: Part 2</b> .....	7
LESSON 4: <b>Formatting Evidence</b> .....	9
LESSON 5: <b>Framework</b> .....	12
LESSON 6: <b>Case Construction and Writing</b> .....	17
LESSON 7: <b>How to Flow</b> .....	20
LESSON 8: <b>Blocks, Rebuttals, Signposting, Organization</b> .....	24
LESSON 9: <b>Cross-Examination</b> .....	28
LESSON 10: <b>Intro to Philosophy: Part 1</b> .....	32
LESSON 11: <b>Intro to Philosophy: Part 2</b> .....	35
LESSON 12: <b>Judge Adaptation</b> .....	39
LESSON 13: <b>Practice Debates</b> .....	42

# LESSON 1: THE FUNDAMENTALS OF ARGUMENT

## TOPIC:

In this lesson, students will break down the component parts of an argument, including claim, warrant/reasoning, evidence/data, and impact and discuss how they all work together to create a coherent work.

## Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to identify the component parts of an argument.
2. Students will be able to explain how the different parts of an argument fit together.

## MATERIALS:

- Paper and pencil
- Computer and projector

## RESOURCES:

- *Elements of Argument Slideshow*
- *Exit Slip* (click to make a copy)
- *Purple Mattress Commercial*
- *OxiClean Commercial* (optional alternative to the Purple Mattress Commercial)
- *Fundamentals of Argument Worksheet*

## Insight:

This lesson provides a common language for the parts of an argument. Without knowing the parts of an argument, students will likely make incomplete arguments and will struggle to understand why they are incomplete. Having a common language and the ability to identify parts of an argument will help students evaluate the quality of arguments they read and hear, as well as construct better arguments themselves. Having common terminology also makes it easier to provide feedback to students that they will understand as the course progresses.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

5 minutes

As an entrance slip, ask students to respond to the following prompt in a few short sentences: “What makes an argument a good argument? Why is that?”

As a class, briefly review what the students wrote by asking a few students to share their ideas and their responses to the prompt.

## BODY

30-40 minutes

Using the *Elements of Argument Slideshow*, define and explain the importance of the key component parts of an argument:

- ▶ **Claim**
- ▶ **Warrant/Reasoning**
- ▶ **Evidence/Data**
- ▶ **Impact**

As a class, watch the *Purple Mattress Commercial*.

Ask the class to identify some arguments made in the commercial and to break those arguments down into their component parts. For example:

**Claim:** *Purple mattress is amazing.*

**Warrant/Reasoning:** *Purple mattress is amazing because it feels amazing.*

**Evidence/Data:** *It cradles pressure points, it sleeps cool, is motion isolating, and won a JD power award for customer satisfaction, etc.*

**Impact:** *Provides more comfort.*

Break the class into groups of 3-4, and distribute the *Fundamentals of Argument Worksheet* for each group to read.

Ask each group to work together to identify the arguments made in the text and to identify the component parts of those arguments.

As a class, review the work each group has done to ensure each group correctly identified the arguments and the component parts of those arguments in the text. For example (*Text 1*):

**Claim:** *Schools should mandate later start times.*

**Warrant/Reasoning:** *Schools should mandate later start times because it would improve student health and academic performance.*

**Evidence/Data:** *Teens can't get to sleep before 11:00 p.m. due to their circadian rhythms, early start times are linked to depression, early start times are linked to car accidents, etc.*

**Impact:** *Student health and academic success (e.g., graduation rates) are improved.*

### CLOSURE

5 minutes

As an **exit slip**, ask the students to reflect on the lesson by responding to these questions with a few short sentences:

- Why do you think it is important to know the different parts of an argument?
- What was the hardest component to identify during your group work?
- Do you have any questions about this lesson?

Although we have provided a digital exit slip, students may write their answers on paper and turn that in.

## LESSON 2: RESEARCH AND MEDIA LITERACY: PART 1

### TOPIC:

Students will gain a basic understanding of different kinds of sources and evaluating their credibility.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to differentiate between credible and non-credible sources.
2. Students will be able to identify credible, common sources including popular news sites, peer reviewed research, and think tank research.

### MATERIALS:

- Computer (for you and the students)
- Projector
- Optional: Paper/writing utensil for notes and/or exit slip

### RESOURCES:

- Slides for the lesson: **Research and Media Literacy 1 Slides**
- Additional articles to help students with their research skills:
  - » NYT Google Tips: **6 Google Tricks That Will Turn You Into an Internet Detective (Published 2019)**
  - » LifeHack Google Tips: **20 Google Search Tips to Use Google More Efficiently**
  - » Using Wikipedia: **To Use or Not to Use: Wikipedia in the Classroom**
- Crash Course Media Literacy:
  - » **Crash Course Media Literacy Preview**
- Crash Course Navigating Digital Information:
  - » **Introduction to Crash Course Navigating Digital Information #1**

### Insight:

Research is a foundational aspect of evidentiary debate. As students start to delve into learning Lincoln-Douglas, they inevitably will have to make choices about what sources are credible enough to cite in their arguments. Evaluating source credibility is one of the life skills that makes debate worthwhile for students.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

5-10 minutes

Ask all students the following question. Give everyone an opportunity to respond.

- ▶ What do you mostly research? (e.g., *celebrity news, things you are going to buy, world affairs, cooking recipes, etc.*)

## BODY

30-40 minutes

**BREATHABILITY:** Depending on the length of classes at your school and how long it takes to get through the main activity, either cut or add the Crash Course Navigating Digital Information video. It is 13 minutes and there are a couple of discussion questions on the slides. If you are unable to get to this video due to time, that is fine.

1. After the daily question, spend 5-10 minutes on direct instruction while going through the first four slides. The source hierarchy goes from most credible (*peer-reviewed*) to credible, but less so (*trusted news sources*). Make sure to explain what each kind of source is, provide examples, and provide any exceptions given that this is an imperfect hierarchy. For example, it's possible that some blog posts are acceptable depending on the author and topic. If the blog is run by the Council on Foreign Relations, it is acceptable to use for foreign policy questions. On the other hand, an undergraduate student's blog post for a college class is not suitable to cite. It is optional for students to take notes, or you can post/print these slides for students to refer to later.
2. Divide students into groups of 3-4 by proximity or other methods. They are welcome to share a single device. Next, explain the activity as per the instruction slides. Students will have 8-10 minutes (*feel free to adjust the time based on the needs of your students*) to look up the 6 sources on the board to determine whether or not they are credible. The six sources provided can be changed based on your professional judgement. Just make sure to choose sources that are cut-and-dry credible or non-credible.
3. After the student groups identify the credibility of each source, have them go up to the board to indicate their group choices or find another way for groups to record their answers. For example, have six boxes at the front of the room (*tissue boxes, for example*) with the names of each source on it. Give the students 6 cards with the numbers 1-6 on them. Color code the numbers so each group has a different color for teacher record keeping. Have them vote on the credibility of the source using anonymous voting. Have them also record their group decision so they can alter and take note about what they got right/wrong and why.

Finally, go through each source and have a group explain how they came to their decision and/or explain the source's credibility.

4. If you have time, watch all or part of the *Crash Course Navigating Digital Information* and answer the discussion questions as a class. Only use this if you have ~15-20 minutes left in class after the end of the primary activity. If you or your district supports extra credit, this is a potential option for additional work that could supplement their grade.

### CLOSURE

*5 minutes*

Students should write down their answers on paper, or you can create a Google Form as an alternative way to collect responses.

- How did your evaluation of each source's credibility line up with the class as a whole?
- Were any of these sources new to you?

## LESSON 3: RESEARCH AND MEDIA LITERACY: PART 2

### TOPIC:

Students will build on their understanding of media literacy by studying disinformation techniques and practicing research.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to evaluate the credibility of multiple sources.
2. Students will be able to cite multiple sources they have found independently.

### MATERIALS:

- Computers (you and students)
- Projector
- Pencil and paper or another way of taking notes

### RESOURCES:

- **Research Practice - Standardized Testing** (digital student worksheet)
- **Research and Media Literacy 2 Slides**
- **Bad News Game**
- Refer to **Lesson 2 – Research and Media Literacy: Part 1** for additional relevant resources

### Insight:

This lesson is a continuation of the research and source evaluation skills that were established in the Research and Media Literacy 1 lesson. Students will have the opportunity to practice their research skills and then learn about disinformation techniques, which is designed to help inoculate them against disinformation strategies they will likely encounter while researching

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

5-10 minutes

Ask all students the following question. Give everyone an opportunity to respond.

- ▶ Where do you get most of your information? (*maybe provide examples, such as social media, parents, friends, news websites, etc.*)

## BODY

30-40 minutes

1. After the daily question, instruct students to use the research practice worksheet to find two sources (*one aff and one neg*) for the standardized testing topic. You may change the topic to differentiate for your students, given that this topic is designed to be easy to research and accessible for students. Other topics may be more appropriate for your students. Provide about 10-15 minutes for researching and completing this assignment. You may then choose to have students pair with another student to share the sources they found (*you may also ask them to double-check if the other student also finds the source credible*), call on students to share their sources with the class, or both.
2. The next activity is the “Bad News” game developed by Cambridge University as an interactive way of teaching students about disinformation techniques. Before playing this game, you may choose to show the accompanying **Crash Course Intro to Media Literacy video** from 4:21 to 8 minutes. You may also cut this video if you need to save time given that it provides context but isn’t necessary to play the Bad News game.
3. Students will need their computers to play the **Bad News Game**. Introduce students to the game using the slides and instruct them to take notes on the “badges” they get while playing. Also tell them to write down their total number of followers at the end of the game to create a small competition among students. Have each student play through the game at least once, although you may have some or all students play through a second time in order to improve their score. Finally, discuss the game as class using the questions on the slides. The game should take 20-30 minutes.

## CLOSURE

5 minutes

**Discussion Question/Exit Slip:**

The discussion questions at the end of the game should be used to end class. Have students write down their answers even if not everyone can share aloud. Make sure you’re randomly picking students to respond if you cannot call on every student.

## LESSON 4: **FORMATTING EVIDENCE**

### TOPIC:

Students will learn about cards, tagging, and formatting evidence through taglines, citations, bolding, underlining, and highlighting.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to format evidence for debate.
2. Students will be able to identify and create taglines.

### MATERIALS:

- *Pen and pencil*
- *Computers*

### RESOURCES:

- Optional notes - take whichever terms are relevant for this lesson (*card, tagline*): ***Debate Terminology Slides***
- Assignment for student practice: ***Card Cutting Assignment***
- Introductory Tutorial: ***Debate Tutorial- Cutting Cards***
- Advanced tutorial: ***How to Cut a Card by Lawrence Zhou***

### Insight:

Lincoln-Douglas Debate (*and debate more broadly*) has odd terminology and conventions for formatting evidence. This lesson will introduce students to “cutting” (*formatting*) “cards” (*evidence*). This is an essential skill for students to have in evidentiary debate, especially if they plan on competing outside of the class.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

5-10 minutes

For review, ask students to recall the parts of an argument (*claim, evidence, warrant, impact*). Have students write down their answers and call on students to answer aloud.

**POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE:** Ask students to recall different information that you might have noticed they have a hard time remembering.

## BODY

30-40 minutes

1. Introduce students to the terms **tagline**, **citation**, and **card**. Use direct instruction through a **slideshow** or other medium.
2. Go through the basic **card cutting tutorial** step by step. Explain that they should always copy and paste full paragraphs without omitting any information. A differentiation tip is that you can have more advanced students go through the **Lawrence Zhou article** for more detailed tips on cutting cards. After copying and pasting full paragraphs, explain what to include in the citation and the difference between the citation that will be read aloud (*author last name and date*) and the full citation that will not be read aloud. Next, show them how to highlight, bold, and underline the evidence. For beginner students, it is better to simply have them bold, underline, and highlight things they plan on reading while leaving everything else in normal text. Finally, explain that they need to describe what the evidence says in their own writing through the tagline.

**OPTIONAL SECOND STEP OF DIRECT INSTRUCTION:** If you think your students need more help understanding how to format evidence in cards, you can pick an article and cut it together as a class by going through each step that you just covered. This is also something you can return to as review later on as a collective class activity.

3. Finally, give students the rest of class to complete the **card cutting assignment**. Explain that they will format two pieces of evidence (*one aff, one neg*). If you are using a different topic for your class debates, it might be appropriate to substitute your own articles for this assignment. Make sure you give feedback on how they are doing later. You may also instruct them to 1) read through the evidence out loud after cutting it, or 2) find an article on their own if they finish early.

### CLOSURE

5 minutes

Have students turn in their formatted evidence for feedback if time allows to finish in class, otherwise assign it for homework. If time permits, offer another example/non-example of an effective and ineffective way to cut a card. The effective evidence should have minimal highlighting that sounds smooth when read aloud. A non-example would be over-highlighted evidence or highlighting that is jarring when read aloud.

### OPTIONAL HOMEWORK:

Formatting evidence through “cutting cards” is a skill that takes practice. In light of this, you may consider assigning additional evidence for the students to format. Ideally, this will be evidence that they can use later on with the topic they will be debating in class. Use the same criteria to evaluate the homework as you did in class (*outlined above*).

### OPTIONAL PRACTICE DAYS:

If the unit allows for additional time spent practicing research and formatting evidence, it would be advisable to give students another day in class to find and format evidence on whatever topic they are debating. You can grade these new pieces of evidence as well, or simply let them have this for later.

## LESSON 5: **FRAMEWORK**

### TOPIC:

In this lesson, students will gain an understanding the role of the framework in Lincoln-Douglas Debate.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to explain the role of the value and criterion.
2. Students will be able to construct an outline of a mock framework.

### MATERIALS:

- Pencil and paper
- Whiteboard or blackboard
- Dictionaries (optional)
- Computers (optional)

### RESOURCES:

- *Sample Negative Constructive*

### Insight:

Frameworks in LD “frame” how the debate will be understood—both by the debaters and by the judge. Strategic use of framing can help win debates, but comprehension of the basic function of a framework (*and its several elements*) is essential for all debaters hoping for a chance to win. More broadly, understanding how to evaluate claims according to standards promotes critical and impartial thinking, removing students from the emotivity of arguments and focusing their attention on how we can objectively assess arguments’ relative strength.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

5 minutes

Pose the following debate resolution to the class:

| *“The public’s right to know ought to be valued above the individual’s right to privacy.”*

As an entry slip, ask the students to answer the following three questions on one side of a sheet of paper:

- What terms do we need to understand in order to debate this topic?
- What is this resolution asking the affirmative (*the debater supporting the topic*) to prove? Specifically, how do we know if something “ought” to be the case?
- What values or principles are in tension/conflict in this topic?

## BODY

30-40 minutes

Introduce the term “**framework**” to the class.

| *The framework is analysis which tells us two things:*

- *What does the resolution mean?*
- *What is it each debater’s job to prove in the round?*

A framework generally consists of four elements:

- ▶ **Definitions**
- ▶ **Observations**
- ▶ **Value**
- ▶ **Criterion**

Debaters can disagree on Definitions, Burdens, Values, and Criteria, in which case they should often argue for why theirs are best.

Instruct the class that not all words in a resolution need to be defined—only define those words that do not have an obvious meaning in the context. There is some wiggle room in choosing which terms need to be defined, and debaters can often reasonably disagree. That being said, there are often also terms that are so vague or crucial that it would not be reasonable to choose not to define them.

Ask the class to share what terms they thought needed to be defined when they did their entry slips.

The class should identify these terms as needing definition:

- ▶ **Public’s right to know**
- ▶ **Ought**
- ▶ **Value**
- ▶ **Individual’s right to privacy**

In particular, it will be important to define:

*“Public’s right to know” because this term is unclear. We also probably want to define it as a phrase (which is how it appears in the topic) rather than as a sequence of individual words.*

*“Ought,” as it is the evaluative term. We are evaluating what we ought to do, and therefore need to know what “ought” means..*

Next, explain to your class that observations are brief analyses of the resolution. They may be more detailed, definition-like analyses that bring clarity to the topic, and/or they may be analyses of the burdens in the debate. A burden is what it is the debater’s job to prove based on the topic.

Ask your class how they answered the second question on the entry slip. This was getting your class to think about burdens. If they say something like, “it’s the affirmative’s job to show that the public’s right to know is more important/beneficial/good,” challenge them to explain how we decide if something is more important/beneficial/good. This will feed into the criterial discussion later.

“Ought” is the evaluative term, meaning debaters are meant to evaluate what “ought” to be done. It is generally on the evaluative term that burdens hinge. Suppose we define “ought” as expressing moral obligation. With this change, it seems like it is the affirmative’s job to prove that there is a moral obligation to value the public’s right to know above the individual’s right to privacy.

Next, explain to your class that the **Value** is the highest good in the round. If the resolution is asking us whether we have a moral obligation, we might value Morality. Since we would ultimately have to show a moral obligation to win the debate, Morality seems like the highest good in this context. Ask the class what other values might be implicated by this topic. Some good answers might be:

- Democracy (*we are talking about the quality of public discourse*)
- Quality of Life (*we are talking about invasions of privacy*)
- Freedom (*we are talking about rights and speech issues*)

## LESSON 5: FRAMEWORK

Some common values are:

- Morality
- Justice / Fairness
- Freedom / Liberty / Autonomy
- Human Dignity
- Governmental Legitimacy
- Societal Welfare
- Equality
- Life
- Quality of Life
- Democracy

Next, explain to your class that the **Criterion** is the way in which we—in the context of the resolution—access or achieve the value. For example, if you have a criterion of Treating People with Dignity, and a value of Morality, you are saying that we can achieve morality by treating people with dignity. We can think of a criterion as either (*or both*) a gateway or measuring stick. If treating people with dignity is a prerequisite to morality, then treating people with dignity is a gateway to morality. You cannot be moral without passing through this gateway. If treating people with dignity is a barometer of morality, then we can measure the “moralness” of an action by how well it treats people with dignity. In this view, treating people with dignity is an important element of morality, so that we can estimate an action’s level of morality by gauging how much that action treats people with dignity.

Importantly, the criterion gives us a way to compare the affirmative to the negative. We can ask, “who protects individual rights best,” to see who better achieves the value, and therefore who wins the debate. Therefore, a debater’s arguments must connect to and matter under their criterion. This is because the Criterion is also the standard by which we measure the importance of the arguments in a debate. If the criterion is treating people with dignity, but the debaters only talk about how their points affect governments, then their arguments don’t matter or “weigh” under the criterion. Since the criterion tells us how we are going to achieve the value, if the debaters cannot present arguments that matter per the criterion, they cannot connect their arguments to their value. Judges generally vote for the debater who connects most/best to the value through the winning criterion.

Ask your class what kind of criteria we could have for the sample resolution. Is there a clear connection between the suggested criteria and the value (*there needs to be*)? Some good answers might be:

- Promoting a Healthy Democracy
- Promoting Social Welfare
- Enhancing the Marketplace of Ideas
- Protecting Individual Rights

Finally, explain to your class that the framework matters. If we are measuring the importance of arguments with a Criterion of “protecting individual rights,” we are going to be less concerned with the overall benefits of prioritizing the public’s right to know and more concerned about how the public’s right to know impacts our personal rights. Conversely, if we are measuring the importance of argument with a Criterion of “promoting social welfare,” we are going to be less concerned about the loss in personal rights and more concerned about the overall benefits of the public’s right to know. This could be a huge factor in how a judge picks a winner.

**CLOSURE**

5-10 minutes

Have each group refocus on the resolution discussed in the hook (e.g., “*the public’s right to know ought to be valued above the individual’s right to privacy.*”)

**EXIT SLIP:**

Have students flip their entry slips over to use the back as an exit slip.

- Using dictionaries or the internet, if available, have students define these terms. If dictionaries or internet access are not available, have students give their best guess as to the meaning of these terms.
- Then, have students identify three possible values for this topic (*at least one for each side*) and three possible criteria (*at least one for each side*). Have the student explain why they chose the values and criteria they did.

Collect the entry/exit slips at the end of class.

**CONTEXTUALIZING:**

For contextualizing this lesson, it is recommended that you ask your class to read the “*Sample Negative Constructive*” as homework so that they can see how a framework is written in an actual case. Ask them to answer the following questions after reading the case:

- How does the criterion connect to the value?
- How do the contentions connect to the criterion?
- What is the evaluative term in the resolution the case is debating? (*Answer: morally justified*)
- What was the strategy behind how the negative chose to define the terms in the topic?
- Were there any other terms the negative should have defined? (*Answer: probably civil disobedience*)

## LESSON 6: CASE CONSTRUCTION AND WRITING

### TOPIC:

Students will learn how to write a constructive case in this lesson. This will provide a foundation for their practice debates later on in the course.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to identify the components of an LD case and explain how each part fits together.
2. Students will be able to teach their classmates about one component of an LD case.
3. Students will be able to cut cards and identify key terms (Definitions, Observations, Value/Criterion, Contentions).

### MATERIALS:

- *Computers for students*

### RESOURCES:

- Debate Terms: *Debate Terminology Slides*
- Slides for Case Construction: *LD Debate Case Construction*
- Example Case: *Sample Negative Constructive*
- Example Case Outline: *Basic Case Construction in LD*
- Textbook: *Lincoln-Douglas Debate* (pages 9-24)
- *The Jigsaw Method Teaching Strategy*
- Slides for this lesson: *Debate Class - Case Writing and Construction*
- Jigsaw activity: *Jigsaw Activity - Case Writing*
- High School Debate Video (*Homework*):
  - » <https://www.speechanddebate.org/nationals-2017-lincoln-douglas-debate-finals/>
  - » Alternative: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lr1xIEwaHaA>

### Insight:

This lesson is intended to show students how cases work. It starts with direct instruction on the different parts of a case, then the students will take ownership over their learning and participate in a jigsaw activity that will help them explore the different parts of a case and practice their public speaking and presentation skills.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

5-10 minutes

Ask students to recall the different parts of a card (*tagline, citation, body of evidence*). Have students write down their answers and then randomly call on students to identify these parts. Have an example ready to show them on a projector or on paper so they have a visual reminder. You may use the tutorial again for this purpose: ***Debate Tutorial - Cutting Cards***.

## BODY

30-40 minutes

1. Review all the terms about cases through the slides for this lesson. Afterward, provide an in-context example through the example ***negative case***. Go through each part of the case and explain how it works together. For differentiation or to better fit the content of your class, you can also change the case to fit the topic that you will be using for your class. Be sure the content is appropriate for the level of students with which you are working. The one provided should be appropriate for new students. This should take about ~15 minutes.
2. For the second part of class, you will have students use a jigsaw method of teaching in order to present one of four different parts of a case: Intro/definitions, value, criterion, and contentions. The instructions for the ***activity*** read as follows:

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Your group will be assigned one part of a case to teach to the class. This will be the Intro/Definitions, the Value Premise, the Value Criterion, and the Contentions. Use the example Neg case linked below (or the alternative case provided in class). Look at the part of the case that your group is assigned to teach. Read from the NSDA LD Textbook below what each part of the case should accomplish. Your group will explain to the class how that part of the case accomplishes what it needs to accomplish. Your group will have 5 minutes to explain your part of the case to the class.

3. Give the groups ~10 minutes to prepare. Then, give them 5 minutes (*20 minutes total*) to present. You are welcome to change the case they are teaching or how to divide the four different groups. Encourage students to ask each other clarifying questions.

## CLOSURE

5 minutes

As an exit slip, have students write down one thing they learned from a different group.

For homework, have your students watch the ***2017 NSDA Final Round Debate*** (*beginning at the 3:58 mark.*)

If students don't have NSDA Accounts to access resources, here is an ***alternative video***.

### OPTIONAL WORK DAYS:

Unless you plan on students using cases that you provide for their practice debates at the end of the unit, then you will need to add several work days for students to complete their cases (*either both aff and neg, or one of them*). You should provide either one or two work days per case if you plan on students writing their own cases. Depending on the length of your classes and the level of your students, the amount of time may need to be adjusted.

### ASSESSMENT:

Regarding assessment, you should make sure to grade their cases using all of the following criteria:

- Do they have each of the following parts of a case?
  - » Definitions
  - » Observations (*optional*)
  - » Value/Criterion
  - » Contentions
- Do they provide qualified evidence for the definitions, value, criterion, and contentions?
- Does the case utilize complete arguments, including claims, warrants, evidence, and impacts?
- Does the case fit together (*e.g., do the impacts from the contention relate back to the criterion, does the criterion achieve the value, etc.*)?
- Does any part of the case conflict with another part of the case, or is each argument consistent with the case as a whole?
- Does the case relate back to the resolution, or are there aspects of it that deal with issues not relevant to the topic?

## LESSON 7: HOW TO FLOW

### TOPIC:

Students will learn how to flow—or take notes—during a debate round.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to construct a template of a flow.
2. Students will be able to flow a debate using the template.

### MATERIALS:

- Pencil and paper
- Computer and projector

### RESOURCES:

- *Mechanics of Flowing Video*
- *Nationals 2019 - Lincoln-Douglas Debate Final Round Video*
- *Flowing Template*
- Textbook: *Lincoln-Douglas Debate* (pages 51-54)

### Insight:

Flowing is, after case writing, the most essential skill a debater needs to learn. Without the ability to flow properly, a debater will struggle to track and recall what has been said, plan their rebuttal speeches, and comprehend the judge's decision after the round. Flowing is vital to debating, and therefore all debaters need to learn how to flow.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

5 minutes

In the previous lesson, students were asked to watch a video of an LD debate. Place the students in groups of 3-4 and ask them to reconstruct the debate. Can they remember each debater's Value and Criteria? Can they remember the key arguments and how they shook out? Challenge the students to remember as much as they can about the debate.

Ask the students to share their recollections. How do the students think they did—do they think they remembered 25% of the arguments made? 50%? 100%? Do the students think they could have remembered more had they taken notes?

## BODY

30-40 minutes

Distribute a *“Flowing Template”* to each of your students.

Then, have your class watch the *“Mechanics of Flowing”* video. They should not write on the template at this time, but it may be a useful visual reference.

After the “Mechanics of Flowing” video is finished, play the *“Nationals 2019 - Lincoln-Douglas Debate Final Round”* video from 1:55 to 8:00 (AC). Have the students flow the Affirmative Constructive in the appropriate column on their “Flowing Template.”

Check in with the students. Did they accurately record the affirmative case, including the Value, Criterion, Observation, Contentions, and supporting reasons for the Contentions? Ask the students to share what they recorded for each of these to make sure that everyone has an accurate flow. Before the next step, students should have roughly the following information flowed under the AC:

- **Value:** Justice
- **Criterion:** Mitigating Structural Oppression
- **Observation:** Affirmative burden = violence may sometimes be justly used by the oppressed vs. oppressors
- **Contention One:** Self-defense right to harm the oppressors
- **Contention Two:** Alternatives to violence are ineffective
  - **Reason 1:** Regimes getting better at dealing with nonviolence
  - **Reason 2:** Rise of internet harms nonviolent revolutions
  - **Reason 3:** Nonviolence only results in cosmetic changes
  - **Reason 4:** Nonviolence only works because of the threat of violence

- **Contention Three:** Violence mitigates structural oppression
  - **Reason 1:** Only force works against an unwilling oppressor
  - **Reason 2:** Violence unifies the oppressed
  - **Reason 3:** Guerrilla warfare is highly effective

Skip ahead in the “[Nationals 2019 - Lincoln-Douglas Debate Final Round](#)” video to 15:50. Play the video from 15:50 to 23:05 (NC/1NR). Have the students flow the Negative Constructive and First Negative Rebuttal in the appropriate columns in their “Flowing Template”.

Check in with the students. Did they accurately record the negative case, including the Value, Criterion, Observation, Contentions, and supporting reasons for the Contentions? Ask the students to share what they recorded for each of these to make sure that everyone has an accurate flow. Before the next step, students should have roughly the following information flowed under the NC:

- **Value:** Justice
- **Criterion:** Maximizing Human Rights
- **Observation:** Modern warfare makes older examples and philosophies obsolete/irrelevant
- **Contention One:** Revolutions allows oppressors to consolidate power
  - Leaders see violence as tool for control
  - Revolution leads to cycle of politicide/genocide
- **Contention Two:** Violence harms human rights
  - Alternative of nonviolent revolution
  - Nonviolent revolutions have less politicide/genocide
  - Alternative of right to exit and escape oppression

### CLOSURE

5-10 minutes

Ask the students to take a close look at their flows. Which arguments in the AC did the negative respond to and which did the negative not respond to? Have the students circle those affirmative arguments which were NOT responded to by the negative.

Ask the students what arguments they circled (*e.g., ask the students which affirmative arguments were dropped by the negative*). Check those responses for accuracy. Students should have circled:

- Observation
- Contention Two, Reason 2

## LESSON 7: HOW TO FLOW

- Contention Two, Reason 4
- Contention Three, Reason 1\*
- Contention Three, Reason 2
- Contention Three, Reason 3

For homework, ask the students to watch and flow the remainder of the debate. In particular, encourage them to look at whether the affirmative correctly identifies as dropped the arguments that the negative did in fact drop. This assignment should not be graded, but should be checked for completion and effort.

**\*NOTE:** the negative may have responded to this argument at the end of their speech, but did not indicate what they were addressing clearly. This is a signposting issue. Whether this is circled or not, treat the response as correct.

### ADDITIONAL FLOWING PRACTICE:

Students will need to return to the skill of flowing throughout the course. As a result, you may find it appropriate to either spend an additional day practicing in class or assign additional homework for flowing.

- **Flowing Sample Cases:** Students can practice flowing a sample case and/or watch along to see what an advanced student flows from the speech in *part 2 of Intro to Flowing PF and LD*.
- **Song Flow:** One high-engagement activity is to have students compete for the most words flowed in a song with fast, high-variety lyrics. Two popular choices are *Billy Joel's "We Didn't Start the Fire"* or *Blackalicious' "Alphabet Aerobics."* You can choose any songs that are appropriate for your students. Have students flow the songs by only using the left two-inch margin of the paper and count the number of unique words they were able to write down as the song played. If you prefer to have students complete this as homework, you can have them choose their own song and bring you the flow the next day.

## LESSON 8: BLOCKS, REBUTTALS, SIGNPOSTING, ORGANIZATION

### TOPIC:

Students will learn the organization of the rebuttal, signposting, and what blocks are and how to utilize them.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will know how to approach LD rebuttals.
2. Students will be able to structure LD rebuttal speeches.
3. Students will be able to watch example LD rebuttals and identify rebuttal arguments.

### MATERIALS:

- Projector or other way to show a debate

### RESOURCES:

- Slides for this lesson: *Debate Class - Blocks, Rebuttals, Signposting, Organization*
- Debate Terms: *Debate Terminology Slides*
- Resources for “I couldn’t disagree more” activity:
  - » *I couldn’t disagree more*
  - » *I couldn’t disagree more task overview*
  - » Description of “I Couldn’t Disagree More” and other activities: *Training Games*
- Example LD Final Round to show (2019)
  - » *YouTube link*
  - » *Wistia link* (using NSDA login)
- Textbook: *Lincoln-Douglas Debate* (pages 33-50)

### Insight:

This lesson is important for students to develop the skills necessary to give rebuttal speeches in LD. Giving rebuttals is a foundational skill in debate, so this will be an important lesson for both giving direct instruction on how students can give rebuttals and also providing students practice with rebuttals.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

10-15 minutes

The attention getting activity for this lesson will last longer than other intro activities because it is designed to practice rebuttal skills without having to introduce specialized knowledge about debate terminology or structure.

**HERE IS A DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTIVITY FROM ONE OF THE MATERIALS:** ‘I Couldn’t Disagree More’ is a useful and quick game that can help students practice rebuttal techniques and helps develop the ability to deal with points of information. One pupil makes a statement (this statement could be serious, silly, topical, controversial, or obvious). The next person has to reply to the statement by saying ‘I couldn’t disagree more’ and then give a reason why.

Either provide a student with a claim to start with and then move around the room, or have the student generate the claim. You can instruct them to base their claims on the topic you are using in class, or allow them to use any claim. Spend the first 10-15 minutes on this activity to get the students in a mindset of generating rebuttal arguments.

## BODY

20-40 minutes

Provide direct instruction using the *slides* for this lesson. This will cover all the essential content for what goes into a rebuttal. This should take about 10 minutes.

After going through direct instructions, continue with the rebuttals in the *2019 LD final round* (or a different round that fits your needs) or get in more flowing practice by showing another full round, like the *2020 final*. Regardless of the round, use this as an opportunity for students to practice their flowing. For breathability, you could show this round in a variety of ways. It is not necessary (*nor desirable, for time’s sake*) to show the whole debate in one day. If you want to show the whole debate, you can spread it out over the course of two days. If you want to only showcase rebuttal skills, have students pull out their flows of the 2019 final from the previous lesson and then show the 1AR. It is up to you how you approach showing this debate. After each rebuttal speech, you should pause the debate and go over the rebuttal arguments that were made and have students recall the arguments they were able to flow. Have students identify how the rebuttal was organized and note how the debaters utilize sign-posting to identify which arguments they are responding to. Note how the speeches are organized to make it easier to flow, rather than having a random organization. This should take about 20-40 minutes, depending on what parts of the debate you show.

**CLOSURE**

5 minutes

For the closure, have students share their flows so you can provide feedback. You should evaluate several things:

1. Make sure that they are only using a two-inch margin on the left side of the paper.
2. Make sure they are getting down as many essential details as they can. For example: the value, criterion, definitions, observations, contentions, and evidence.
3. Make sure there is sufficient spacing between contentions and that students use the back side of the paper when they run out of room.
4. Make sure students are writing in ink that is easy to view. They should be able to read their own handwriting as well.
5. Make sure students are using shorthand when appropriate. For example, writing “C1” rather than “contention one” on their paper.

**ADDITIONAL PRACTICE DAYS:**

If you think your students require an additional day to practice flowing, signposting, and organization, you may spend another day on these skills by getting a deck of cards and having them flow a “speech” as you draw cards from the deck and substitute those for each part of a case. For example, you could say, “The value is the eight of hearts” or something along those lines as you go through a constructive speech. Go through the speech with your students afterward and make sure they were able to flow the speech in the order you provided the cards. Then, either you or a student (*it may take multiple speeches of modeling before students are ready to try this themselves*) could give a “rebuttal speech” by responding to everything with other cards. For example, you might say “In response to their first contention of the ace of spades, I have two arguments. First, the two of clubs says their evidence is faulty. Secondly, the jack of spades says they have no impact.” As you advance through the activity, you can go so far as to intentionally drop arguments and see if students notice the flaws.

**NOTE:** Students who give these speeches will get practice speaking and signposting as they go through a speech. Students who are listening will get practice flowing.

As homework or an additional day of work time, you may ask students to write blocks against common arguments on whatever topic they will be debating for their practice debates later in the unit. Provide students with an argument on the topic and ask them to find a block to that argument. Ideally, this will include a card as well. You may grade their block based on:

- Whether or not the block itself is a complete argument (*claim, warrant, evidence, and impact*).
- Its relevance/responsiveness to the original argument. If their block engages with the other argument (*for example, by pointing out contradicting facts*), then it is responsive. If their argument misunderstands the original argument or fails to address it, then it is non-responsive.

## LESSON 9: CROSS-EXAMINATION

### TOPIC:

In this lesson, students will learn the basics of cross-examination in Lincoln-Douglas Debate: how it works and how to do it.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to explain the mechanics of cross-examination in LD (e.g., how long is it, who is the questioner, and who is the respondent).
2. Students will be able to analyze opponents' arguments in preparation for mock cross-examination through the generation of probative questions.

### MATERIALS:

- Pencil and paper
- Computer and projector
- Whiteboard or blackboard

### RESOURCES:

- *Cross-Examination Handout*
- *2004 Lincoln-Douglas Debate National Finals Video*
- Textbook: *Lincoln-Douglas Debate* (pages 25-32)

### Insight:

Cross-examination is the only opportunity for debaters to directly interact in an LD debate. It is also the only chance a debater has to extract concessions from their opponent. Knowing how cross-examination works, and how to engage in it effectively, is therefore critical to knowing how to debate well. While practice makes perfect, this lesson will give students the basic tools they need to engage critically, carefully, and strategically with cross-examination so that they can have success in their debates.

### ONE-DAY LESSON

#### HOOK

5 minutes

Ask the students what they know about cross-examination. They might talk about debate or the court process. Get them to suggest some definitions for the term. Ideally, they should identify that cross-examination:

- Is a question-and-answer session.
- There are designated roles (*one questioner, one respondent*).
- It is probative (*e.g., it is not just an information-gathering exercise, but a chance to poke holes in someone's arguments*).

Ask the students what kinds of things a questioner can do to get the answers they want in a cross-examination. What strategies can the questioner employ?

#### BODY

30-40 minutes

Divide the class into groups of 4-5 and distribute one “**Cross-Examination Handout**” to each group.

Present this information about the mechanics of cross-examination:

- In LD, there are two cross-examination periods.
- Each period is three minutes long.
- In the first period, the affirmative is the respondent (*the one who answers questions*) and the negative is the questioner.
- In the second period, the negative is the respondent (*the one who answers questions*) and the affirmative is the questioner.

Present these four tips for approaching cross-examination as a questioner:

- First, probative questions are better than clarifying ones, but sometimes clarifying questions are necessary. If you didn't understand or record/flow an argument your opponent made, get clarification.
- Second, challenge the assumptions in your opponent's case. Ask: why, how, what, when, and which. Drill down into their arguments. Debater's are not always prepared to identify and defend their underlying assumptions.
- Third, have a few predetermined questions designed to probe anticipated cases and/or to set up your own cases, but do not rely heavily on pre-written material (*this can*

## LESSON 9: CROSS-EXAMINATION



*result in failing to engage with the opponent's actual arguments as they have uniquely presented them).* Don't be afraid to go off-script when you get a good lead.

- Fourth, plan some questions in advance, in case you aren't sure what to ask at first. Design some questions to set up your case or to attack cases you anticipate opponents running.

Present these two tips for approaching cross-examination as a respondent:

- First, think about the kinds of questions you're likely to be asked by a questioner. How will you respond in a way that makes sense with your arguments? Plan out your responses ahead of time.
- Second, project confidence. Being questioned can be intimidating. Projecting confidence can make it feel like you're in command.

Play the **"2004 Lincoln-Douglas Debate National Finals Video"** from 0:00 to 7:40. Students should flow the speech as they watch.

Give the class 5-10 minutes to do both of the following:

- Discuss the speech. Particularly: What holes could be poked in the affirmative arguments they just heard? What are some potential negative arguments? What questions might set up those potential negative arguments for later in the debate?
- Generate 3-4 initial questions (*each with follow up questions*), mirroring the model shown in the **"Cross-Examination Handout."** Each group should aim for at least one question probing the affirmative case, one question setting up a possible negative argument, and one or two additional questions.

Now, have some groups share a few of their initial and follow-up questions, and have those groups explain why they chose to ask the questions they did.

Resume the **"2004 Lincoln-Douglas Debate National Finals"** video, playing from 7:40 to 11:00.

Discuss the following questions as a class: Did the questioner ask the sort of questions you anticipated? How did the questioner and respondent do in the cross-examination? What could each have improved on?

### CLOSURE

5 minutes

As an exit slip, ask the students to reflect on the lesson by responding to these questions with a few short sentences:

- What are two tips for handling cross-examination as the questioner?
- What is a tip for handling cross-examination as the respondent?
- How long is a cross-examination period?

## LESSON 9: CROSS-EXAMINATION

- Thinking about the video you watched, what other things do you think it is important to keep in mind during a cross-examination?

Have the students turn in their exit slips and review them for comprehension. These slips may be graded, at your discretion.

### OPTIONAL HOMEWORK:

Provide students with an example case (*such as the one provided in the case writing lesson*) or with an example debate such as the one provided in this lesson. Have students generate a list of five different questions based on what they would ask the other debater. You may also consider asking students to write a short (*1-3 sentence*) explanation of why the question will be helpful for their rebuttal speech. Without this explanation, students may just skate through by asking comprehension questions that don't have strategic benefit or require critical thinking. Grade these questions based on 1) whether or not they completed the appropriate number and questions and 2) whether or not their explanation of the question matches the question itself.

### OPTIONAL PRACTICE ACTIVITY:

Students can use the case that they have written for their practice debates or an example case they plan on using for the practice debates for an extended cross-examination activity. Normally, cross-examination only lasts three minutes, which offers a necessary limit in a competitive setting. However, in a classroom setting, students can get more out of the activity by extending the cross-ex time to something as long as 10 minutes. This can be structured in a few different ways. If your class is small and/or outgoing, you can have one student give their case and have students from the entire class ask questions about the case for 10 minutes. Feel free to allow for up to two follow-up questions per questioner. A different way of structuring the activity is to have students divide into either pairs or groups of three and have them take turns sharing their cases and then asking questions for 10 minutes. Then, you can switch groups, partners, and/or cases to get new perspectives. This practice activity can last up to a full class period.

## LESSON 10: INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY: PART 1

### TOPIC:

This lesson offers an introduction to Consequentialism and Deontology, common philosophical approaches in LD.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to explain Consequentialism and Deontology.
2. Students will be able to evaluate whether an action was guided by Consequentialist or Deontological reasoning.

### MATERIALS:

- *Computer and projector*

### RESOURCES:

- *Basics of Consequentialism Slideshow*
- *Kant and Categorical Imperatives: Crash Course Philosophy #35 Video*

### Insight:

Philosophy is commonly used in LD to explain why a certain position is morally superior or why a certain action ought, morally speaking, to be taken. Two of the most common philosophical and ethical approaches used to do this are Consequentialism and Deontology, which are often conceived of as polar opposites. Understanding the basics of these approaches will not only be critical as debaters begin to craft their own cases and arguments, but will be essential for understanding the cases and arguments of opponents.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

5-10 minutes

Organize the class into groups of 3-4. Then, pose one or both of the following two hypotheticals to your entire class:

- John, who works at a trillion-dollar business, has a friend named Sally. Sally is very sick and needs \$50,000 dollars to save her life. The only way to get this money in time is to steal it. John steals the money from the business and saves Sally's life. Was John right to steal the money?
- June was a passenger on a ship that sank. She escaped on a life raft with four strangers. Now, their life raft is slowly sinking because the load is too heavy. To stop their life raft from sinking, June must push someone off the life raft and into the ocean. June decides not to push someone off. Was June right not to push someone off?

Give each group 5 minutes to discuss the hypothetical(s) among themselves.

Then, ask a few groups to briefly share their opinions with the class. Was John right? Was June right? Why or why not?

## BODY

30-35 minutes

Keep the students in their groups. Use the “*Basics of Consequentialism*” slideshow to explain the following:

- Consequentialism
- Utilitarianism

On the final slide of the “Basics of Consequentialism” slideshow, take 3-5 minutes to discuss the “questions for consequentialists” as a class. Then, have your class watch the “*Kant and Categorical Imperatives: Crash Course Philosophy #35*” video from 1:05 to 9:30.

Point out after the video plays that Kant's views, and those inspired by him, fall into a family of philosophical theories called “Deontology” (*pronounced Dee/Day-on-tol-ogy*).

Review the following ideas with the class:

- **Universalizability:** An action cannot be right for me but wrong for you—a maxim has to be right or wrong for everyone.
- **End-in-Itself:** As human beings, we exist for our own self-fulfillment. Unlike a coffee cup, we do not exist to serve someone else's purposes. We have fundamental dignity

as agents. It is never okay to treat an “end-in-itself” as a “mere means,” even if doing so achieves some greater good.

### CLOSURE

5-10 minutes

Ask each group to decide whether John was a utilitarian or deontologist and/or whether June was a utilitarian or deontologist. Give each group 5 minutes to discuss. The correct answers are:

- John is a utilitarian. He reasoned that saving a life was more important than a rich business losing \$50,000. Therefore, the better outcome was achieved by stealing. A deontologist would not condone stealing, as stealing is not a universalizable maxim.
- June is a deontologist. She reasoned that, since all persons are ends-in-themselves with innate moral value, it would be wrong to push someone off the life raft. The person pushed would be used as a tool (*or mere means*) for saving the rest of them. A consequentialist would push the person off the life raft, because doing so produces better consequences (*e.g., a greater chance to save more lives*).

Ask the groups to share their answers. Review those answers with the groups to ensure that each group understands why John is a utilitarian and/or why June is a deontologist. Use this discussion to assess the class’s comprehension of the lesson.

## LESSON 11: INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY: PART 2

### TOPIC:

This lesson offers an introduction to Hobbes' and Locke's Social Contracts, common philosophical approaches in Lincoln-Douglas Debate.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to explain Social Contract Theory.
2. Students will be able to identify and explain the key differences between Hobbes' and Locke's iterations of the Social Contract Theory.

### MATERIALS:

- Pencil and paper
- Computer and projector
- Whiteboard or blackboard

### RESOURCES:

- *Contractarianism: Crash Course Philosophy #37 Video*
- *Political Theory - John Locke Video*
- *Hobbes vs. Locke vs. Rousseau - Social Contract Theories Compared Video*

### Insight:

Philosophy is commonly used in LD to explain why a certain position is morally superior or why a certain action ought, morally speaking, to be taken. Besides consequentialism and deontology, which were covered in the previous lesson, one other philosophical theory makes a frequent appearance in LD debates: Social Contract Theory. Not only is understanding this theory useful for crafting cases and anticipating and responding to opponents' arguments, but it is also useful for contextualizing our own political system, with its constitutional structure.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

## HOOK

5-10 minutes

Place the students into groups of 4-5. Ask each group to imagine that they, and a couple hundred strangers, have been abandoned on a mystery island and have no chance of rescue. The islanders can now choose two paths forward: they can choose to live freely without rules OR they can agree on a set of common rules and principles to live by. Which option should the islanders take?

Instruct any group that decides to “live freely without rules” to discuss and decide whether humans are innately good/cooperative or bad/selfish. Will humans living without rules tend towards violence or towards peace?

Further, instruct any group that decides to “agree on a set of common rules and principles to live by” to also discuss and decide how those rules will be enforced. How will rulebreakers be punished? Who will have the authority to dispense punishment? What powers will authority figures be given over everyone else?

Have the groups write down their answers and reasoning on a piece of paper (*this will become the exit slip later on*).

Give the groups 5-10 minutes to discuss this scenario, decide on what path forward they will take and why, and record their responses.

## BODY

30-35 minutes

Keep the students in their groups. Play the “**Contractarianism: Crash Course Philosophy #37**” video from 0:00 to 8:35. After the video, review the following key terms:

- **Contractarianism:** Morality requires that we honor the contracts and agreements we—as rational agents—have freely made.
- **Social Contract:** The agreement or contract which establishes rules for a society as a whole and which creates a government (*or sovereign*) to enforce those rules.
- **State of Nature:** The state of anarchy or total freedom which exists prior to the establishment of a social contract.
- **Tacit/Implicit Consent:** Consenting or agreeing to a contract implicitly (*e.g., by participating in or benefiting from the contractual arrangement*) rather than explicitly (*e.g., by saying “I agree to this contract” or by signing on the dotted line*).

Present the following information to the class:

- **Thomas Hobbes**, partially as a result of living during the English Civil War, felt that men tended toward violence when there was a lack of central authority. Therefore, Hobbes believed that the state of nature would be extremely violent.
- **John Locke**, whose philosophy inspired our own political system, believed that while the state of nature was not ideal, it was nevertheless not nearly as “nasty, brutish, and short” as Hobbes imagined it was.
- Hobbes argued that, in order to escape the state of nature, citizens would contract/ agree to give **enormous** power to the government to empower the government to end the existing anarchy and prevent future anarchy. Citizens would do this because of just how bad and terrifying anarchy is. Citizens would only reserve for themselves the **rights to life and corporeal freedom** (e.g., *freedom of movement and freedom from enslavement*).
- Locke argued that, in order to escape the state of nature, citizens would contract/ agree to give **limited** power to the government to empower the government to end the existing anarchy and prevent future anarchy. Locke felt that, because the state of nature was not utterly unbearable, citizens would not pay as dear a price to prevent it as Hobbes thought they would pay. Citizens would reserve for themselves the **rights to life, liberty, and property** (*the inspiration for the Declaration of Independence’s “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”*).

If there is still time in the lesson, play the indicated excerpt from one of the following videos:

- **“Political Theory - John Locke”** from 3:30 to 5:40
- **“Hobbes vs. Locke vs. Rousseau - Social Contract Theories Compared”** from 0:25 to 4:00

Time-permitting, briefly discuss as a class the video excerpt that was played.

### CLOSURE

5-10 minutes

Ask each group to reflect on their hook activity. Did they try to form a social contract on their mystery island? If so, was their social contract arrangement more Hobbesian or more Lockean, and why? Have the groups record their responses on the same piece of paper used for the hook. This piece of paper is their exit slip.

Additionally, ask each group to answer—in their own words—these three questions, and to record their answers on their exit slips:

- What is the State of Nature?
- What is Contractarianism?
- Why did Hobbes and Locke disagree about what contractors/citizens would agree to in the social contract?

## LESSON 11: INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY: PART 2



Have the students hand in their exit slips and check for accuracy. These may be graded at your discretion.

Students should be able to correctly identify on their exit slips that the reason Hobbes and Locke disagree is that they have different views about the state of nature. Hobbes sees people as violence-prone, and therefore thinks the state of nature would be a hellish condition. Hobbes reasons that citizens would give up almost anything to guarantee that anarchy could never happen again. Locke thinks that people are neutral or good, and therefore thinks that the state of nature (*while not ideal*) would be a tolerable condition. Locke reasons that citizens would only give up a few things to guarantee that anarchy could never happen again.

## LESSON 12: JUDGE ADAPTATION

### TOPIC:

During this lesson, students will be exposed to the different attitudes of the audience and strategies to best adapt to them during a debate round.

### Essential Question + Objectives

1. Students will be able to identify different argumentative needs based on the audience present.
2. Students will be able to adapt to a judge's attitude during a debate.
3. Students will be able to appeal to different kinds of audiences.

### MATERIALS:

- Notecards (with multiple different audiences on them - about 3-4 people per group)
- Writing utensil/notes

### RESOURCES:

- Slides for the activity: *Judge Adaptation Slides*
- Textbook: *Lincoln-Douglas Debate* (pages 55-60)

### Insight:

This lesson is designed to get students thinking about audience adaptation more generally. Teachers and coaches should reinforce the information in this lesson through feedback later on when students are doing debates.

### ONE-DAY LESSON

#### HOOK

*5-10 minutes*

Ask students one or all of the following example questions:

- What arguments are the most persuasive for your parents/guardians?
- What arguments are the most persuasive for your teachers?
- What arguments are the most persuasive for your friends?
- What do you notice about the differences between what appeals to these different groups?

#### BODY

*30-40 minutes*

1. Have students take notes on the first 2-4 slides. If needed, you can cut the slides on commonplaces and public reasoning. Keep the first two slides about audiences and attitudes.
2. Split students into groups of 3-4. Give each group an audience card, which is a notecard with 1 kind of audience on it. For example: teenagers, toddlers, senior citizens, etc. Students will follow the directions and present a commercial for selling a vacuum to this audience. The vacuum can have whatever features might appeal to the audience. The other groups should not know what each other group's audience is. Give students 10 minutes to prepare and about 2-4 minutes for their commercial. Have each person not presenting write down which audience they think is being appealed to. Tally up the results at the end to see which students guessed correctly most of the time. If you want, you can also have them vote on the best commercial.
3. Instructions:
  - Get into (#) groups.
  - Receive an audience card.
  - Prepare a one-minute commercial aimed at that audience. Every group is trying to sell their audience a vacuum cleaner.
  - Perform your commercial without telling us your audience.
  - Other groups will guess your audience.
  - Group discussion based on activity.

## LESSON 12: JUDGE ADAPTATION



---

### CLOSURE

*5 minutes*

---

On an exit slip, have students reflect on which commercials were the most persuasive for this specific audience and why. Have them explain how those same arguments and appeals might not work for a different audience.

## LESSON 13: PRACTICE DEBATES

### TOPIC:

Students will put the previous lessons into practice by participating in Lincoln-Douglas practice debates.

### Essential Question + Objectives

#### Debating Students

1. Students will be able to use their research from previous lessons to conduct a full LD debate.
2. Students will be able to use debate terminology when appropriate during their debate.
3. Students will be able to run through a complete LD practice debate.

#### Observing Students

1. Students will be able to accurately flow arguments throughout the debate.
2. Students will weigh impacts by writing a reason for decision (RFD).

### MATERIALS:

- Pens/paper for flowing
- Timers (phones will suffice)
- Student-written or example cases (preferably printed, but on a device also works)

### RESOURCES:

- Textbook: *Lincoln-Douglas Debate*

### Insight:

At a certain point, there are diminishing returns on teaching students debate through isolated skills. This lesson intends to create a holistic understanding of LD debate through practice.

## ONE-DAY LESSON

### HOOK

5-10 minutes

Preview the practice debate by either selecting two students for a debate who are in class or referring to a pre-arranged list of debates that you have scheduled. Remind the students of what materials they will need and remind them of the time structure of LD. Give the students who are debating time to arrange their materials at the front of the room. While the students are preparing to debate, instruct other students to flow the debate and inform them that they will be writing a “reason for decision” (*RFD*) based on who they think won the debate. Do not share these results with the class, but collect them for a grade. Writing RFDs will help your students think more systematically about debate.

### BODY

30-40 minutes

Run through the entire LD debate with the two students that were selected. This will almost certainly take up the entire lesson.

You can flow and time the debate to model for students and also grade the debaters more effectively. Alternatively, you can monitor the class while listening to the debate and also keeping time to help debaters keep track of their speech time.

Students should applaud their peers in any way that is acceptable, whether that be snaps, lightly knocking on desks, or clapping.

Repeat this lesson as many times as necessary to go through all the debaters who need to be assessed.

**BREATHABILITY:** If you have the space and do not need to watch the debates (because you do not plan on assessing the students), you may have multiple debates run at once with peers as their audience. However, it is recommended that you assess these debates as their summative grade.

### CLOSURE

5 minutes

Collect the RFDs written by other students.

**OPTIONAL:** Have students who debated write a short self-reflection on one glow (what they did well) and one grow (what they could improve on).

