

Lesson: **Debate: Gentrification to Westward Expansion**

Author/Teacher: Charles Maciejewski with Erick Espin

Grade Level: Social Studies, 9th

Essential Question:

Is the current gentrification of Washington Heights an example of a neighborhood's natural change over time OR a modern example of American territorial expansion where power and money can claim any land desired? Explain.

Project and Purpose:

Students will establish a position, provide evidence, and analyze information to support, defend, and oppose a position in a debate.

Students will be a part of a group (affirmative or negative) which compares/contrasts one of the following through the lens of power and money to answer the essential question (above):

- Gentrification in Washington Heights to Westward Expansion in the Cherokee Nation
- Gentrification in Washington Heights to Westward Expansion and the Annexation of Texas
- Gentrification in Washington Heights to Westward Expansion and the Mexican-American War

Standards and Objectives:

NYS SS Standards: (for entire unit)

- 11.3a American nationalism was both strengthened and challenged by territorial expansion and economic growth.
- (Standards: 1, 3, 4, 5; Themes: TCC, GEO, GOV, ECO, TECH)
- 11.3b Different perspectives concerning constitutional, political, economic, and social issues contributed to the growth of sectionalism.
- (Standards: 1, 3, 4, 5; Themes: TCC, GEO, GOV, ECO, TECH)
- 11.4c Federal policies regarding westward expansion had positive effects on the national economy but negative consequences for Native Americans.
- (Standards: 1, 3, 4, 5; Themes: TCC, GEO, GOV, ECO, TECH)
- [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.9-10.1](#)
Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.
- [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.9-10.2](#)
Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of how key events or ideas develop over the course of the text
- [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.9-10.4](#)
Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including vocabulary describing political, social, or economic aspects of history/social science.
- [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.9-10.6](#)
Compare the point of view of two or more authors for how they treat the same or similar topics, including which details they include and emphasize in their respective accounts.

Objectives:

Students refine knowledge of debate position, role, and responsibilities.

Materials:

- Debate Format
- Debate Templates
- Anchor text:
 - *The Futurity of Nations*: John O'Sullivan
 - www.manhattantimesnews.com/ticked-off-on-thayerfastidio-en-thayer
- Supporting text:
 - www.villagevoice.com/news/a-manhattan-landlord-is-evicting-an-entire-block-of-latino-business-owners-7268863
 - www.patch.com/new-york/washington-heights-inwood/inwood-residents-speak-out-against-rezoning-plan-during-community
 - www.mailman.columbia.edu/public-health-now/news/gentrification-our-backyard
 - www.nytimes.com/2015/06/19/nyregion/longtime-tenants-in-manhattan-see-an-effort-to-push-them-out.html

Note: This is the culmination of a three- month unit on Westward Expansion and Migration vs. Gentrification: a five-day preparation for a debate.

Procedure:

- 1. Day 1:** Introduce/review the process of a debate: questions, groups, positions, role/round. Use the materials provided to discuss.
- 2. Day 2:** student group work
 - Students work on gathering information for debate
 - Teachers pull out groups of roles for opening, rebuttal, cross examination, and closing
- 3. Day 3:** Present rubric. Continue group preparation.
- 4. Days 4 and 5:** Dress rehearsal/Fishbowl debate
 - Debates are held as soon as rehearsals are completed.

Conclusion:

Students will reflect upon their participation in the debates.

Debate Format Information

Debate Format: What happens in each round?

Affirmative Opening Statement (2 minutes)

Negative Opening Statement (2 minutes)

Affirmative Rebuttal (3 minutes)

Negative Rebuttal (3 minutes)

Affirmative Cross Examination (5 minutes)

Negative Cross Examination (5 minutes)

Audience Cross Examination? (Friday Championship?)

Affirmative Closing (2 minutes)

Negative Closing (2 minutes)

Opening Statement:

Taken from “How to Prepare an Opening Statement” from teachers.northwestschool.org. Each side in a debate is called the “position.”

1. Your first line should state exactly what your side is arguing: “We believe the colonists should remain loyal to Britain and not seek independence,” or: “We believe we, the colonists, have a right to seek our independence from Britain.”
2. The rest of the statement needs to SUMMARIZE in PERSUASIVE LANGUAGE why your position is the strongest.
3. You don’t want to give too many details, but you should explain the strongest points you want to make. You should have at least three (3) solid points to make, but you can have more.
4. Think of this opening statement like a story you are telling about why your argument is the most convincing. Consider using QUOTATIONS that you think are emotionally powerful. You MUST appeal to people’s sense of REASON and EMOTION.
5. The opening statement will probably be one page long, and should not take more than two minutes to read.
6. When you present your opening statement: speak slowly, clearly, loudly. Do NOT stumble over your words. You should know the writing well enough to feel CONFIDENT and COMFORTABLE as you present your position.

Notes:

Rebuttal:

Taken from "How to Give a Rebuttal" by Jim Hanson from www.wcdebate.com

1. Prepare for the Rebuttal

First, THINK ABOUT YOUR SIDE. Compare your position to your opponent's position. For example, "We are for single-sex schools; they are opposed to them."

2. Second, find the arguments that support your side. Identify three or four key arguments that support your position. For example, "We are showing single-sex schools help girls learn more; single sex schools prevent harassment against girls."

3. Third, identify any opposing arguments that might defeat you. Look at your flow, think about what the opposing team appears to be winning. For example, "Hmm, they are showing that single-sex schools reinforce gender segregation in society." NOW, THINK HOW YOUR ARGUMENTS DEFEAT THIS ARGUMENT. For example, "We showed single-sex schools help girls and thereby break barriers in society."

Present the Rebuttal:

Begin by IDENTIFYING THE CHOICE FOR THE JUDGE. "This debate boils down to, do you give students a choice to go to single-sex schools or do you stop that choice."

Then, LIST OUT EACH OF MAIN REASONS TO SUPPORT YOUR SIDE. Present your reasons, follow it with an explanation and supporting arguments. After this, respond to any opposing arguments that might undermine your argument. Then, sum up and explain why this reason is a voting issue for you. For example, "The first reason to vote government is that single-sex schools stop harassment. Harassment is a serious problem--the opposition has conceded that girls are sexually harassed, touched inappropriately, even raped. Single-sex schools stop this harassment because the environment changes and there isn't the opportunity to harass. That is a fact. Now, the opposition wants to argue the harassment would just happen out of school. First, that concedes that we do stop the harassment in the school and that is a worthwhile achievement. Second, as we argued, women speak out and empower themselves in single-sex schools and that encourages change in our society to reduce the attitudes that contribute to harassment. In sum, our proposal puts a dent in harassment especially in schools and that justifies a government ballot."

Conclude the speech, requesting that the judge vote for your side.

Notes:

Cross Examination: Asking and Answering Questions in Cross-Examination

Taken from Breaking Down Barriers: How to Debate (2000 Edition)

The Questioner

1. Ask questions to clarify arguments.

Examples:

- “What was your second point?”
- “What program are you supporting?”
- “Are you for or against reforming welfare?”

2. Ask questions about the quality of your opponent’s evidence.

Examples:

- “What was the date of that evidence?”
- “Doesn’t your evidence actually say that we’re already resolving the fish shortage?”

3. Ask questions to get your opponents to admit their case has weaknesses.

Examples:

Q: “Your case supports nationwide sex education. Right?”

R: “Right.”

Q: “And your study that shows sex education works comes from one city.”

R: “Yes and the experts say it will work well in other areas.”

Q: “Hmmm. Do you think it will work even in areas where there are serious community objections to sex education?”

R: “Yes.”

Q: “Any proof for this?”

R: “Our study concluded it would work elsewhere.”

General Rules for the Questioner

1. **First, do not make statements.** The questioner should ask questions only. So, don’t present arguments or new evidence when you are the questioner.

Don’t say:

- “There aren’t many accidents.”
- “Let me read a piece of evidence. According to . . .”

Do ask:

- “How many accidents are there?”
- “Given that pitbulls have killed people, how can you argue that pitbulls are good?”

- 2. Second, don't masquerade your arguments as questions.** Ask questions to gain information, not to ask your opponent to confirm a point you made.

Don't say:

- "Didn't we show there are homeless people?"
- "Didn't I prove that many deaths occur each year?"

Do ask:

- "Did you show there are only a few homeless people?"
- "How many deaths each year do you claim occur?"

- 3. Third, and most important, be courteous.** Treat your opponents nicely, even if you feel they're being rude. Debate is supposed to be civil. If you want to duke it out, join boxing.

Don't do this:

Q: Is the Clinton administration acting on poverty?"

R: "Yes, it is."

Q: "What? Do you know anything?"

R: "I, uh . . ."

Q: "Look dummy. Clinton hasn't done nothing. Got it?"

Do this:

Q: "Is the Clinton administration acting on the poverty issue?"

R: "Yes, it is."

Q: "Do you have any support for your answer?"

R: "Um. Yes."

Q: "And what is that support?"

- 4. Fourth, give your opponent a chance to answer questions.**

Don't cut off your opponent like this:

Q: "Why?"

R: "Because of the . . ."

Q: "Are you sure . . ."

R: "Of c . . ."

Q: "Let's move on."

Do give your opponent a chance to answer:

Q: "Why hasn't there been action on these prescription drugs?"

R: "Because of the government regulations and because of industry profit motives."

Q: "Okay, but aren't . . ."

Don't ask several questions without giving your opponent a chance to respond:

- "What was the date of that evidence? . . . and what did it say?... And why did she say it?... Huh?"

Do ask one question at a time:

- "First, what was the date of that evidence?"

- 5. Fifth, maintain control of the cross-examination.** Allowing your opponent to answer your questions doesn't mean your opponent is entitled to give a full speech each time he or she answers. Just give him or her the needed time to answer.

Don't let the respondent question you when you're the questioner:

Q: "Why would the United States attack China?"

R: "Hmmm. Well, you answer this: Why would China attack the United States?"

Q: "Well. I don't know. Hmmm. I'll have to think about that. Do you have another question for me?"

Use your time for your questions. And use your questions to get information which will damage your opponent's case and build up your case.

The Respondent

- 1. Give clear, specific, concise answers.**

Don't answer like this:

- "The use of detrimental fluid acquisition in the pilot project examination elements makes the confusion understandable. The resulting effects of the H2O in the ground were not considered, however..."

Answer like this:

- Answer: "The pilot project didn't work because of the large amounts of water underground."
- Answer: "Yes."
- Answer: "Well, that's because the trees grow much faster."

- 2. Ask for clarification if the question is unclear.**

Examples:

- "Would you please repeat the question?"
- "I don't understand the question."
- "Would you reword your question."

- 3. Qualify your answers.**

Examples:

- "A qualified no."
- "Well, yes, but only if the road is built using the south route."

- 4. Retort questions that attack your arguments.**

Example:

Q: "Your case discusses a threat to cut off ties with the Mexican police."

R: "That's right. Until the drug traffic is cleared up, no ties with the Mexican police."

Q: "Won't that sour U.S.-Mexican relations?"

R: "No. It will make the relations better by clarifying and resolving the drug trafficking issue."

General Rules for the Respondent

- 1. First, Avoid being rude.** Don't get into an argument with the questioner.

Don't do this:

Q: "What is the date of your evidence?"

R: "Look, it's newer than your evidence. Your evidence is so old it belongs in a nursing home."

Do this:

Q: "What is the date of your evidence?"

R: "It's from 1999."

- 2. Second, don't give long treatises on your case.** Answer the question that your opponent asked. Don't restate every argument that supports your case.

Don't say:

- "Yes and, hey, have I told you the fourteen other ways our plan will save the world? Let me tell you all about it."

Do say:

- "Yes it will help the environment because litterers will be heavily fined."

- 3. Third, don't read new evidence.** Cross examination is for questions about arguments that you and your opponent have already made in speeches. It is not for questions about evidence that you have not read yet.

Don't say:

- "Well, this piece of evidence will answer that. According to..."

Do say:

- "Space stations can give added energy and we can document that in a later speech."
- "When you raise that issue, we will respond."

- 4. Fourth, be honest.** Don't answer questions with lies just to make your case appear better. Answer questions truthfully.

Don't say:

- "No. George Bush was never president of the United States."

Do say:

- "Yes, it is true Bush was president."

- 5. Fifth, don't ask questions unless you need to clarify your opponent's question.** Remember that you are the respondent, not the questioner. So, answer; don't ask.

Closing Argument:

Taken from *“Writing an EPIC Debate Closing Statement”* by Shannon Galloway

Closing Statements... What are they?

When a lawyer or debater is DONE with all of the actual arguing, then he or she gets one last shot to convince the judge: the closing statement. This speech is a SUMMARY of all of the points that have been discussed, kind of like the conclusion paragraph of an essay.

However, it’s also MORE than just a summary. It needs to...

- answer any lingering questions,
- respond to any recent attacks from the other side,
- restate the BIGGEST reasons why your side is right, and
- end in a strong, confident, memorable way.

Remember: this is your FINAL IMPRESSION, the LAST CHANCE you have to change their minds

The Basics of an EPIC Closing Statement

- One single TOPIC SENTENCE that restates your opinion/claim.
- MULTIPLE sentences that review your reasons (AND why they are GOOD reasons!).
- One final, very dramatic sentence (or two) to leave an EPIC last impression.

Notes:

Debate Template: **Opening Statement**

Directions:

Use the below templates to complete your writing for your specific role in the debate. Type directly in this document. Use role descriptions in class to answer any questions (All material below was taken from them.).

Opening Statement:

This lasts two (2) minutes and needs to use reason and emotion. Remember to speak slowly, clearly, loudly. You should know the writing well enough to feel confident and comfortable as you present your position.

1. State in 1-2 sentences your team's position.

2. Use persuasive language to explain why your position is the strongest.

3. List your three (3) solid points/claims/arguments:

- **Point 1:**

- **Point 2:**

- **Point 3:**

4. What quote will you be using for each point above?

5. Summarize your three (3) points including the quotes:

Debate Template: Rebuttal

- 1. This about your side.** Compare your position to your opponent's position. For example, "We believe gentrification is the same as westward expansion and they believe it is not!" *Type directly in this document.*

- 2.** Find the arguments that support your side. Identify three (3) or four (4) key arguments that support your position. This connect to the opening statement.

Example point: For example, money and power has played a role in both westward expansion and gentrification.

Example point: This showsthat they are the same because Americans used their money and power to take over lands int eh 19th Century and now the same is happening in Washing ton Heights with your professionals and developers taking over buildings.

- **Point 1:**

Evidence supporting your point 1: _____

Explain why this supports your point 1: _____

- **Point 2:**

Evidence supporting your point 2: _____

Explain why this supports your point 2: _____

- **Point 3:**

Evidence supporting your point 3: _____

Explain why this supports your point 3: _____

- 3. Identify opposing arguments (counterclaim) that might defeat you.** Look at your flow, think about what the opoposing team appears to be winning. You may be thinking on your feet here because you need to listen to what the opening statement was andbe able to have a rebuttal.

Debate Template: **Cross-Examinations**

- 1. Clarify Opponent's Argument:** State 3 questions you will ask to get opposition to clarify argument

Question 1:

Question 2:

Question 3:

- 2. Challenge Opponent's evidence:** State 3 possible questions that can challenge opponent's quality of evidence.

Question 1:

Question 2:

Question 3:

- 3. Get Opponent to reveal weakness of argument:** State 3 possible questions that can reveal weakness of opponent's evidence.

Question 1:

Question 2:

Question 3:

Debate Template: **Closing Statement**

1. Summary: Provide a summary of your team’s three key points:

2. Counterclaims: State 3 counterclaims you suspect will be made by the opposing side:

Counterclaim 1:

Counterclaim 2:

Counterclaim 3:

3. Counterclaim Response: Provide your response to each counterclaim:

Response to counterclaim 1:

Response to counterclaim 2:

Response to counterclaim 3:

4. Final, dramatic sentence (or two): What dramatic sentence or two do you plan to end with?

Debate Rubric: Opening Statement

	95 – Exceeding Mastery (5)	85 – Meeting Mastery (4)	75 – Approaching Mastery (3)	65 – Low Mastery (2)	55 – Initiating Mastery (1)
Position Team’s Argument	The team’s position and key points is clearly established in the student’s individual presentation. The student also summarizes the key points with effective explanations.	The team’s position and key points is clearly established in the student’s individual presentation. The student also summarizes the key points.	The team’s position is clearly established in the student’s individual presentation and with clearly stating the three key supporting points.	The team’s position is clearly established in the student’s individual presentation but without stating the three key supporting points.	The team’s position is not clearly established in the student’s individual presentation.
Evidence Specific Varied Accurate	There is a variety of specific, purposeful, and related terms, events, places, and quotations from across lessons and sources as well as outside knowledge. The evidence is always applied accurately and explained clearly.	There is a variety of specific terms, events, places, concepts, and quotations applied accurately and explained clearly.	There are some specific terms, events, places, and concepts. The evidence is sometimes applied accurately.	Little to no specific terms, events, and places.	No specific terms, events, and places.
Analysis Developed Connections	There are extensive connections between ideas and historical content across lessons and units. The connections made show a deep understanding of the content. The analysis represents a thoroughly developed discussion of the topic.	There are many connections made between ideas and historical evidence across lessons and units. The connections represent a strong understanding of the content. The analysis represents a developed discussion of the topic.	There are some connections made between ideas and historical evidence which shows a satisfactory understanding of the content. The analysis is more than a basic summary of the historical content.	There are few connections made between ideas and historical evidence. The analysis is mostly summary showing a basic understanding of the content.	There are no connections made between ideas and historical evidence. Analysis shows limited understanding of the content.

Debate Rubric: Cross Exam

	95 – Exceeding Mastery (5)	85 – Meeting Mastery (4)	75 – Approaching Mastery (3)	65 – Low Mastery (2)	55 – Initiating Mastery (1)
Position Team’s Argument	The student’s questions/ answers are in agreement with the team’s position and argument. The questions/answers help support, develop, and explain the team’s position and argument.	The student’s questions/ answers are in agreement with the team’s position and argument. The questions/answers help support and develop the team’s position and argument.	The student’s questions/ answers are in agreement with the team’s position and argument. The questions/answers help support the team’s position and argument.	The student’s questions/ answers are in agreement with the team’s position and argument. However, the questions/answers do not help develop, support, or explain the team’s position and argument.	The student’s questions/ answers are not in agreement with the team’s position and argument.
Evidence Specific Varied Accurate	There is a variety of specific, purposeful, and related terms, events, places, and quotations from across lessons and sources as well as outside knowledge. The evidence is always applied accurately and explained clearly.	There is a variety of specific terms, events, places, concepts, and quotations applied accurately and explained clearly.	There are some specific terms, events, places, and concepts. The evidence is sometimes applied accurately.	Little to no specific terms, events, and places.	No specific terms, events, and places.
Analysis Developed Connections	The student’s questions follow a logical and strategic pattern. The questions effectively use the opposing team’s answers to highlight the weakness of the opposition’s argument and help develop, support, and explain their team’s position. The answers address the opposition’s counterclaims, reinforces the strength to their team’s argument demonstrating a deep understanding of the historical content.	The student’s questions follow a logical and strategic pattern. The questions use the opposing team’s answers to highlight the weakness of the opposition’s argument and help support their team’s position. The answers address the opposition’s counterclaims, reinforces the strength of their team’s argument, and represent a strong understanding of the historical content.	The student’s questions follow a logical and strategic pattern. The questions use the opposing team’s answers to highlight the weakness of the opposition’s argument. The answers address the opposition’s counterclaims and represent a satisfactory understanding of the content.	The student asks questions to try and highlight the weakness of the opposition’s argument. The student attempts to answer the opposition’s questions but the responses might be inaccurate or incomplete representing a basic understanding of the content.	The student asks an insufficient amount of questions. The questions do not highlight the weakness of the opposition’s argument. The student does not make an attempt to answer or is unable to answer the opposition’s questions representing a limiting understanding of the content.

Debate Rubric: **Rebuttal**

	95 – Exceeding Mastery (5)	85 – Meeting Mastery (4)	75 – Approaching Mastery (3)	65 – Low Mastery (2)	55 – Initiating Mastery (1)
Position Team’s Argument	The team’s position is clearly compared to the opponent’s side. The individual presents clear arguments that support their side. The presenter clearly presents opposing arguments (counterclaims) and clearly counters the arguments.	The team’s position is compared to the opponent’s side. The individual presents arguments that support their side. The presenter presents counterclaims and counters them.	The team’s position is compared to the opponent’s side. The individual presents an argument and it may include an unclear presentation of a counterclaim and counters it.	The team’s position is somewhat compared to the opponent’s side. The individual presents an argument but may lack clarity and may or may not present a counterclaim and may or may not have a counter to the counterclaim.	The team’s is not compared to the opponent’s side. There is no argument made and no counterclaim presented and no counter presented.
Evidence Specific Varied Accurate	There is a variety of specific, purposeful, and related terms, events, places, and quotations from across lessons and sources as well as outside knowledge. The evidence is always applied accurately and explained clearly.	There is a variety of specific terms, events, places, concepts, and quotations applied accurately and explained clearly.	There are some specific terms, events, places, and concepts. The evidence is sometimes applied accurately.	Little to no specific terms, events, and places.	No specific terms, events, and places.
Analysis Developed Connections	There are extensive connections between ideas and historical content across lessons and units. The connections made show a deep understanding of the westward expansion and gentrification. The analysis represents a thoroughly developed discussion of the topic.	There are many connections made between ideas and historical evidence across lessons and units. The connections represent a strong understanding of the westward expansion and gentrification. The analysis represents a developed discussion of the topic.	There are some connections made between ideas and historical evidence which shows a satisfactory understanding of westward expansion and gentrification. The analysis is more than a basic summary of the historical content and gentrification.	There are few connections made between ideas and historical evidence. The analysis is mostly summary showing a basic understanding of the westward expansion and gentrification.	There are no connections made between ideas and historical evidence. Analysis is confused as summary and shows limited understanding of westward expansion and gentrification.

Debate Rubric: Closing Statment

	95 – Exceeding Mastery (5)	85 – Meeting Mastery (4)	75 – Approaching Mastery (3)	65 – Low Mastery (2)	55 – Initiating Mastery (1)
Position Team’s Argument	The team’s position and key points is clearly established in the student’s individual presentation. The student also clearly and effectively addresses the counterclaims of the opposing team.	The team’s position and key points is clearly established in the student’s individual presentation. The student also addresses the the counterclaims of the opposing team but may not refute each of them.	The team’s position is clearly established in the student’s individual presentation and with clearly stating the three key supporting points. The student makes an attempt to address the counterclaims of the opposing team.	The team’s position is clearly established in the student’s individual presentation but without stating the three key supporting points and does not address the counterclaims of the opposing team.	The team’s position is not clearly established in the student’s individual presentation.
Evidence Specific Varied Accurate	There is a variety of specific, purposeful, and related terms, events, places, and quotations from across lessons and sources as well as outside knowledge. The evidence is always applied accurately and explained clearly.	There is a variety of specific terms, events, places, concepts, and quotations applied accurately and explained clearly.	There are some specific terms, events, places, and concepts. The evidence is sometimes applied accurately.	Little to no specific terms, events, and places.	No specific terms, events, and places.
Analysis Developed Connections	There are extensive connections made between ideas and historical evidence which address the counterclaims of the opposing team. The analysis represents a thoroughly developed discussion of the team’s position and why the opposition’s counterclaims are insufficient.	There are many connections made between ideas and historical evidence which address the counterclaims of the opposing team. The analysis represents a developed discussion of the team’s position.	There are some connections made between ideas and historical evidence that address some of the counterclaims of the opposing team which shows a satisfactory understanding of the content. The analysis is more than a basic summary of the historical content.	There are few connections made between ideas and historical evidence. The analysis is mostly summary showing a basic understanding of the content.	There are no connections made between ideas and historical evidence. Analysis is confused as summary and shows limited understanding of the content.