

EaD Comprehensive Lesson Plans



or



0248043888

<https://www.TeachersAvenue.net>

<https://TrendingGhana.net>

<https://www.mcgregorinriis.com>

BASIC 9

WEEKLY LESSON PLAN – WEEK 2

Strand:	The Family And The Community		Sub-Strand:	Religion and Social Cohesion	
Content Standard:	B9 3.1.1: Identify and apply ways people with different religions can co-exist peacefully				
Indicator (s)	B9 3.1.1.1 Identify and explain examples of tolerant and intolerant communities		Performance Indicator: Learners can apply the qualities of tolerance in their daily lives		
Week Ending	19-01-2024				
Class	B.S.9	Class Size:		Duration:	
Subject	RME				
Reference	RME Curriculum, Teachers Resource Pack, Learners Resource Pack, Textbook.				
Teaching / Learning Resources	Poster, Pictures, video, charts.		Core Competencies:	Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Communication and Collaboration.	
DAY/DATE	PHASE 1 : STARTER	PHASE 2: MAIN			PHASE 3: REFLECTION
MONDAY	Discuss with the Learners about the meanings of keywords and terminologies. Terminologies; - tolerance - Intolerance - Segregation - Democracy - Diversity - prejudice	- Assist Learners to explain the concept “Religious tolerance”. - Learners brainstorm to differentiate between a religious tolerance and religious intolerance. - Show Learners pictures and video displaying a community which has experienced religious tolerance and a community, which has experienced religious intolerance. - Discuss with the Learners about the characteristics of tolerance. Characteristics of a tolerant community; - Peaceful relationship among members Development in unity Inter-religious marriages Characteristics of an intolerant community; Quarrels and mistrust among members Lack of or poor development Lack of or poor inter-personal relationship Qualities of tolerance; Embracing diversity. The world, which we dwell in, is diverse. This means that we accept			Through questions and answers, conclude the lesson. Exercise; - What is Religious tolerance ? - State 3 characteristics of tolerance.

		the fact that there are people who are different from us. The moment we accept differences, and realize that diversity is a central feature of humanity, that always was, is and will be, then we find inner peace and contentment, because then we are not seeking to obliterate that which is but natural nor are we then looking down upon or dismissing people who are different from us in any way whatsoever. ▪ Not retorting. At times we are faced with acerbic and bitter people. Whose toxic remarks goad us to a tit for tat reply. But being tolerant of their negativity and by ignoring their hurtful remarks we maintain composure, do not lose our cool and handle difficult situations tactfully. ▪ Forgiving mistakes. People make mistakes all the time. We do not embody perfection. Being tolerant means forgiving people for their misdemeanors and not nitpicking on them constantly. ▪ Worrying about our own neck. We have a very short time on earth. It will be no exaggeration to suggest that the years of our entire life can be counted on our fingertips. This being the case, it would be sheer folly to spend a significant proportion of our time on trivial matters, which are not our remit of accountability. Instead of worrying about the salvation of others our focus should be our own self because ultimately we won't be questioned about the deeds of anyone except our own. ▪ Respecting people's rights. To deliberately infringe on their rights means we do not have any regard for their humanity. A sign of our tolerant character is our respect for the rights of individuals. 5. Practicing tolerance within the family. Tolerance can be cemented in an individual from the home. The home is the place where one learns to be tolerant for intolerance too is picked up from the home and family. The views and attitudes that parents pass on to their children shape their personality. The child also learns from the relationship of his father and mother. If the spouses are intolerant of one another, constantly picking up arguments the child will do the same. Once he walks out of his home, then he will have that same mindset. He will see people as his adversaries just like he saw	
--	--	--	--

		his parents to be at constant animosity with one another. Therefore it is vital that family life be stable and serene so that parents do not pass on intolerant attitudes to their children.	
THURSDAY	Discuss with the Learners about the paradox of tolerance.	1. Assist Learners to identify the 3 threats as enumerated by Preston_King that tolerance is characterized. 2. Learners in small groups to discuss and report to the class on why intolerance is an obstacle to a tolerant society. 3. Discuss with the Learners about the difference between tolerance and freedom of speech. Intolerance as an obstacle to a tolerant society Other solutions to the paradox of intolerance frame it in more practical terms, a solution forwarded by philosophers such as Karl Popper. Popper underlines the importance of rational argument, drawing attention to the fact that many intolerant philosophies reject rational argument and thus prevent calls for tolerance from being received on equal terms:^[5] Less well known [than other paradoxes] is the <i>paradox of tolerance</i>: Unlimited tolerance must lead to the disappearance of tolerance. If we extend unlimited tolerance even to those who are intolerant, if we are not prepared to defend a tolerant society against the onslaught of the intolerant, then the tolerant will be destroyed, and tolerance with them.—In this formulation, I do not imply, for instance, that we should always suppress the utterance of intolerant philosophies; as long as we can counter them by rational argument and keep them in check by public opinion, suppression would certainly be most unwise. But we should claim the <i>right</i> to suppress them if necessary even by force; for it may easily turn out that they are not prepared to meet us on the level of rational argument, but begin by denouncing all argument; they may forbid their followers to listen to rational argument, because it is deceptive, and teach them to answer arguments by the use of their fists or pistols. We should therefore claim, in the name of tolerance, the right not to tolerate the intolerant. We should claim that any movement preaching intolerance places itself outside the law and we should consider incitement to	Through questions and answers, conclude the lesson. Exercise; Differentiate between tolerance and freedom of speech.

		intolerance and persecution as criminal, in the same way as we should consider incitement to murder, or to kidnapping, or to the revival of the slave trade, as criminal. Popper also draws attention to the fact that intolerance is often asserted through the use of violence, drawing on a point re-iterated by philosophers such as John Rawls. In <i>A Theory of Justice</i>, Rawls asserts that a society must tolerate the intolerant in order to be a just society, but qualifies this assertion by stating that exceptional circumstances may call for society to exercise its right to self-preservation against acts of intolerance that threaten the liberty and security of the tolerant.^[6] Such formulations address the inherent moral contradiction that arises from the assumption that the moral virtue of tolerance is at odds with the toleration of moral wrongs, which can be resolved by grounding toleration within limits defined by a higher moral order. <u>Tolerance and freedom of speech</u> The paradox of tolerance is important in the discussion of what, if any, boundaries are to be set on freedom of speech. Raphael Cohen-Almagor, in the chapter "Popper's Paradox of Tolerance and Its Modification" of <i>The Boundaries of Liberty and Tolerance: The Struggle Against Kahanism in Israel</i> (1994), asserts that to allow freedom of speech to those who would use it to eliminate the very principle upon which that freedom relies is paradoxical.^[7] Michel Rosenfeld, in the <i>Harvard Law Review</i> in 1987, stated: "it seems contradictory to extend freedom of speech to extremists who ... if successful, ruthlessly suppress the speech of those with whom they disagree." Rosenfeld points out that Western European democracies and the US have opposite approaches to the question of tolerance of hate speech, in that where most Western European nations place legal penalties on the circulation of extremely intolerant or fringe political materials (e.g. Holocaust denial) as being inherently socially disruptive or inciting of violence, the US has ruled that such materials are in and of themselves protected by the principle of freedom of speech and thus immune to restriction, except when calls to violence or other illegal activities are explicitly and directly made	
--	--	--	--

Name of Teacher:

School:

District: