



# WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATE

---

## SEPTEMBER 2024 SAMPLE MOTIONS



**PREPARED MOTIONS** **3**

- 1. Excluding death as an impact, This House prefers a post-COVID society..... 3**
- 2. This House would protect the private lives of politicians..... 4**
- 3. This House believes that satire, as a form of political commentary, does more harm than good. .... 5**
- 4. This House would significantly limit private land ownership. .... 6**
- 5. This House would ban the use of Performance Enhancing Drugs (PEDs) in professional sports. .... 7**

**IMPROMPTU MOTIONS** **8**

- 1. This House believes that prefers nature over nurture as a primary parenting style. .... 8**
- 2. This House believes that violence is a just response to political oppression. .... 9**
- 3. This House would not punish economic crimes against the poor. .... 10**
- 4. This House believes that the feminist movement should support the narrative that "beauty does not matter" over the narrative that "all bodies are beautiful." .... 11**
- 5. This House regrets the narrative that a longer lifespan is good for humanity. .... 12**

# WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATE

Sample Motions | September 2024

--

## Prepared Motions

### 1. Excluding death as an impact, This House prefers a post-COVID society.

**Context:** This debate will explore the societal changes that have emerged as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants will consider whether the transformations in work culture, technology adoption, healthcare systems, and social behaviors have ultimately led to a more resilient and adaptable society. The proposition will argue that these changes have brought about positive long-term effects, such as increased flexibility, innovation, and a heightened awareness of public health. The opposition, however, may contend that these changes have exacerbated inequalities, mental health issues, and social isolation, questioning whether the post-COVID society is truly preferable.

#### Proposition Arguments:

1. Remote Work Flexibility: Increased work-life balance through widespread adoption of remote work.
2. Healthcare Advancements: Accelerated medical innovation and telehealth integration.
3. Digital Transformation: Rapid digitalization has improved accessibility and efficiency in many sectors.

#### Opposition Arguments:

1. Social Isolation: Increased remote interactions have weakened social bonds and community ties.
2. Widened Inequality: Economic disparities have grown, particularly affecting vulnerable populations.
3. Mental Health Crisis: Heightened stress and anxiety have led to worsening mental health outcomes.

## 2. This House would protect the private lives of politicians.

**Context:** This debate centers on whether the private lives of politicians should be shielded from public scrutiny. The proposition will argue that politicians, like any other individuals, have a right to privacy, and that their personal lives should not be subjected to intense public or media scrutiny unless it directly affects their public duties. The opposition, however, might assert that the personal conduct of politicians can reflect their integrity, judgment, and ability to serve, making it relevant to the public who elects them.

### Proposition Arguments:

1. Right to Privacy: Politicians deserve the same privacy protections as any other citizen.
2. Focus on Policy: Public attention should focus on politicians' professional actions and decisions, not personal matters.
3. Deterrent to Public Service: Invasion of privacy can discourage qualified individuals from entering politics.

### Opposition Arguments:

1. Public Trust: Private conduct can reflect a politician's character and integrity, impacting public trust.
2. Transparency and Accountability: Full transparency ensures politicians are held accountable for their actions, both public and private.
3. Conflict of Interest: Personal lives can reveal potential conflicts of interest that may affect public decision-making.

### **3. This House believes that satire, as a form of political commentary, does more harm than good.**

**Context:** This debate considers the impact of satire as a form of political commentary and whether it ultimately contributes positively or negatively to public discourse. At its core, the debate questions the role of satire in shaping political opinions, fostering civic engagement, and holding power to account. It also examines whether satire trivializes serious issues, spreads misinformation, or deepens political divides by relying on humor and exaggeration.

#### **Proposition Arguments:**

1. **Trivializes Issues:** Satire can oversimplify complex political matters, reducing their seriousness.
2. **Spreads Misinformation:** Humor can blur the lines between fact and fiction, leading to misunderstandings.
3. **Polarizes Opinions:** Satirical commentary may deepen divisions by reinforcing biases and hostility.

#### **Opposition Arguments:**

1. **Encourages Engagement:** Satire can motivate audiences to engage with political issues and think critically.
2. **Holds Power Accountable:** It serves as a tool for critique, exposing hypocrisy and corruption in a humorous way.
3. **Promotes Discourse:** Satire can spark conversations and challenge prevailing narratives in an accessible manner.

#### 4. This House would significantly limit private land ownership.

**Context:** This debate focuses on the implications of significantly limiting private land ownership and its potential impact on society. It raises fundamental questions about the balance between individual property rights and the collective good, exploring issues such as land use, environmental sustainability, and social equity. The discussion also examines the historical context of land ownership, including its role in wealth accumulation and inequality, as well as the potential benefits of reallocation for public resources and housing.

##### **Proposition Arguments:**

1. Promotes Equality: Reducing private land ownership can help address wealth disparities and promote social equity.
2. Environmental Stewardship: Limiting land ownership can facilitate sustainable land use and protect natural resources.
3. Public Good: Reallocating land for community use can improve access to housing, parks, and public services.

##### **Opposition Arguments:**

1. Individual Rights: Private land ownership is a fundamental right that supports personal freedom and autonomy.
2. Economic Growth: Land ownership incentivizes investment and development, driving economic growth and innovation.
3. Efficient Resource Management: Property rights encourage responsible stewardship and maintenance of land, benefiting communities.

## 5. This House would ban the use of Performance Enhancing Drugs (PEDs) in professional sports.

**Context:** This debate explores the broader implications of banning Performance Enhancing Drugs (PEDs) in professional sports, considering the values that underpin competitive athletics and the nature of fairness in competition. It raises fundamental questions about the balance between health and performance, the ethical responsibilities of athletes, and the impact of doping on the integrity of sports.

### Proposition Arguments:

1. **Fairness in Competition:** Banning PEDs ensures a level playing field, where success is determined by natural talent and hard work.
2. **Athlete Health and Safety:** Eliminating PEDs reduces the risk of serious health issues associated with their use, protecting athletes' well-being.
3. **Integrity of Sports:** A ban upholds the spirit of competition, reinforcing trust in the fairness and legitimacy of athletic achievements.

### Opposition Arguments:

1. **Athlete Autonomy:** Athletes should have the right to make their own choices regarding their bodies and performance, including the use of PEDs.
2. **Safe Regulation:** With proper oversight, PEDs can be used safely, potentially enhancing performance without compromising health.
3. **Evolving Nature of Sports:** PEDs are already part of the sports landscape; banning them may not eliminate their use and could lead to a culture of secrecy and deception.

## Impromptu Motions

### 1. This House believes that prefers nature over nurture as a primary parenting style.

**Context:** This debate explores the ongoing discussion about the most effective approach to parenting: whether to rely more on natural instincts and emotional bonding (nature) or on structured guidance and environmental influences (nurture). It raises fundamental questions about the role of biology versus experience in a child's development. The debate also touches on the broader implications of parenting choices, such as how much influence parents should have over shaping their child's personality and future, and whether a child's innate characteristics should guide parenting decisions.

#### Proposition Arguments:

1. **Innate Bonding:** Natural instincts foster a deeper emotional connection between parent and child.
2. **Respecting Individuality:** Emphasizing nature allows children to develop their unique traits and abilities.
3. **Organic Development:** Relying on nature supports a more natural and stress-free upbringing.

#### Opposition Arguments:

1. **Shaping Potential:** Structured guidance helps maximize a child's talents and prepares them for society.
2. **Environmental Influence:** Nurture recognizes the importance of education and external factors in development.
3. **Building Resilience:** Intentional parenting techniques teach essential life skills and adaptability.



## 2. This House believes that violence is a just response to political oppression.

**Context:** This debate examines the complex relationship between violence and political oppression, questioning whether violent resistance can ever be justified in the face of systemic injustice. It raises profound ethical and philosophical questions about the nature of justice, the effectiveness of nonviolent versus violent methods of resistance, and the consequences of such actions for society at large.

### Proposition Arguments:

1. **Legitimate Resistance:** Violence can be a justified response when oppressive regimes deny basic human rights and peaceful means of protest are ineffective.
2. **Reclaiming Agency:** Engaging in violent resistance allows oppressed groups to assert their autonomy and fight back against systemic injustice.
3. **Historical Precedents:** Many successful movements against tyranny and oppression, such as revolutions, have involved the use of violence to achieve political change.

### Opposition Arguments:

1. **Moral High Ground:** Nonviolent resistance maintains moral authority and can foster broader support for the cause by appealing to universal human rights.
2. **Escalation of Conflict:** Violence often leads to further oppression, suffering, and instability, potentially undermining the very goals of liberation movements.
3. **Ineffective Outcomes:** Historical evidence shows that violent uprisings can result in prolonged conflict and may not lead to lasting political change or improvement in conditions.

### 3. This House would not punish economic crimes against the poor.

**Context:** This debate raises critical questions about justice, accountability, and the role of socioeconomic status in the legal system. The discussion delves into the implications of economic exploitation, the effectiveness of punitive versus restorative approaches, and how the legal system addresses the intersections of poverty and crime. Additionally, it reflects on societal values regarding accountability, the protection of marginalized communities, and the potential for systemic change in addressing the root causes of economic disparity.

#### **Proposition Arguments:**

1. Focus on Restoration: Emphasizing restorative justice allows for healing and support for victims, rather than punitive measures that may further harm them.
2. Systemic Inequities: Punishing economic crimes may fail to address the underlying systemic issues that contribute to poverty and exploitation.
3. Disproportionate Impact: Economic penalties often disproportionately affect the poor, making it unjust to impose harsh punishments on those who are already marginalized.

#### **Opposition Arguments:**

1. Rule of Law: Failing to punish economic crimes undermines the rule of law and can create a perception that such crimes are acceptable.
2. Deterrence: Punishing offenders serves as a deterrent against future exploitation and protects vulnerable populations from further harm.
3. Accountability: Economic crimes, regardless of the victim's status, deserve accountability to ensure that perpetrators face consequences for their actions.

#### **4. This House believes that the feminist movement should support the narrative that "beauty does not matter" over the narrative that "all bodies are beautiful."**

**Context:** This debate examines the feminist movement's stance on body image and beauty standards, specifically whether it should advocate for the narrative that "beauty does not matter" rather than the idea that "all bodies are beautiful." It raises important questions about the societal emphasis on physical appearance and how it influences women's empowerment and self-worth. The discussion explores the implications of these narratives on self-acceptance, the impact of beauty standards on mental health, and the potential for fostering a culture that values individuals beyond their physical attributes.

##### **Proposition Arguments:**

1. **Redefining Worth:** Emphasizing that beauty is not a measure of value encourages individuals to focus on their talents, intelligence, and character rather than physical appearance.
2. **Combating Objectification:** This narrative challenges societal norms that objectify individuals based on their looks, promoting a more holistic view of identity.
3. **Fostering True Empowerment:** Supporting the idea that beauty does not matter can empower individuals to embrace authenticity and reject harmful beauty standards.

##### **Opposition Arguments:**

1. **Promoting Inclusivity:** Acknowledging that all bodies are beautiful fosters inclusivity and acceptance of diverse body types, helping to combat stigma and discrimination.
2. **Enhancing Self-Confidence:** Celebrating body diversity can boost self-esteem and encourage individuals to embrace their unique features, promoting positive body image.
3. **Challenging Beauty Norms:** This narrative directly challenges unrealistic beauty standards perpetuated by media and society, advocating for a more expansive definition of beauty.

## 5. This House regrets the narrative that a longer lifespan is good for humanity.

**Context:** This debate addresses the implications of the narrative that a longer lifespan is inherently beneficial for humanity. It raises critical questions about the quality of life, the impact of aging populations on society, and the ethical considerations surrounding healthcare and resources. The discussion examines whether an extended lifespan leads to increased well-being and fulfillment or if it may result in challenges such as overpopulation, strained healthcare systems, and the burden of age-related diseases.

### Proposition Arguments:

1. **Quality Over Quantity:** A longer lifespan does not guarantee a better quality of life, as extended aging can lead to increased suffering and chronic health issues.
2. **Resource Strain:** An aging population can place significant pressure on healthcare systems, social services, and economic resources, potentially leading to societal instability.
3. **Overpopulation Concerns:** Increased longevity contributes to overpopulation, exacerbating environmental degradation and resource depletion.

### Opposition Arguments:

1. **Advancements in Health:** Longer lifespans often accompany advancements in healthcare and quality of life, allowing individuals to enjoy healthier, more active years.
2. **Wisdom and Experience:** An extended lifespan allows for the accumulation of knowledge, wisdom, and experience, benefiting society through mentorship and leadership.
3. **Fulfillment of Potential:** Longer lives provide more opportunities for personal growth, achievement, and fulfillment, enabling individuals to pursue their passions and contribute to society over a more extended period.