



WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATE

JANUARY 2026

SAMPLE MOTIONS



PREPARED MOTIONS	3
1. This House would mandate organ donation after death.....	3
2. This House, as the African Union, would grant diplomatic recognition to the Republic of Somaliland as an independent state.	4
3. This House prefers a world where generative artificial intelligence is integrated into education.....	5
4. This House regrets the rise of the use of GLP-1 agonists as a tool for weight loss.	6
5. This House believes that vigilantism is a legitimate response to the failure of the justice system.....	7
IMPROPTU MOTIONS	8
1. This House would ban all forms of online anonymity.	8
2. This House believes that states should heavily tax companies whose technologies significantly reduce human labor demand.....	9
3. This House believes that emerging democracies should prioritize economic development over political liberalization.	10
4. This House regrets the rise of political influencers as primary sources of political information for young people.....	11
5. This House believes that art should never be censored.	12

WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATE

Sample Motions | January 2026

Prepared Motions

1. This House would mandate organ donation after death.

Context: This debate considers whether governments should require mandatory organ donation after death. Some people may argue that compulsory donation would save thousands of lives, reduce transplant shortages, and treat organs as a public good once a person no longer needs them. Others may believe that mandating donation violates bodily autonomy, religious beliefs, and individual consent, even after death. The discussion weighs public health benefits against personal rights and ethical boundaries.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Saves Lives:** Mandatory donation would dramatically increase the supply of organs, reducing preventable deaths.
- **Public Good Principle:** After death, organs can serve society at no cost to the donor.
- **Efficiency and Fairness:** Eliminates opt-in barriers and unequal donation rates across communities.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Violates Autonomy:** Individuals should retain control over their bodies, even after death.
- **Religious and Cultural Objections:** Mandatory policies may conflict with deeply held beliefs.
- **Erodes Trust:** Coercive policies could reduce public confidence in medical institutions.

2. This House, as the African Union, would grant diplomatic recognition to the Republic of Somaliland as an independent state.

Context: This debate considers whether the African Union (AU) should formally recognize the Republic of Somaliland as an independent state, separate from Somalia. Some people may argue that Somaliland has demonstrated long-term political stability, effective self-governance, and democratic legitimacy compared to much of the region. Others may believe that recognition would undermine Somalia's territorial integrity, encourage secessionist movements across Africa, and conflict with the African Union's long-standing commitment to existing borders. The debate centers on stability, legitimacy, and regional precedent.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Rewards Stability and Governance:** Somaliland has maintained peace, democratic institutions, and functional governance for decades.
- **Enhances Regional Security:** Recognition allows formal cooperation on trade, security, and counterterrorism.
- **Respects Self-Determination:** Recognition acknowledges the clear and sustained will of Somaliland's population to govern independently.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Threatens Territorial Integrity:** Recognition undermines Somalia's sovereignty and ongoing reunification efforts.
- **Dangerous Precedent:** Recognition could encourage secessionist claims across Africa, increasing instability.
- **Weakens AU Norms:** Recognition contradicts the AU principle of preserving colonial-era borders to avoid conflict.

3. This House prefers a world where generative artificial intelligence is integrated into education.

Context: This debate explores whether education systems should widely integrate generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools into teaching and learning. Some people may argue that AI can personalize education, expand access to resources, and better prepare students for a technology-driven future. Others may believe that heavy reliance on AI undermines critical thinking, worsens inequality between students, and erodes the role of teachers. The discussion weighs innovation and accessibility against educational integrity and equity.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Personalized Learning:** AI can tailor lessons, feedback, and pacing to individual student needs.
- **Expanded Access:** Generative AI provides tutoring and learning support to students regardless of location or resources.
- **Future Readiness:** Familiarity with AI tools prepares students for modern workplaces and digital literacy demands.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Erodes Critical Thinking:** Overreliance on AI may reduce students' ability to think independently and problem-solve.
- **Deepens Inequality:** Students with better access to technology benefit more, widening educational gaps.
- **Undermines Teaching Roles:** Excessive AI use may devalue educators and weaken human mentorship in learning.

4. This House regrets the rise of the use of GLP-1 agonists as a tool for weight loss.

Context: This debate examines the growing use of GLP-1 agonists (such as Ozempic or Wegovy) as tools for weight loss. Some people may argue that these medications offer an effective, medical solution for obesity and related health risks, improving quality of life and reducing strain on healthcare systems. Others may believe their normalization medicalizes body size, fuels unhealthy beauty standards, and shifts attention away from sustainable lifestyle, mental health, and structural drivers of obesity. The discussion centers on health, ethics, and societal impact.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Medicalizes Body Image:** Normalizing GLP-1 use reinforces the idea that weight loss is a medical necessity rather than a personal or holistic health choice.
- **Unclear Long-Term Effects:** Widespread use outpaces long-term research on safety, dependency, and metabolic consequences.
- **Shifts Focus from Root Causes:** Reliance on medication diverts attention from nutrition access, mental health, and environmental contributors to obesity.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Effective Health Intervention:** GLP-1 agonists significantly reduce obesity-related risks like diabetes and heart disease.
- **Expands Access to Treatment:** GLP-1 agonists provide an option for individuals who struggle with weight loss through lifestyle changes alone.
- **Reduces Stigma Through Medical Framing:** Treating obesity as a medical condition can lessen moral judgment and shame.

5. This House believes that vigilantism is a legitimate response to the failure of the justice system.

Context: This debate examines whether vigilantism—individuals taking the law into their own hands—can be justified when formal justice systems fail to deliver accountability, protection, or fairness. Some people may argue that when institutions are corrupt, ineffective, or inaccessible, vigilantism becomes a necessary means of self-defense and community protection. Others may believe that legitimizing vigilantism undermines the rule of law, escalates violence, and replaces due process with subjective moral judgment. The discussion centers on legitimacy, authority, and the consequences of abandoning institutional justice.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Response to Institutional Failure:** When courts and police fail to protect citizens, vigilantism may be the only available form of justice.
- **Deterrence Effect:** Vigilante actions can discourage crime in areas where official enforcement is weak or absent.
- **Community Empowerment:** Local actors may better understand and respond to harms affecting their communities.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Erodes Rule of Law:** Vigilantism replaces legal process with personal judgment, undermining justice systems entirely.
- **High Risk of Abuse:** Without oversight, vigilantes can target innocents, escalate violence, or act on prejudice.
- **Destabilizing Consequences:** Normalizing vigilantism can lead to cycles of retaliation and broader social chaos.

Impromptu Motions

1. This House would ban all forms of online anonymity.

Context: This debate examines whether all forms of online anonymity should be prohibited. Some people may argue that anonymity enables harassment, misinformation, and criminal behavior by removing accountability for harmful actions. Others may believe anonymity is essential for privacy, free expression, and the protection of vulnerable individuals, especially in repressive or stigmatizing contexts. The discussion weighs safety and accountability against freedom and protection online.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Increases Accountability:** Removing anonymity discourages harassment, hate speech, and abuse by tying actions to real identities.
- **Reduces Misinformation and Crime:** Anonymous accounts are often used to spread false information, scams, and extremist content.
- **Improves Online Discourse:** Knowing identities are public encourages more respectful and responsible engagement.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Protects Vulnerable Voices:** Anonymity is crucial for whistleblowers, activists, and marginalized individuals fearing retaliation.
- **Preserves Privacy:** Users may need anonymity to discuss sensitive topics like health, identity, or personal trauma.
- **Threatens Free Expression:** Banning anonymity can silence dissent and empower surveillance or authoritarian control.

2. This House believes that states should heavily tax companies whose technologies significantly reduce human labor demand.

Context: This debate examines whether governments should impose heavy taxes on companies whose technologies significantly reduce the demand for human labor, such as automation and AI-driven systems. Some people may argue that these technologies generate enormous private profits while imposing social costs like unemployment, inequality, and worker displacement. Others may believe that taxing such companies would stifle innovation, slow economic growth, and punish efficiency gains that historically drive prosperity. The discussion centers on how societies should distribute the benefits and burdens of technological change.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Offsets Social Costs:** Heavy taxation helps fund retraining, welfare, and social safety nets for displaced workers.
- **Fair Redistribution:** Companies that profit from labor-reducing technologies should contribute more to the societies affected.
- **Slows Harmful Automation:** Taxes can discourage premature or excessive automation that prioritizes profit over social stability.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Innovation Suppression:** High taxes may deter investment and slow technological progress that benefits the economy long-term.
- **Global Competitiveness:** Firms may relocate to lower-tax jurisdictions, reducing jobs and revenue domestically.
- **Historical Precedent:** Technological disruption has consistently created new jobs over time, making punitive taxation unnecessary.

3. This House believes that emerging democracies should prioritize economic development over political liberalization.

Context: This debate examines whether emerging democracies should focus first on economic development—such as industrial growth, poverty reduction, and infrastructure—before prioritizing political liberalization like expanded civil liberties, competitive elections, and free media. Some people may argue that economic stability creates the conditions necessary for durable democracy and social cohesion. Others may believe that delaying political liberalization risks entrenching authoritarianism and undermines the very democratic values these states aim to build. The discussion weighs sequencing, stability, and legitimacy in state-building.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Foundation for Stability:** Economic growth reduces poverty and unrest, creating conditions where democratic institutions can function effectively.
- **Prevents Democratic Backsliding:** Weak economies can fuel populism and instability, undermining fragile democratic systems.
- **State Capacity First:** Strong economic institutions improve government effectiveness before expanding political participation.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Risk of Authoritarian Entrenchment:** Delaying political rights can allow elites to consolidate power indefinitely.
- **Legitimacy and Accountability:** Political liberalization ensures leaders are accountable and responsive during development.
- **Rights Are Not Sequential:** Civil liberties and democracy should not be treated as luxuries postponed until after growth.

4. This House regrets the rise of political influencers as primary sources of political information for young people.

Context: This debate examines the growing role of political influencers—often operating on platforms like TikTok, YouTube, and Instagram—as primary sources of political information for young people. Some people may argue that influencers make politics more accessible, engaging, and relevant to audiences traditionally disengaged from formal news media. Others may believe that this trend oversimplifies complex issues, spreads misinformation, and prioritizes virality and personal branding over accuracy and accountability. The discussion focuses on credibility, media literacy, and the quality of democratic participation.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Misinformation and Oversimplification:** Influencers often condense complex political issues into catchy narratives, sacrificing nuance and accuracy.
- **Lack of Accountability:** Unlike traditional journalists, political influencers are not bound by editorial standards or fact-checking requirements.
- **Algorithmic Distortion:** Content is shaped by engagement incentives, rewarding outrage and bias rather than balanced analysis.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Increased Political Engagement:** Influencers reach young audiences who might otherwise avoid politics entirely.
- **Accessibility and Relatability:** Influencers communicate in familiar language and formats, lowering barriers to political understanding.
- **Diversifies Media Ecosystem:** They challenge traditional gatekeepers and introduce a wider range of perspectives into political discourse.

5. This House believes that art should never be censored.

Context: This debate examines whether art should ever be subject to censorship by governments, institutions, or platforms. Some people may argue that artistic expression is a fundamental form of free speech and that censorship stifles creativity, dissent, and cultural progress. Others may believe that certain forms of art can cause real harm—by promoting violence, hate, or exploitation—and that limits are sometimes necessary to protect society. The discussion centers on freedom of expression, harm, and the role of authority in regulating culture.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Freedom of Expression:** Art is a core form of speech, and censoring it undermines democratic and creative freedoms.
- **Cultural Progress:** Provocative or controversial art often challenges norms and drives social change.
- **Subjectivity of Harm:** What is deemed offensive varies widely, making censorship arbitrary and dangerous.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Prevention of Harm:** Some art can promote hate, violence, or exploitation, justifying restrictions.
- **Protection of Vulnerable Groups:** Censorship may be needed to prevent dehumanization or psychological harm.
- **Social Responsibility:** Artists and institutions have obligations to consider the broader impact of their work.