

“A world state without any national boundary is the only solution to world peace.”

1. Speaker1 (FOR) — Opening Speech

Good morning respected judges and friends,

We strongly support the motion that *a world state without any national boundary is the only solution to world peace*.

Borders divide us into “us” and “them,” creating suspicion and conflict. Many wars were fought over territory and national pride. Without borders, there is no reason to fight for land or power.

A united world allows free movement of people, sharing of resources, and equal rights for all. It ends refugee crises and illegal immigration because everyone belongs everywhere.

Global challenges like climate change and pandemics require unified action — one world government can coordinate faster and better than divided countries.

Military spending would drop drastically, redirecting funds toward education and health.

Therefore, a borderless world is the only true path to lasting peace. Thank you.

2. Opponent 1 (AGAINST) —

While a world without borders sounds ideal, it is unrealistic and risky.

Without national boundaries, chaos will rule. Law enforcement will become impossible across huge populations with different languages and cultures.

Cultural differences can cause clashes, and people may lose their identity and heritage. National pride motivates progress and innovation.

Managing a single global government is too complex and risks power concentration in the hands of few.

Security threats will rise without national control points.

Hence, national boundaries are necessary to maintain order, security, and cultural identity.

3. Speaker 2 (FOR) — Rebuttal to Opponent 1

My opponent fears chaos and loss of culture, but chaos actually comes from division and competition created by borders.

Cultural diversity will flourish in a united world, not disappear. Borders often create fear of “others,” while unity encourages acceptance.

Global organizations like the UN already manage international cooperation successfully — a world government is a natural extension.

Security will improve because no hostile nations will exist to create conflict.

Power concentration can be avoided with checks and balances designed in the system.

4. Opponent 2 (AGAINST) — Rebuttal to Speaker 2

Despite global organizations, a single world government is too idealistic. History shows large empires often fail due to corruption and rebellion.

Cultural and language differences are underestimated and can cause serious internal conflicts.

The loss of national sovereignty can lead to oppression and loss of freedom.

We cannot ignore the practical challenges of governing billions of people under one system.

5. speaker1(FOR) — Final Rebuttal (1.5 min)

No system is perfect, but the current divided world has proven unable to prevent wars, poverty, or climate disasters.

A world without borders removes the root causes of conflict — division and competition over resources.

Cultural identity will remain strong within a united framework promoting peace and cooperation.

History's lessons teach us that cooperation and unity, not division, are the keys to lasting peace.

Therefore, a world state without national boundaries is the only solution for true world peace.

Thank you.

Key points:

FOR (Points)	Short Brief
No border = no border conflicts	Many wars in history were fought over territory. Removing borders removes the root cause.
Global military reduction	No national armies → less military spending → more money for education, health, and environment.
Shared environmental responsibility	Problems like climate change need global action, not separate national policies.
Better disaster response	A united world can send aid anywhere without visa, permission, or political delay.
Equal human rights	Everyone will have the same legal protection, no matter where they are born.
End of illegal immigration	No need for dangerous migration routes — people can live and work anywhere.
Global economic stability	No trade wars or sanctions — a single economy reduces poverty and inequality.
Unified education & technology	Everyone gets equal access to quality education and innovation.
Peace through shared identity	People will see themselves as “humans” first, not as citizens of different countries.

End (for)

Against(Points)	Short Brief
No border = no border conflicts	Borders maintain order and sovereignty; without them, chaos and lawlessness can rise.
Global military reduction	National armies are needed for defense and security; removing them risks vulnerability.
Shared environmental responsibility	Global policies are hard to enforce; different countries have different priorities and needs.
Better disaster response	Coordinating aid globally is complicated; political interests delay responses even now.
Equal human rights	Different countries have different laws and cultures; universal laws may not fit all.
End of illegal immigration	Borders protect jobs and social services; open migration can strain resources and cause tension.
Global economic stability	Different economies have different needs; a single economy can increase inequality and exploitation.
Unified education & technology	Diverse education systems reflect culture; one system may erode cultural identity and local relevance.
Peace through shared identity	National and cultural identities motivate people; removing them may cause loss of pride and social cohesion.

Unseen for them but known to us

FOR Points (Super Short Version)

1. No border = no war over land
2. Army budget saved → education, health
3. Climate problems need one law, not many
4. Disaster aid reaches anywhere, fast
5. Equal rights for all humans
6. No illegal immigration/refugees
7. Stable world economy
8. Same education & tech for all
9. One identity: human, not country
10. More cultural understanding
11. Less political corruption via nationalism
12. One justice system for all
13. Free travel, no visas
14. Science & medicine shared globally
15. End of weapons race
16. Resources used efficiently
17. Global poverty reduced faster
18. Focus on future (space, AI, climate)
19. No border history fights
20. United crisis response

FOR Point	Common AGAINST Argument	Counter Reply (FOR Side)
No border = no war over land	Borders protect sovereignty; without them, chaos	History shows borders <i>cause</i> many wars; unity removes main cause of land disputes
Army budget saved → education, health	Armies are needed for security	In a united world, no external threat exists — funds better used for people's welfare
Climate problems need one law	Different regions have different needs	True, but a central policy can adapt locally while keeping global goals aligned
Disaster aid anywhere, fast	Local governments respond faster	Often disasters overwhelm locals; a global system ensures immediate help without politics
Equal rights for all humans	Culture clash may harm rights	Rights can be adapted to respect culture while still being equal under law
No illegal immigration/refugees	Overpopulation in rich countries	People move naturally; balanced global development reduces migration pressure
Stable world economy	One economy may collapse together	A global safety net is stronger than isolated economies — shared recovery is faster
Same education & tech for all	Loss of cultural diversity	Education equality doesn't mean cultural erasure — tech can help preserve cultures
One identity: human, not country	People need national pride	Pride can come from human achievements, not just flags
More cultural understanding	Cultures may mix too much and lose uniqueness	Exchange increases appreciation — global unity celebrates differences, not erases them

Less political corruption via nationalism	Global government could be corrupt too	One transparent system with global checks is easier to monitor than hundreds of corrupt systems
One justice system for all	One law cannot fit all traditions	Core laws can be universal (human rights) while allowing local adaptations
Free travel, no visas	Security risks	With one global ID and tracking, security is maintained without borders
Science & medicine shared globally	Rich nations may dominate decisions	Equal representation in global council ensures fair decisions
End of weapons race	Still need weapons for crime control	Small-scale security forces can exist for law enforcement, not war
Resources used efficiently	Resource-rich areas might be exploited	Fair global distribution policies can prevent exploitation
Global poverty reduced faster	Rich nations may resist sharing	Without borders, “rich” and “poor” nations don’t exist — it’s one shared economy
Focus on future (space, AI, climate)	Local needs may be ignored	Local issues can be solved faster when global conflicts no longer drain resources
No border history fights	History is part of identity	History can be preserved and taught without it causing future divisions
United crisis response	Too much central power	Checks, balance, and citizen representation can avoid abuse

FOR Point	Possible Question (Opponent/Audience)	Strong Answer
No border = no border conflicts	<i>If there are no borders, won't local disputes still exist?</i>	Local disputes exist, but borders make them bigger. Without borders, disputes are solved as internal matters, not wars between nations.
	<i>Borders also protect cultures. Without them, will we lose identity?</i>	Cultures can exist without borders — just like states within a country have unique cultures but no armies fighting each other.
	<i>Isn't human greed still a reason for conflict?</i>	Yes, but without political boundaries, greed won't escalate into armed conflicts over territory.
Global military reduction	<i>Won't we still need an army for protection?</i>	One united global security force is enough — cheaper, smaller, and not divided into competing armies.
	<i>Won't criminals take advantage if there's no strong army?</i>	Global law enforcement will still exist, but without massive budgets for war — more focus on safety and justice.

Is this realistic?

Not immediately, but many impossible ideas in history — like abolishing slavery — became real through cooperation.

**Shared
environmental
responsibility**

Why would removing borders solve climate change?

Borders slow cooperation — one world government can enforce a single policy for all. Climate has no nationality.

Countries already work together for climate; why change?

Current cooperation is slow because each country protects its own economy first. A world state removes that selfish barrier.

What if some areas don't want to follow the rule?

In a world state, law is the same for all — no escape from responsibility.

**Better disaster
response**

We already send aid to other countries — why change?

Aid today is delayed by visas, permissions, politics. In a borderless world, help arrives instantly like it does between states in one country.

Won't some areas get more help than others?

A global system would distribute help based on need, not politics or nationality.

Equal human rights

Is it possible to manage all disasters globally?

With shared resources and planning, yes — we already do this partially through the UN, but borders slow it down.

Human rights laws already exist. Why remove borders?

Many countries ignore human rights treaties. In a single world state, the same law applies everywhere with one court.

Won't cultural laws clash with global laws?

Cultural traditions can continue, but basic human rights like freedom and equality will be non-negotiable.

What if the world government becomes corrupt?

Strong checks and public participation will make it more accountable than multiple separate corrupt governments.

End of illegal immigration

Won't removing borders create overpopulation in some areas?

Movement will balance naturally — people will spread based on job availability, housing, and resources, just like within a country.

Won't rich areas be flooded by poor migrants?

Initially some movement, but over time, economic opportunities will grow everywhere due to balanced global policies.

**Global economic
stability**

*If everyone can move
anywhere, what happens
to local jobs?*

Global economic planning can ensure job creation everywhere so migration doesn't overload certain areas.

*If one economy crashes,
won't the whole world
suffer?*

Yes, but with one economy, there's no competitive trade war — resources are shared to prevent collapse.

*Won't richer countries
have to pay for poorer
ones?*

That's an investment — lifting poorer areas creates more markets and stability, which benefits everyone.

*Won't corruption destroy
the system?*

With one transparent system, corruption can be tackled at the highest level, instead of hiding in separate countries.

**Unified
education &
technology**

*Won't it be hard to set one
education standard for
all?*

Core subjects can be the same, while allowing local languages and culture studies for diversity.

*Will rich nations lose their
technological edge?*

Sharing knowledge lifts everyone and creates new innovations faster.

What about brain drain?

There's no "drain" when everyone belongs to one

economy — talent benefits the whole system.

**Peace through
shared identity**

Humans will still form groups. Won't racism and bias remain?

Prejudice may remain, but without nationalistic politics, it has less power to cause war.

Isn't nationalism natural for humans?

Nationalism is taught, not natural — with global education, we can teach unity instead.

Won't this erase patriotism?

Patriotism can shift from a country to the whole planet — pride in being human.