**CONCLUSION AGAINST FRONTIERS**

*“I feel indignant when something is condemned not because it is believed that it is not well done but because it is modern”*

My name is Jose Aparicio and with this sentence from the classic poet Horace I will conclude the arguments of my team in this debate.

Boundaries are obsolete, old-fashioned and useless and, for that reason, taking Horace words, our team has defended the need to open to a new modern system where boundaries among countries will disappear from the map.

As you have listened from my partners, our team has defended a modern globalized world based on the protection of human rights and equality where there is no room for frontiers.

My partner Raquel has explained that if boundaries had a curriculum nobody will hire them as this curriculum includes two world wars and many other conflicts. Boundaries have also segregated families as has happened in Korea and finally, many refugees are waiting to cross them in refugee camps as if they were second class humans.

Do you really think that somebody can justify that this world where universal rights should prevail could be divided by frontiers? As Raquel has argumented, we can’t continue depending on frontiers since they deny progress.

Even though we tried to defend boundaries we would end up in a cul-de-sac as they are unnecessary. There are many historical and social arguments, as well as economic ones as my partner Sofia has beautifully explained.

In a globalized world frontiers don’t have a future. Globalization means competing in a global market where companies need to get better and offer their best products and services. Frontiers imply protectionism, a mercantile System that isolates the countries since the progress in scientific, industrial and cultural fields have a difficult path when they face frontiers.

Furthermore, we need to prioritize the article 13 from DUDH, which defends the free circulation of citizens as a human right. Europe made a huge progress thanks to the Schengen Treaty which allows free circulation of European citizens.

We, the youth, we have the moral obligation to make this world a little bit better for future generations. How are we going to achieve that? It’s difficult but we can start by erasing frontiers because, as we have exposed, they limit the progress of the humanity.

**CONCLUSION IN FAVOUR OF FRONTIERS**

*“Fish can’t run through the mountain and I can’t have a walk around Jupiter”*

Good morning, my name is Jose Aparicio and I’m the last member of my team to intervene in this debate.

This quotation may seem a little extravagant to you but my intention is to summarize the essence of what we have tried to convey during this debate. The frontiers are only some limits and there is nothing bad in having limits as they are necessary and natural for us, human beings.

As my partner Raquel Guerrero has already presented, frontiers are absolutely a must to preserve the essence of the different people. We consider that it is a cultural disaster that Halloween is imposing over our Catalan autumn traditions or that we are forgetting about some of our oldest traditions such as human castles which are UNESCO intangible cultural heritage. We do not consider that adopting new festivities may be something to avoid, but the problem arises when these new traditions destroy the cultural heritage of a land and its people, erasing the differences and idiosyncrasy.

The very same way the atmosphere protects us from part of the dangers of the Universe, frontiers establish some limits that protect us.

Rousseau said*“there is a difference between travelling to see countries and travelling to see their people”*. As my partner has argumented, globalization implies a standardization of the world and it is erasing our uniqueness.

As you can see, a world without boundaries is only a utopia, a fantasy. It may sound good but it wouldn’t be practical.

Members of the jury, ladies and gentlemen, the moment to reflect has arrived. We need to think about what is on the best interest for our citizens. Think in a logical, practical way and you will see that there is only one conclusion: a world of progress and fraternity can only be achieved with frontiers.

Moreover, my partner Sofia Kalu, has explained to you the economic disasters that a world without boundaries will provoke in terms of commerce. As she has told you, national professions and industries are lost; they are industries that generate richness for a country and that avoid depending on foreign countries and governments. These industries are lost as they cannot compete with the low cost of imported products that use exploited children and which do not respect the human rights. Do you really believe that the answer is to buy cheap products produced by companies that exploit workers? Or do you think that we should invest in our country, promoting and fostering the workload and incrementing the salaries?