Rachel and I affirm.

Contention One is Helping the Mexiconomy.

NAFTA creates growth in Mexico in two ways.

The first is opening up the economy.
Villareal 17 clarifies that NAFTA created trade liberalization and economic openness in Mexico.
Brier 17 finds that NAFTA played a critical role in opening Mexico's economy up to trade, investment, and growth.

The second is increasing investment.
Zarsky 04 elucidates that NAFTA tripled US FDI in Mexico, half of which went directly to the manufacturing sector. **Zarsky** continues that, as a result of NAFTA, Mexican exports increased 50%, and 90% of that growth was in manufacturing.
Brier 17 reports that NAFTA generated over $80 billion in two-way trade between the US and Mexico, thus boosting Mexican industry, creating over a million jobs.

Ultimately, **Rubio 17** concludes that NAFTA is critical to Mexican economic growth.

The impacts of continuing Mexican economic growth are threefold.

The first is spurring change.
Breir finds that Mexico is on the pathway toward social change right now and is on the brink of major reform, continuing that a stronger Mexican economy is key to political and social reform in Mexico.
Villareal 17 corroborates that NAFTA opened up Mexico's economy, locking in market reform measures, mitigating the debt crisis, and strengthening democracy in Mexico.
Breir determines that reforms in Mexico translate to reforms throughout Latin America, improves security for the entire Western hemisphere.

The second is benefitting the United States.
Rubio 17 finds that NAFTA-created growth creates regional stability in Mexico, which benefits not only Mexico, but also helps the United States by creating a stable trade partner.

The third impact is stopping the violence.
Breier continues that economic reform solves for organized crime and weakens the influence of cartels.

Ramirez 16 determines that Latin American drug cartels have ties to terrorist organizations including al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and Hezbollah, and that these ties could facilitate the movement of terrorist weapons, operatives, and training materials into the US if cartels were strengthened. US participation in NAFTA uniquely curtails the power of cartels, preventing terrorists from gaining easy access to the US.
Critically, **Cusick 10** explains that conflict in Latin America threatens democracy and stability in North America and the world as a whole. The only way to prevent this conflict is through NAFTA and the reform it uniquely creates.

Contention 2 is Chemical Growth.

The presence of NAFTA facilitates growth in the chemical industry. The **ICIS 18** writes that NAFTA reduces tariffs for US chemical companies, saving them over $1.5 billion in tariffs alone. They further that this has increased jobs and trade volume, as well as driving economic growth, lowering manufacturing and consumer prices.

This success is not limited to the United States. Indeed, **The Chemistry Industry Association of Canada 17** explains that as a direct result of the effectiveness of NAFTA at reducing trade barriers, trade in chemicals amongst NAFTA has more than tripled, comprehensively reducing cost of production, crafting economic growth and job creation, and increasing American competitiveness in the industry.

Moreover, the status quo is further improving growth for the chemical industry. As **Chemical Watch 17** notes, the chemical industry sees talks about NAFTA as an opportunity to further unite the North American chemical market and standardize regulations, both increasing economic attainment of the industry and mitigating the risk of danger.

The impacts of a growing chemical industry are two fold:

The **first** is manufacturing. Indeed, North American manufacturing industries rely on growth in the chemical industry. As the **American Chemistry Council 18**, increased production of chemicals in the U.S. also boosts the broader manufacturing sector, since 96% of all manufactured goods depend on chemistry. The **AIC** furthers that in 2016, the chemical industry accounted for nearly half of construction spending in U.S. manufacturing. Luckily, **Stettner et al 17** explains that manufacturing jobs are more profitable than other jobs, despite not requiring a college degree, noting that manufacturing jobs pay an average of 9% more than other non-college educated jobs. Moreover they write that these jobs have become essential for the lives of rural workers, sometimes providing the only source of income in rural communities.

The **second** impact is mitigating climate change.
According to **Tabuchi** and **Hakim 16** of the **New York times**, competition in the chemical sector is pushing a drive away from profitable chemical and towards a climate change and energy efficient sector. The **New York Times** furthers that this competition drives a shared interest between the chemical sector and the international community to work toward mitigating climate change. **Cotran 16** of the **Sustainability Accounting Standards Board** writes that, because chemical industries affect so many other industries, in the building sector alone chemical companies cut global emissions by more than 5%.

Thus, we affirm.

NAFTA crucial for US chemicals growth - ACC report. (**2018**). **ICIS**.com. Retrieved 23 May 2018, from

https://www.icis.com/resources/news/2018/02/28/10197951/nafta-crucial-for-us-chemicals-growth-acc-report/ // RM

Jobs and trade volume are not the only benefit that the US chemical industry enjoys from NAFTA, the report said, adding that **the free trade agreement had saved US chemical companies $700m in tariffs on exports and $800m on tariffs on imports. "The cost savings have helped drive economic growth throughout the manufacturing supply chain and lowered prices for manufacturers and consumers,"** the ACC said.

Chemistry Industry Association of Canada (2017). Canadianchemistry.ca. Retrieved 23 May 2018, from

https://www.canadianchemistry.ca/library/uploads/CIAC_NAFTA_Submission-Final.pdf // RM

Over the past two decades, **NAFTA has provided enormous benefit for the chemical sectors in Canada, Mexico and the United States. The Agreement has facilitated expanded economic growth, job creation, and enhanced North American competitiveness vis-a-vis the broader global marketplace.** Since entering into force, **trade in chemicals amongst NAFTA countries has more than tripled,** from $20 billion in 1994 to $63 billion in 2014. **NAFTA's success lies in the economic partnerships, supply chain synergies and efficiencies that have been created through reduced barriers to trade. The interconnectivity between the three NAFTA economies has not only lowered the cost of chemical production, it has also strengthened the sector's relevance in North America's overall manufacturing economy. More than 96 per cent of manufactured goods** — from electronics to automobiles, medical equipment to our homes — **are touched by chemistry. As a result, the chemistry industry has a multiplier effect on job creation and economic growth. This is a direct outcome of NAFTA's effectiveness in reducing barriers to trade.** This includes trade in energy products, particularly natural gas – a critical building block for chemical production in North America. More than 10 per cent of NAFTA trade is in energy products, and there are more than 100 cross-border energy infrastructure projects in place amongst the three economies.

Chemical Watch 9/28/2017 North American chemical industry united as Nafta talks close

https://chemicalwatch.com/59586/north-american-chemical-industry-united-as-nafta-talks-close // RM

Chemical industry associations in Canada, Mexico and the US have presented a united front following the third round of talks **for the renegotiation of** the North American Free Trade Agreement (**Nafta**) **After the talks ended** in Ottawa on 27 September, **the Chemical Industry Association of Canada (CIAC), the American Chemistry Council (ACC) and the Asociacion Nacional de la Industria Química (ANIQ) issued joint recommendations on regulatory cooperation and rules of origin**. The statement was a signal that Mexico will likely follow the US and Canada in adopting a risk-based chemical management scheme rather than the hazard-based approach used in the EU's REACH. "**We need to create a North American chemical industry, not just a Canadian, American or Mexican industry**," said Guillermo Miller of ANIQ during a panel discussion at the sidelines of the negotiations. "**We need regulatory convergence and agreement on rules of origin. Common rules of origin will facilitate trade by reducing barriers**." The associations issued a statement in March that "**chemical regulations should be science and risk-based, taking both hazard and exposure into consideration**." They followed up in September with more detailed statements on regulatory cooperation and rules of origin. **The groups view Nafta 'modernisation' as an opportunity to set a global precedent in favour of risk-based regulation."Implementation of these agreed positions will encourage regulatory harmonisation capable of protecting people and the environment in all three countries while also spurring innovation and improving our overall regional position in the highly competitive global chemistry sector,"** said CIAC's president and CEO Bob Masterson. "A great amount of effort by our respective associations and the industry in all three countries has gone into landing on these consensus positions," he said. **"We are leading the way in demonstrating that there are indeed opportunities to modernise Nafta while delivering benefits to all three partners to the agreement,"** Greg Skelton, senior director, global affairs at the ACC said that in Ottawa, the coordination of regulations is critical to maintain tariff-free trade. And, he added, **the industry wants to spread TSCA-type rules across the North American system.**

American Chemistry Council (2018). *Americanchemistry.com*. Retrieved 23 May 2018, from

https://www.americanchemistry.com/NAFTA-and-the-Chemical-Industry.pdf // RM

In 2016, the chemical industry accounted for nearly half of construction spending in U.S. manufacturing.

…

Increased production of chemicals in the U.S. will also boost the broader manufacturing sector, since 96% of all manufactured goods depend on chemistry.

Tabuchi, H., & Hakim, D. (2016). *How the Chemical Industry Joined the Fight Against Climate Change*. *Nytimes.com*. Retrieved 26 May 2018, from

https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/17/business/how-the-chemical-industry-joined-the-fight-against-climate-change.html // RM

It might seem surprising to find the world's chemical companies on the front lines of preventing climate change, fighting to disrupt their own industries. But in a sweeping accord reached on Saturday in Kigali, Rwanda, **companies** including Honeywell and Chemours, a DuPont spinoff, **were among the most active backers of a move away from a profitable chemical** that has long been the foundation for the fast-growing air-conditioning and refrigeration business. **The companies were driven** less **by** idealism than by **intense competition, and a bet that they could create more environmentally friendly alternatives.** Still, some environmentalists say **the** aggressive **move** away from hydrofluorocarbons, or HFCs, **provides a template for other industries to follow. "They learned that without a rule change, their new products couldn't compete,"** said David Doniger, director of the Climate and Clean Air Program at the Natural Resources Defense Council, based in New York. "They woke up and said, 'The science is real.'" "We wanted them restricted for purely environmental reasons. The **companies wanted them restricted for** many **other reasons," including profit**, Mr. Doniger said. "But the point is that **they had a certain common interest with the international community."**

Cotran, H -- *Climate Innovation Heats Up for Chemicals Industry - Sustainability Accounting Standards Board*. (2016). *Sustainability Accounting Standards Board*. Retrieved 26 May 2018, from https://www.sasb.org/climate-innovation-heats-chemicals-industry/ // RM

The chemical industry does not typically come to mind when considering ways to address global climate change. This is not surprising given that chemical and petrochemical production accounted for nearly ten percent of global energy consumption and seven percent of GHG emissions in 2012. What many people do not realize, however, is that **chemical companies are at the forefront of innovation into products that deliver energy efficiency and greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction across the economy. These benefits are realized through the wide application of chemicals technology, from building products to agriculture. The industry is able to drive efficiency at scale because chemicals are ubiquitous – more than 95% of manufactured products incorporate chemicals.** Regulations are a key force behind rising demand for efficiency-enhancing products, such as in the auto industry, where increasingly stringent emissions and fuel efficiency regulations are driving automakers towards vehicle lightweighting. Take the example of Solvay, the Belgian chemical and plastics giant, which earlier this year partnered with engineering firm Drive System Design to develop plastics-based auto transmissions that could reduce the weight of transmissions casings by as much as 45 percent, improving vehicle fuel economy. According to a landmark 2009 study by the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), **the industry enables significant emissions reductions across the economy.** The study examined the 2005 emissions footprint of a group of chemical-derived products and compared it to a scenario where the products did not exist. Across all of the products examined, the ICCA estimates that **the industry enabled between 2.1 and 2.6 units of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) savings per unit of GHG emitted during chemical production and sourcing** in 2005. Transportation applications carry some of the greatest potential for GHG savings, which is understandable given that the transportation sector generates nearly a quarter of global emissions.

The ICCA estimates that the use of lightweight plastics in existing automotive applications, such as lightweight engine components and chassis, saved up to 120 Mt CO2e in 2005. Likewise, antifouling paints used on the hulls of oceangoing vessels to prevent the growth of drag-inducing organisms were estimated to reduce fuel consumption by as much as 29 percent and reduce global GHG emissions by 190 Mt CO2e. The building sector, responsible for nearly a third of energy used globally, is another key area of emissions reductions. **Chemical-derived building products, including insulation and reflective coatings,** and air sealing products that reduce heat transfer, **saved** an estimated 2.4 Gt of CO2e in 2005, or **more than five percent of total global emissions**. Additionally, **the use of 2.8 billion compact fluorescent lightbulbs, filled with gases manufactured by chemicals companies, saved as much as 700 Mt per year.** With building energy use and CO2 emissions forecast to rise by 62 percent and 87 percent, respectively, by 2050, **chemical industry solutions will continue to play an important role in efficiency in the building sector.**

Stettner et al Yudken, J - McCormack, M - Stettner, A. *Why Manufacturing Jobs Are Worth Saving*. (2017). *The Century Foundation*. Retrieved 1 June 2018, from

https://tcf.org/content/report/manufacturing-jobs-worth-saving/ // RM

Manufacturing has become more regionally concentrated, with three manufacturing regions (the Rust Belt, Agricultural Midwest, and the Industrial Southeast) holding most of the nation's manufacturing jobs. Seven Rust Belt states (Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota) have 3.7 million manufacturing jobs, more than seventeen large Western states including California and Texas. **Manufacturing is now of greatest importance to mostly rural communities in these manufacturing states, where it makes up one-in-four private-sector jobs, as compared to either strictly rural or urban areas. Manufacturing jobs continue to provide above-average wages, especially for skilled positions that require on-the-job training but not college degrees. Among workers without a four-year college degree, manufacturing workers** earn $150 more per week than in other industries. On average, an econometric analysis finds that workers in manufacturing **earn 9 percent more per week than workers in other economic sectors,** holding other differences between workers equal. However, plummeting manufacturing unionization in the Rust Belt over the past twenty-five years (from 28.4 to 14.5 percent) has shrunk the real wage advantage of manufacturing jobs from $220 to $170 per week in the crucial region.

Zarsky, Lyuba, and Kevin P. Gallagher. "NAFTA, foreign direct investment, and sustainable industrial development in Mexico." *Americas Program Policy Brief* 28 (20**04**).
http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/Pubs/rp/AmerProgFDIJan04.pdf
On the surface, the strategy was, at least until recently, a dazzling success. **Between 1994 and 2002, FDI inflows into Mexico ballooned to a yearly average of $13 billion, nearly three times more than the yearly average of $4.5 billion between 1988 and 1993.** Indeed, Mexico ranks among the top three developing country recipients of global FDI. Moreover, as hoped, **about half of the FDI flowed into manufacturing. Exports increased by nearly 50% after the passage of NAFTA in 1994 and manufactures accounted for nearly 90% of total exports.** In the face of the failure of many developing countries to attract FDI—despite the embrace of integration policies—Mexico became a poster child for neoliberal globalization.

Villareal, M., and Ian F. Fergusson. "The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)." (20**17**). https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42965.pdf
Well before NAFTA negotiations began, Mexico was liberalizing its protectionist trade and investment policies that had been in place for decades (see page 9 of this report). The restrictive trade regime began after Mexico's revolutionary period and remained until the early- to mid- 1980s when the country was facing a debt crisis. It was at this time that the government took unilateral steps to open and modernize its economy by relaxing investment policies and liberalizing trade barriers. **The trade liberalization measures that began in the mid-1980s shifted Mexico from one of the world's most protected economies into one of the most open.** Mexico now has 12 FTAs involving 46 countries.5 Mexico's first steps in opening its closed economy focused on reforming its import substitution policies in the mid-1980s. Further reforms were made in 1986 when Mexico became a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). As a condition of becoming a GATT member, for example, Mexico agreed to lower its maximum tariff rates to 50%. Mexico went further by reducing its highest tariff rate from 100% to 20%. Mexico's trade-weighted average tariff fell from 25% in 1985 to about 19% in 1989.6 Although Mexico had been lowering trade and investment restrictions since 1986, the number of remaining barriers for U.S. exports remained high at the time of the NAFTA negotiations. Mexico required import licenses on 230 products from the United States, affecting about 7% of the value of U.S. exports to Mexico. Prior to its entry into GATT, Mexico required import licenses on all imports. **At the time of the NAFTA negotiations, about 60% of U.S. agricultural exports to Mexico required import licenses. Mexico also had numerous other nontariff barriers, such as "official import prices," an arbitrary customs valuation system that raised duty assessments.7 For Mexico, an FTA with the United States represented a way to lock in the reforms of its market opening measures from the mid-1980s to transform Mexico's formerly statist economy after the devastating debt crisis of the 1980s.**8 The combination of the severe economic impact of the debt crisis, low domestic savings, and an increasingly overvalued peso put pressure on the Mexican government to adopt market-opening economic reforms and boost imports of goods and capital to encourage more competition in the Mexican market. **An FTA with the United States was a way of blocking domestic efforts to roll back Mexican reforms, especially in the politically sensitive agriculture sector.** NAFTA helped deflect protectionist demands of industrial groups and special interest groups in Mexico.9 **One of the main goals of the Mexican government was to increase investment confidence in order to attract greater flows of foreign investment and spur economic growth. Since the entry into force of NAFTA, Mexico has used the agreement as a basic model for other FTAs Mexico has signed with other countries.10** For the United States, NAFTA represented an opportunity to expand the growing export market to the south, but it also represented a political opportunity for the United States and Mexico to work together in resolving some of the tensions in the bilateral relationship.11 An FTA with Mexico would help U.S. businesses expand exports to a growing market of 100 million people. U.S. officials also recognized that imports from Mexico would likely include higher U.S. content than imports from Asian countries. In addition to the trade and investment opportunities that NAFTA represented, **an agreement with Mexico would be a way to support the growth of political pluralism and a deepening of democratic processes in Mexico.** NAFTA also presented an opportunity for the United States to spur the slow progress on the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations.12

Rubio 17 (Luis, Chairman @ Mexican Council on Foreign Relations, "Keep the Trade Deal; the U.S. Needs Mexico to Prosper," 1/30,
https://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2017/01/30/new-terms-for-nafta-7/keep-the-trade-deal-the-us-needs-mexico-to-prosper) // RH
Mexico has gone a long way in reforming its economy and Nafta is a critical part of that process. There are plenty of issues Mexico needs to address in order to become a full democracy, and it is here where Nafta is most important. **A stable, prosperous Mexico is critical to** both Mexican and **American interests and security**. Nafta is far more than a trade agreement — it is **Mexico's engine of growth**. It needs upgrading and updating, and that is exactly what happened during the negotiations that took place in the context of Trans-Pacific Partnership. But it **is also crucial to regional stability**, which is in the U.S.'s interests. Nafta does not confer on Mexico any advantages or privileges. It is a symmetrical arrangement in which Canada, Mexico and the U.S. are equal partners. There is, however, a big asymmetry in the importance of the trade agreement to each nation: Even though certain industrial sectors profit enormously thanks to their Mexican business interests, Nafta's impact on the U.S. is relatively minor. The opposite is not true: The impact of U.S. economic and political decisions in regarding Mexico can be extraordinary, as witnessed by the devaluation of the peso over the last few months.

Cusick 10 (Tyler, Associate @ Boston Consulting Group + Research Partner at Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard, Harvard Political Review, "Not our backyard but still our neighbors,"
http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:wsBUXHiIWEkJ:harvardpolitics.com/world/not-our-backyard-but-still-our-neighbors/+&cd=21&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us) // RH
As the revolt in Quito showed, despite the gains in democracy, **Latin America appears to be as volatile as it was thirty years ago**. All it took for an attempt to shutdown the democratic regime in Ecuador was an unpopular austerity measure that looked to cut benefits for public servants. Faced with social distress, mobilization into militant revolts still appears to be a viable option for dissidents, just as it was under the authoritarian regimes and corrupt democracies of the previous century. As Honduras demonstrated to the world in the summer of 2009, **military overthrows of democracies still happen in the western hemisphere, right on the United States' doorstep**. With vested military allies in neighboring nations Peru and Columbia, the United States revealed its continued interest in the stability of its southern neighbors by voicing its support for the Correa administration (despite the Chavez-leaning tendencies of the aforementioned leftist president). And there is ample reason that the US should care. President Correa of Ecuador being taken from hospital where he was held hostage by revolting police.

With newly appointed Colombian president and US ally Juan Manuel Santos **on the verge of** realizing the goal of the Plan Colombia legislation and f**inally ridding his nation of its FARC menace** and making large gains in the war on illegal drug trafficking, **there is little room for unrest in the region**. Couple that with the United States' large military presence in Colombia and Peru, and there is genuine reason for the US to take a general interest in the maintenance of stability in the region. **With Nicaragua, Venezuela, Bolivia, and Ecuador all fronted by heads of state who are decidedly anti-America** and marred by large disparities in wealth as well as exorbitant rates of subsistent poverty, **the tension for a potential destabilizing event remains a very real fear**. **With the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan and Iraq underway**, **Washington does not want to have to deal with a** refugee crisis in one of its southern allies or **a failed state in the western hemisphere**. The rise of popularly elected figures like Chavez and Correa who ran on anti-American platforms implies a general animosity towards continued American influence in Latin America, and whose to say that this anger could not be channeled into a militant organization a la Al Qaeda or Al-Shabaab. **A failed state in the Latin America could spell disastrous for the US in a world** as **interconnected** as our own. Whereas enemies from across the Atlantic are one thing, **having terrorism emerge from a neighbor** in the West **would be** both horrifying and **a direct slap in the face of America's movement towards world democracy.**

Kimberly **BREIR 17**. Director, US-Mexico Futures Initiatives, Center for Strategic and International Studies; MA, Latin American Studies, Georgetown. "What Could a U.S.-Mexico Partnership Look Like? New Approaches Could Advance Cooperation With Mexico." Global Trade. January 3. http://www.globaltrademag.com/global-trade-daily/u-s-mexico-partnership-look-like. // RH

There have been other encouraging signs as well. **Mexico's Congress is no longer the rubber stamp it once was. And, in 2012, Mexico's main political parties passed a reform platform** under the Pact for Mexic**o focused on much-needed internal reforms including** in the areas of **education, labor, the electoral system, fiscal policy, telecommunications, and** the historic **opening of the energy sector to private investment. Overall, Mexico is a more democratic country now** than it was 20 years ago, although with all of the fits and starts that comes with it.¶ Mexico's economy has also been dramatically transformed over this same period. Prior to the 1990s, Mexico's economy was largely closed to imports, including from the United States. The **North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) played a transformative and positive role in opening up the Mexican economy, creating jobs, and in the expansion of Mexico's middle class**. Mexico now has 10 free trade agreements involving 45 countries and a host of other investment deals involving another 33. On economic policy in recent years, Mexico has moved to increase competition in telecommunications as well as undertaking the historic opening of the energy sector to private investment following the nationalization if the 1930s.¶ Stalled progress and a critical window of opportunity¶ **Despite the fast-forward transformation of the economy and political system, the reform process for law enforcement and the judiciary is often described** by Mexican analysts, foreign investors, and more importantly by public opinion **as more disappointing**. Despite numerous restructurings of law enforcement, insecurity prevails in many parts of the country. The landmark judicial reform passed in 2008 that is transforming the judiciary from a closed inquisitorial system toward an adversarial model is yet to be fully implemented. The slow progress on rule-of-law issues has created enormous opportunity costs for Mexico in terms of trade and investment, and public confidence in institutions remains low.¶ **The next two years** in Mexico **are a critically important window for reform** implementation. Moreover, **the population's perception of** the **success** of implementation **may be even more important** than formal passage of reform bills into law. Justice reform implementation amid continuing impunity for the political class will not be perceived as a real change. Energy and telecommunications **reforms that do not deliver benefits** to average Mexicans **are not** likely to be **seen as transformative**, even though the rules on paper are a dramatic departure from the status quo ante. A failure by the Mexican government to fundamentally shift the momentum against the cartels and against corrupt practices in the public sector will further erode confidence in institutions and governance. The opportunity to strengthen the Mexican state and consolidate the reforms rests in the hands of the Mexican political class.¶ Much of **Latin America has seen the winds of political change blowing through the region** in the past two years. For **Mexico**, it may well be that public perception of the political class and its **actions** in the next two years **will influence how strong the winds** of change **blow** in Mexico in 2018. This is of critical importance to the United States, because political uncertainty on the southern U.S. border could impact bilateral cooperation across the range of issues in the relationship.¶ The U.S.-Mexico relationship¶ As one of only two land neighbors, **Mexico is a critical partner** of the United States **on** both **national security** and economic security. Despite this fact, U.S. policy toward Mexico often lacks a big-think vision that recognizes both the breadth and depth of issues that matter greatly to the American people. The relationship often gets out of balance and ends up in a reactive, tit-for-tat cycle. This is deeply counterproductive and must be avoided if for no other reason than to ensure that the two governments deliver results.¶ The **priorities outlined by** President-elect **Trump** during the campaign, including immigration reform and border security improvements, suggest a quick focus on Mexico. Done carefully, an immigration reform **can be a win-win**, and border security upgrades would include not only more physical barriers, but stepped-up cooperation and a focus on border infrastructure. Any border security measures must take into account that $2.4 billion worth of goods cross the United States' northern and southern borders every day. The goal should be to balance security challenges with the needs of cross-border commerce that are fundamental to the U.S. economy.¶ In fact, the Trump administration has a great opportunity to put serious attention on border infrastructure, which is a long-neglected issue and a drag on U.S. competitiveness. Mexican and Canadian leaders have also made infrastructure a priority and cooperation in this area could present an early win all around. The three countries need to work together to prioritize what new points of entry are needed and also on how to fund new projects. Recent estimates suggest that border infrastructure improvements in North America could increase U.S. GDP by one percentage point, or about $220 billion a year, creating new jobs along with it.¶ The Trump campaign emphasized the need for the United States to get better deals on trade. If it pursues trade discussions, they must be framed by the reality that the U.S. economic relationship with Mexico is not a zero-sum game. U.S. companies and the products they produce are competitive in the global economy in part thanks to imported components from Mexico and Canada. In fact, **the private sectors in the United States and Mexico and Canada not only trade with each other, but make products together with supply chains that are deeply integrated.** Those ties have made the United States more competitive in the global marketplace, and far from being a net liability, are an asset.¶ The starting point of any discussions should also recognize that NAFTA dramatically increased U.S. exports to Mexico. I**n 1992, prior to NAFTA, U.S. exports to Mexico totaled about $42 billion. In 2015, the United States exported goods and services valued at $267 billion, making it the United States' second-largest export market and the source of millions of U.S. jobs. The total two-way trade in goods and services in 2015 was over $580 billion**.¶ While it is not clear what the priorities the administration would have in a NAFTA discussion (Mexico gave up more on tariffs than did the United States in 1993), it is important to recognize that all parties agree that NAFTA could be looked at with modern eyes and that there is an opportunity to do this in a win-win-win fashion. In fact, the three countries already began to modernize the deal, under the talks for the now-stalled Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP). TPP talks included Canada and Mexico and all sides agreed to add new labor and environment provisions, as well as subjecting them to dispute settlement mechanisms. Additional low-hanging fruit of a NAFTA discussion could include issues as mundane as visa categories—occupations that exist now in the technology sector, for example, did not exist 22 years ago.¶ When NAFTA was conceived, the internet did not exist. New rules are needed for sectors like e-commerce. Mexico's energy sector was not open to private investment when NAFTA was negotiated. The three countries now have the opportunity to work together toward North American energy independence with all of the positive geostrategic implications that could have.¶ Done properly, both the United States and Mexico (and Canada) could find benefits from the process of updating the trade relationship and addressing issues including the skills gap across the continent, particularly in manufacturing. For those that have lost jobs due to globalization, the three countries could revisit adjustment assistance and job-training programs to help our three societies better adapt and ensure that skills match jobs already available. According to recent estimates, the number of manufacturing jobs unfilled in the United States because of a skills gap numbers in the millions. North America has the opportunity to tackle these issues as allies, not competitors.¶ Further, **Mexico's prosperity is in the interest of the U**nited **S**tates. **A stronger Mexican economy** means fewer Mexicans will leave their homes seeking opportunity in the United States. (Net immigration flows from Mexico are already less than zero, according to a 2015 Pew study.) **Strong growth and job creation in Mexico also spur the expansion of Mexico's middle class and make Mexico a better partner as citizens' demands, for improved security and rule of law** for example, **dovetail with U.S. security interests**.¶ Outside of the economic relationship, the United States has a direct stake in Mexico's success in **strengthening** its **security and rule of law**. The U.S. Mérida Initiative was conceived to support implementation of Mexico´s rule-of-law reforms, recognizing the fundamental importance of working with Mexico to **address organized crime**, violence, and impunity and its effects in both countries. There is much more that could be done **to weaken the influence of** the **cartels** responsible for exporting drugs into the United States, but success will depend primarily on U.S.-Mexican intelligence and law enforcement partnerships and the mutual sharing of information. That is, success in this area will center around trust and would be at risk in a climate of confrontation.

Byron **RAMIREZ 16**. Adjunct Professor of Strategic Management, University of La Verne; PhD, Economics and Political Science, Claremont Graduate School. "The Criminal and Terrorist Threat of Narco Submarine Technology." Geopolitical Monitor. June 7. https://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/the-criminal-and-terrorist-threat-of-narco-submarine-technology/. // RH

The conceivable threats to international security become increasingly complex and acute when we recognize that some **drug trafficking organizations have been linked with terrorism**. For over 50 years, FARC has carried out bombings, extortions, assassinations, and kidnappings throughout Colombia. In an effort to finance its agenda, FARC has engaged in drug trafficking operations **that include** the **use of narco submarines**. **There are** also the cases of individuals with suspected **ties to Al-Qaida, the Taliban, and Hezbollah** who have been involved in drug related activities. Some of these funds from drug trafficking activities have been used to finance terrorist activities.It is not clear to what extent criminal organizations are involved in financially, logistically, and operationally supporting the efforts of terrorist groups. Yet, there are indications that **these networks could facilitate** the **movement of** terrorist **operatives or w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction **toward U.S. borders** as well as high-value targets in the Western Hemisphere. Despite the fact that law enforcement has seized several vessels, many other **narco sub**marine**s** have **travel**ed **undetected and** almost completely **unrestricted**. **This makes them increasingly perilous to international security**. It is feasible that **criminal-terrorist cooperation could deliver great damage** via the use of narco submarines **that could** carry weapons or parts of **weapons of mass destruction, biological warfare agents, and chemical weapons. Terrorist**

organizations have in the past used the international illicit marketplace to finance their activities, purchase equipment, and potentially **could deploy narco sub**marine**s as vessels of mass destruction**. Hezbollah has supporters in Lebanese diaspora communities in Latin America. There have been illicit activities such as money laundering and drug trafficking in the Tri-Border Area of Argentina, Brazil, and Paraguay, which generated revenue that was later transferred to Hezbollah. For decades, **Iran has funded, provided weapons, and trained terrorists**. During the past several years there has been increased cooperation between Iran and Ecuador, Nicaragua, Venezuela, and Cuba. Although the nature of the cooper ation appears to be related to economic exchange, it is important to realize that other types of cooperation could potentially exist between individuals from these countries which could in turn pose threats to U.S. national security and the security of other countries in the region. Furthermore, there are some recent cases of terrorists who have traveled to Latin America and have been arrested near the U.S. border. Narco submarines constitute an eminent threat when we consider that their design and technology have evolved, and thus they are proficient in avoiding detection and capture. **These vessels are equipped with advanced navigation** systems, **satellite communication, and radars**. **They can travel long distances undetected** evidenced by the copious narco submarines that have been detected throughout the Pacific Ocean and Caribbean Sea. A terrorist group such as FARC could feasibly collaborate with Al Qaeda or Hezbollah and equip narco submarines with added technical features that would enable terrorist organizations to launch destructive attacks on U.S. targets throughout the Americas. **Given their capacity** to travel long distances, narco **sub**marine**s could** also **be deployed to European coasts** and coastal cities. In addition to carrying biological and chemical weapons, narco submarines could also transport terrorist operatives to target locations.