

**The Policies, Politics, and Strategies Responses Concerning the Illicit Drug
Distribution of Mexican/South American Traffickers
Annotated Bibliography
Keyshawn Jackson Allison**

January 2023

Integrative Summary

Drug trafficking organizations have risen in power over the last century from the selling of opium, the production of marijuana, and the exportation of cocaine. Over this time, they have increased in military and political power. Corrupting the general population and political power of Mexican and South American nations. This has resulted in the cartels growing from million-dollar organizations to the billion-dollar ones they are known as today. Political decisions concerning drugs and other aspects of trade in recent years have worsened the problem and allowed cartels to grow in power. As well as increase the amount of violence. Policies including NAFTA, the inauguration of Mexican leaders who seek to focus on cartels, and many other political decisions play a part in all of this. The fallback from these operations and policies only allows the cartel to profit further. Throughout all of this, the United States and Mexico have been attempting to control, neutralize, and bring many of these organizations to justice and out of power. From the many attempts to crush this complicated issue, both countries' operations,s and decisions have only made the problem worse or only made a dent in it. The reason for individuals to turn to drug production isn't targeted the majority of the time. Resulting in a dent that an increased amount of violence would repair, the production of drugs, and the exploitation of the poor.

Joel Salvador Herrera, **Cultivating Violence: Trade Liberalization, Illicit Labor, and the Mexican Drug Trade**, Journal Study, University of Miami, 2019

In this study, Joel Salvador Herrera seeks to find the link between economic liberalization and drug violence. Mostly by looking at prime locations like Mexico, where drug trafficking is most prevalent. Salvador conducts this study by analyzing many aspects of the drug trade. For example, he analyzes the effects of the NAFTA agreement of 1994, narco violence statistics in the 21st century, narco relations in the last two decades, and the growing rates of violence since the 80s. Through this research, he comes to many conclusions relating to the economic liberalization of drugs and the violence associated with drug smuggling.

However, the policies and politics that Salvador uses show that political agreements like NAFTA can have and have had an effect on drug smuggling. Although the agreement opened up more trade for the United States and Mexico with the rest of the world, it left Mexico in a worse state. As a result of NAFTA, it is reported that as many as 1.3 million farm jobs in Mexico were lost. This is a result of the increased production that stemmed from the NAFTA trade agreement. As a result of NAFTA, the economic status of many Mexican citizens, this article coherelates the violence in the Mexican drug trade with the decrease of Mexico's economic state. The increasing corruption that stems from the economic problems plaguing Mexico only make the illicit drug trade worse. Salvador comes to a conclusion in a statement relating to the connection between the destabilization of legitimate jobs in Mexico. Salvador wrote that “On the other hand, labor markets in the developing world have been restructured along more precarious lines, making social reproduction more difficult in licit sectors and arguably aiding the growth of illicit industries”(Herrera 134). This statement summarizes the shifting nature of Mexico throughout the last few decades. The NAFTA agreement was not seen as a positive for Mexico, but an act

that only worsened the corruption and illicit selling of drugs in Mexico. Salvador also dedicates a section to examining how the market-led development that Mexico went through in the mid-1990s. He forms a hypothesis around the correlation between the market's upward mobility and the drug trade. Herrera wrote "The hypothesis forwarded here is that trade opening leads to sectoral changes in the Mexican political economy, which, in turn, inadvertently increase the flow of workers into the drug trade"(Herrera 135). This idea later led to his connection between trade and production centers. Expanding the idea that production or trade centers both had increased cartel violence, presence, and illicit drug production. This idea expresses just how bad the situation is in Mexico. Markets are shared with illicit drug production unknowingly and knowingly in circumstances concerning corruption. This connection between the market and drug production only expresses the impact NAFTA had on drug production. Herrera later expands on this later in his study through calculations. Herrera conducts these calculations to see the greater correlation between trade production and narco-violence. These calculations include "trade protection", amount of workers, drug trade deaths, trade exposure, and finally the regions with increased production or trade. However, he also contains a section where his estimations are explained. To summarize the purpose of his calculations Herrera wrote that "The main hypothesis is that trade exposure is positively associated with higher levels of violence, due to the exclusionary dynamics of Mexico's trade opening—but with mechanisms that differ based on the political economy of drug trafficking in each region"(Herrera 143). Later in his conclusion, Herrera explains his findings and many other new interpretations.

Salvador analyzed many government policies that were imposed and models of zones that contain a large amount of drug smuggling. He was able to conclude that violence and the use of illicit drugs definitely increased over the last few decades in zones containing a large amount of

smuggling. However, Salvador still remains ambivalent towards the effect of government policies and politics associated with Mexico. However, the NAFTA policy as a result caused a lot of Mexican individuals to lose their jobs, which created situations where poverty became more prevalent. Poverty is a similar shared issue between the zones Salvador mentioned in his study.

Julien Mercille, Violent Narco-Cartels or US Hegemony? The political economy of the 'War on drugs' in Mexico, Journal Study, 2011

This study focuses on another political aspect of the drug war. The neoliberal reforms from the United States and how the United States government not only profited but influenced the drug crisis in Mexico. Julien Mercille analyzes the influence and economic positives associated with the United States Hegemony in Mexico. Particularly the reason why Mexico is a central place to the war on drugs today.

To start off, at a point in Mercille's study he analyzes the history of US hegemony in Mexico. Raising many points to support the fact that Mexico and South America has always been a large production or trade center for the United States. Mercille begins his study by highlighting several main interpretations concerning the discussion of his article. The interpretations he wrote are that the United States focuses their efforts mainly on drug cartels as they believe they are the main source of the problems. Secondly, that the US collaborates with the Mexican government to keep the production and supplying of drugs from reaching US soil. He expresses an important part of the problem in expressing that the corruption that currently plagues the Mexican government is the United States biggest issue to conquer the drug war. Finally, Mercille emphasizes that the United States should promote military aid, arrest drug kingpins, interdiction, and promote NAFTA trade agreements. The involvement of NAFTA plays a big part in either worsening or containing the problem. Mercille discusses all of these interpretations to introduce his own alternate interpretations that contain layers associated with those previously mentioned.

Mercille goes as far back as WW2 to express how much the United States has always had an opportunistic view towards the country. This and many more influences were the reason why many decades down the line neoliberal reforms were imposed and NAFTA was created.

However, just like NAFTA, Mercille argues that the neoliberal reforms contributed to making the drug trade worse. These reforms targeted certain aspects like decreasing trade barriers, removing regulation associated with capital markets and eliminating the ability to price control. This as result increased commerce between the United States and Mexican border. Which only increased the large quantity of drugs that was once only smuggled through sea. South American Cartels and Mexican Cartels had the ability to increase their production as a result. However another aspect that is mentioned throughout articles is when the United States under President Ronald Reagan decided to combat the drug trade, the militarization of Mexican soldiers had negative results. Many Mexican soldiers were trained on United States soil to combat the drug trade in their own country. However as a result of the corruption that plagues Mexico, many soldiers who returned to Mexico, were recruited into the infamous Zeta Cartel. Another issue left to uncorrupted Mexican officials to deal with. However the United States today still continues to offer surveillance efforts by the DEA and other military assets to continue to contain certain drug production centers or cartels. This leads Mercille into bringing up the problem of money laundering. Although efforts are focused on Mexican soil, Mercille notes that several drug kingpins launder money in America. Mercille wrote that “drug money. In 2010 Wachovia (now part of Wells Fargo) had to forfeit \$110 million to US authorities for having allowed drug-related financial transactions of the same amount, in addition to \$50 million for failure to monitor funds used to ship 22 tons of cocaine”(Mercille 1649). This essentially expresses the fact that several problems are present in the United States and efforts shouldn't solely be focused on Mexican soil.

From the evidence that Marcille provides in this study, it becomes clear that the United States profited from Mexico for years. However as a result of the United States increasing

economic reforms and policies that were imposed on Mexico, disastrous results in the drug trade were created. The corruption from NAFTA, neoliberal reforms and the justly attempts by Ronald Reagan to deal with an increasing problem only made the problems worse. Each issue leaving Mexico more corrupted and the illicit drug trade worse.

James P. Farewell and Darby Arakelian, **War on Our Doorstep: Not a Mere Crime Problem**, Journal Study, 2014

This article discusses the problems that stem from the way the United States has chosen to handle the illegal drug trade. Although the policies and political choices the United States has made worsened the illegal drug trade in Mexico. The current objective of the United States authority organizations and Mexican authorities are different in their approach. James P. Farewell and Darby Arakelian study the problems with the strategies both groups use to combat drug cartels.

Farewell firstly seeks to characterize the conflict to properly determine a strategy. The argument that Farewell analyzes is the two opposing views towards handling the drug conflict. The argument that whether or not the drug cartel problem should be handled with a military response or through a change in reforms and political policy. However Farewell argues that approaching the cartels don't only seek greed or profit but political power as well. In this study, Farewell supports this argument through analyzing how the cartel spends billions annually to pay off cops, assassinate political officials, and engage in campaigns to subvert the Mexican government. Although Farewell believes Mexico should focus on combating this and stopping kidnappings. Farewell also analyzes how cartels manage to control the population and even political officials. The evidence Farewell provides also expresses how the political state that NAFTA left Mexico in only worsened the problem. The increased poverty only left room for workers to turn to more illegal drug production. Concerning how cartels market their criminal organizations, Farewell wrote that "Why be poor? Come work for us."³⁷ One Zetas banner hanging over a major thoroughfare declared: "Operative Group 'the Zetas' wants you soldier or ex-soldier. We offer a good salary, food and benefits for your family"(Farewell 46). This example only expresses the initial problem with the booming poverty in Mexico as a result of

NAFTA. However Farewell seeks to note how well these criminal organizations have come to market themselves. On the surface it appears that they are out to help individuals. Farewell noted that “They espouse an odd form of Christianity and run drug rehab clinics. The cartel offers jobs and organizes popular protests against the government”(Farewell 46). Once the cartels got through with the general population, they moved on to gaining political power.

In the next section, Farewell titled “Seizing Political Power”, the methods the cartels used to achieve political power is discussed. The several reasons Farewell expresses for why the cartels rose to political power include the billions they spend annually to bribe police, their assassination of political officials who seek to thwart their operations, their extortion and even how they seek to demean the Mexican government. Their objective to demean the Mexican government also in exchange enhances their power with the general population of Mexico. This only scratches the surface of all the operations that cartels take part in to expand their political power. However to set a pause to this Mexico and the United States government both have to impose better policies before taking on the cartels militarily.

The United States should focus solely on the flow of illegal drugs. Most importantly Farewell explains many alternate strategies both countries can take to combat this problem. The “Different Approach” section has many initiatives both countries can take to approach the problem. Some of these initiatives involve treating cartels as terrorists or insurgents, seize and restrict cartel funds, create a special military force with the Mexican Government, the United States has to persuade now former president Nieto, and revamp the Merida initiative. Farewell concludes his study with these solutions, revamping the approach the United States and Mexico can take from now.

Farewell by his conclusion reiterates that the United States has to let go of their “defeatist rhetoric”. The United States and Mexico only makes a dent that only makes the issue worse because of the distance between the two nations. Two countries approach the problem differently which causes a lot of political conflict only leading to more setbacks. Learning from past mistakes is something this study highlights.

Melissa Dell, **Trafficking Networks and the Mexican Drug War**, Journal Study, 2015

In the many other studies analyzed recently, the policies and decisions made by the United States negatively affected the illegal drug trade. Alternatively however, Melissa Dell in this study examines the policies that Mexico has made and how it has spilled over to the United States as a result. Dell goes about this firstly through looking more in depth into the PAN government in Mexico. Mexico's conservative National Action Party (PAN) is behind the decisions to combat the illegal drug. This is what Dell mainly focuses on in this study.

Dell elaborates upon the Drug Trafficking industry in his section titled "Drug and Violence in Mexico". Although cartels focus mainly on the production and supplying of drugs, Dell notes that they part in many other criminal opportunities. Opportunities to them which include protection rackets, kidnapping, human smuggling, prostitution and many other illegal means of profit. Dell also notes that "The poor, who have limited resources to state protection, are particularly likely to be exploited"(Dell 1745). In this article, again we see how poverty only increases the cartel's power to expand and have more workers. Dell uses the cartels' use of the poor and use of many other illegal profiteering methods to express what the main issue is.

The section titled "B. Mexico's War on Drug Trafficking", involves a part of Dell's central argument. The National Action Party under President Felipe Calderon targeted the illegal drug trade throughout his time in office from 2006 to 2012. However Dell importantly notes that the decade under the Institutionalized Revolutionary Party only made the drug trade worse because of how the party chose to ignore the drug trade. This is another case of corruption in politics however as it is well documented that the (PRI) contained a large amount of corruption. Dell argues however through different data displays and calculations that the crackdowns that came during Calderon's era worsened the violence in Mexico. Most importantly, Dell's findings

suggest that instead of target drug trafficking routes, the enforcement of homicide laws need to be improved first. The war on drugs conducted during Calderon's era only worsened the violence throughout Mexico. This is expressed more in the section titled "Direct Effects of Close PAN Victories on Violence". She uses Data, calculations including economic framework, and graphical analysis of violent patterns to express the effects of violent PAN victories. In the section related to Data, Dell explains the statistical data she seeks to use in her calculations. Data including drug-related homicide deaths, electoral data and multiplying the death municipal data by monthly. Immediately in the economic framework section that contains calculations, Dell analyzes an important detail concerning the corruption of the voting that occurs. Dell emphasizes that "While traffickers may have incentives to intimidate voters and candidates, recall that mayors prior to the Calderon administration had limited capacity to challenge heavily armed traffickers given the absence of a widespread federal crackdown"(Dell 1751). Dell further expands on this by explaining that Cartels had more mayors killed after crackdowns. Finally in the section related to the violence patterns that are analyzed through graphs. Many interesting discoveries are made involving the rise of violence. Concerning the rise in violence, Dell wrote that "The homicide rate increases following the inaugurations of PAN mayors and remains significantly high in PAN municipalities for as long as data are available"(Dell 1756). This is another example of the "spillovers" Dell correlates with cartel violence.

This study from Melissa Dell examines the history of Mexico's political issues and homicide correlations with crackdowns. It also explains the history of how the drug trade worsens in different ways even with a political party that targets it. The political corruption becomes worse enough to influence a party and shift it to completely ignoring the drug wars.

Finally Mexico can not simply just crackdown on the drug trade but reshape and better enforce their homicide laws before target cartel drug routes.

Matthew S. Jenner, **International Drug Trafficking: A Global Problem with a Domestic Solution**, Journal Study, 2011

There have been many policies, reforms and discussions regarding the illicit drug trade. Some solutions have unfortunately only made matters worse. In this study by Matthew S. Jenner, he reviews the history behind many proposed solutions, the topic of legalization and the next step in government regulation. Through the discussion of past historical solutions, Jenner uses that to formulate possible solutions to combat the illegal drug trade.

Jenner lists four major past strategies taken up by the United States and its allies to combat the illegal drug trade. Strategies which include the inclusion of the United Nations, The United States focusing on interdiction of the war on drugs, "Plan Columbia " and the decriminalization of Mexico in the early 2000s. Firstly, the United Nations, Jenner references the Commission on Narcotic Drugs that was established in 1946. This created multiple conventions that monitored drugs illicit and non illicit as well considering drugs from a health standpoint. As a result, a framework was available for member states. Secondly, interdiction and international funding was a part of the United States anti drug objective. This resulted in several operations, including 1969 where the United States required cars to be searched when crossing over the U.S. Mexican border. Mexico also joined in on the United States aggressive campaign to manage the importation of marijuana. "Plan Columbia ", is another example of an antidrug campaign however in 1999 President Andres Pastrana initiated plan columbia. This campaign was meant to target the flow of drugs, promote economic and community justice and finally, spread the rule of law. It's also written that the United States contributed as much as six billion dollars to help in this operation. Finally, the decriminalization of Mexico in the early 2000s resulted in the "Law Against Small Drug Traffickers" ' being passed by the Mexican government to combat the drug problem plaguing Mexico in 2009. As a result of this law a small amount of marijuana, cocaine

and other drugs were made illegal. Each of these throughout the past history were initiatives with good intentions however the results weren't always positive.

The findings after the solutions express that the proposed solutions either did not work, made a dent or did more harm than good. Problems including the United Nations setting a good framework but only setting guidelines that don't actually make a dent in the trade. Regarding this, Jenner wrote that "The U.N. Convention Against Illicit Trafficking provides tremendous insight into how to combat drug trafficking. However, the Convention has one inherent downfall: it is merely a framework"(Jenner 910). Although it left a framework open for many member nations, it was not enough. As a result of The United States interdiction, they were not intercepting a large percentage of the drugs being trafficked worldwide so it only made a dent in operations. Plan Colombia destabilized operations in cities but only just pushed drug traffickers into lower populated areas. Drug producers only moved into more rural areas, where they had more room to produce more drugs. Finally the decriminalization of Mexico slightly succeeded but Jenner notes that "only time will tell". Legalization and decriminalization is something that Jenner concludes isn't a simple solution and will not automatically yield results. As a result of his analysis, Jenner formulates that the next step is Government Regulation. Arguing that governments should regulate the consumption of newly legal drugs, target violence, control the manufacturing process and regulate possession through the use of heavy government involvement. As a result of this, Jenner states that legalization and decriminalization can work once these are controlled through heavy government involvement.

The solutions discussed in this study aren't only criticized by Jenner but used to formulate a better solution. Each previous strategy in history has had somewhat of a good outcome or a good intention but didn't entirely deal with the problem. Combating drug violence

and having a heavy government regulation of the process of drugs can pave a way for other past strategies. Strategies like legalization and decriminalization.

Ioan Grillo, **Mexican Cartels: A Century of Defying U.S. Drug Policy**, Journal Study, 2013.

Cartels and drug smugglers have avoided drug policies for decades. In this journal study by Ioan Grillo, the many U.S. policies that have been avoided throughout history are highlighted. Focusing on the fact that learning about how an enemy maneuvers certain policies or laws is important to tackling these groups. As well as focusing on the century long growth of the cartels we know today.

Grillo focuses on many points in history where certain drugs were produced by drug smugglers in Mexico and South American Countries. This study touches on the smuggling of Opium, Marijuana, formation of cartels all the way to the drug wars of today. Starting with the smuggling of Opium. The allies and tactics that early stages of smuggler groups used are an early warning towards the many tactics cartels would use today. As well as the connection Spanish smugglers had with Chinese smuggler groups. Grillo highlights this fact later into his section of the discussion of Opium smuggling. Grillo wrote that “One of the earliest U.S. investigations into this trade in 1916 reports how the Mexican and Chinese worked with Chinese opium syndicates in the United States in one case in San Francisco”(Grillo 254). Even in 1916 Grillo notes that there were many signs of corruption between Mexican officials. This approach to the history of Mexican smuggling networks also brings up the premise that the choices the US Government makes, affects what Mexican governments choose to smuggle. For example, Grillo notes that before the prohibition was repealed, smugglers from Mexico targeted the importation of alcohol. However once it was repealed, they shifted their focus towards heroin and opium in the 1930s. Another example of this relationship between the United States and Mexican smugglers is highlighted by Grillo. In the context of the 1940s, Grillo wrote that “Many allege that the U.S. government directly aided this growth by purchasing opium to make morphine for

its troops who were bleeding from German and Japanese shells”(Grillo 255). Although it is alleged, this is another case of the many occurrences where many believe that the United States influenced the drug trade throughout the years in some shape for their own benefit. This aspect leads into Grillo’s discussion of the marijuana drug trade in the 60s to the 70s.

Most importantly, Grillo emphasizes because of the increased drug consumption that was occurring in the 1960s and 70s, Mexican drug networks boomed as a result. As a result of increased smuggling, the United States under President Nixon targeted this. This decision also highlights the policies or actions imposed that only made matters worse. Operation Intercept is an example of this. As a result of Operation Intercept, Grillo wrote that “However, the operation wrecked havoc, backing up trucks of goods and preventing Mexican workers from traveling to their U.S. jobs. After a barrage of complaints, the government stopped Intercept after 17 days, evincing the grim reality that only selected vehicles could be checked”(Grillo 256). As a result of the Operation failing the drug smuggling only increased in production and funds. Grillo emphasizes that as a result of the boom of drug smuggling at the time, cartel millionaires became billionaires. However as a result of many more operations and the growth of cartel factions, violence between factions or government officials only became more apparent. Grillo even noted that “Almost no one predicted the level of violence that Mexican cartels would unleash in the twenty-first century”(Grillo 258). In This section Grillo notes problems that were previously discussed and only worsened the problem. The PAN parties launched an offensive against the cartel and several trained soldiers defecting to cartels. However Grillo also proposes that the assault rifle repeal of 2004 only made matters worse. Grillo also notes that Carderons offensive failed because it only increased the violence. The final section titled “Changing The Conversation” also highlights the Mexican Government’s decrease in targeting Cartels by the

PRI that came into power in 2012. However a somewhat positive result came from this.

Although cartels continued to strengthen, violence decreased and the United States relationship with Mexico increased. Which leads to Grillo's statement in the conclusion. Grillo wrote that "Mexico City and Washington currently appear resigned to limiting the damage of the cartels, arresting some traffickers, and seizing some drugs, rather than keen on making a serious effort to end the cross-border trade in narcotics"(Grillo 264). However, Grillo notes that Mexico and The United States should take this time to really focus on how to take a positive approach to the problem.

Studying the history of drug smugglers becoming the billion dollar cartel organizations of today allow for better solutions to be formed from past failures. The opium trade, marijuana trade and the drug wars only reemphasized the different approach that should be taken. Not only that, better policies and reforms should be imposed. The relationship between Mexico and the United States first needs to improve so a greater political relationship can result in a better handling of the drug trade.

Julia Buxton, **Drugs Policies and Development: Conflict and Coexistence: Chapter 2 Drug Control and Development: A Blind Spot**, Book Chapter, 2020.

In this chapter taken from *Drugs Policies and Development: Conflict and Coexistence*, Buxton takes another approach to analyzing the failed policies proposed by the United States and Mexico to tackle the illicit drug trade. He also proposes his own theoretical solution through analyzing previous policies. Buxton analyzes free trade to trade regulations, impacts of international trade regulations, americanization and criminalization. In this study, he also reanalyzes the history of the approach the United States has taken on the illicit drug illicit.

Similarly to Julien Mercille's previous article, Buxton elaborates on the history of the free trade agreements of the early 20th century and the opium smuggling around the same era as well. All the way until the U.S. war on drugs of the 1970s. However most importantly was Buxton's introduction of criminalization. The pragmatism also from the United States contradicts their recent efforts in criminalization of the certain drugs being smuggled. Buxton wrote that "The US has played a Janus-faced role in global drug control. While a vigorous promoter of prohibition, US agencies also condoned and encouraged illegal cultivation, manufacture and trafficking activities when in the national geostrategic interest"(Buxton 22). This came as a result of the United States interest in preventing several communities and South American nations from moving towards communism. As a result, Buxton notes that the United States funded right-wing and anti-communist insurgencies. Despite the manufacturing of drugs that would plague communities and allowed cartels to increase their power, the United States at the time was more concerned with preventing the spread of communism. This aspect leads Buxton into his discussion on criminalization. The increase in alternative development, crop eradication programs to target illicit drug production and increased enforcement in the countries where the illicit drugs were produced caused several consequences. The black market only increased

production as a result and it had many drawbacks. Buxton emphasized that “Sometimes source-country interventions reduce production in one country, but unfortunately there seems to be no shortage of peasant farmers and criminals in relatively lawless regions who are willing to take up the slack”(Buxton 23). Targeting a select area only increased production in another and left open more alternatives for other groups to cultivate their power. Buxton also notes that the opiate interceptions and cocaine targeting in the late 20th century still caused the many consequences seen with criminalization. The final aspect, Buxton emphasized is that “conditions of marginalisation, isolation and poverty that render engagement in the illegal drug trade (including in harvesting, collection, transportation and brokerage) a rational, if not the only option for sustaining livelihoods”(Buxton 27). All of these aspects caused the several drawbacks that led to the increased violence, power and production of cartels in the 21st century. This leads into Buxtons alternative approach to imposing illicit drug policies.

Buxtons alternate approach including the aspect that drug production that many take part in include more complicated reasonings then just simple criminal profiteering. This is where he introduces the AD approach. This approach includes the idea of learning from previous failures and focuses on fixing the reasoning of why individuals choose to take up in the production of drugs. To add more evidence to using this idea, Buxton includes the fact that the AD approach worked in containing the production of opium in Thailand. After many failed militaristic approaches in Thailand, Buxton wrote that “Led by King Boumibol, the Thai Royal Highlands Project encouraged Hmong community participation to identify and address citizenship and infrastructure deficits”(Buxton 29). As a result of this economic formalization increased because of Thailand's effort to address citizenship and infrastructure deficits. This leads to Buxton arguing that “The 1998 Action Plan, the sdgs, and the 2016 ungass Outcome Document are

notable for ignoring and excluding meaningful, evidence-driven engagement with the development impacts of criminalisation”(Buxton 36). This alternative approach is useful as it doesn’t just target the production of the illicit drugs but fixing the many reasons as to why individuals would take up in this practice.

This article as well as Julien Mercille that was recently discussed, uses the AD approach. Both of them analyze the failures of the past and use it to form a solution for the future. There are many complicated reasons for individuals getting involved in the production of drugs. Many forms of poverty and less opportunities lead individuals towards choosing to take up illegal actions in drug production.

Bibliographical Listing

1. Herrera, Joel Salvador. "Cultivating Violence: Trade Liberalization, Illicit Labor, and the Mexican Drug Trade." *Latin American Politics and Society*, vol. 61, no. 3, 2019, pp. 129–53.
2. MERCILLE, JULIEN. "Violent Narco-Cartels or US Hegemony? The Political Economy of the 'War on Drugs' in Mexico." *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 9, 2011, pp. 1637–53.
3. Farwell, James P., and Darby Arakelian. "War on Our Doorstep: Not a Mere Crime Problem." *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2014, pp. 40–54.
4. Dell, Melissa. "Trafficking Networks and the Mexican Drug War." *The American Economic Review*, vol. 105, no. 6, 2015, pp. 1738–79.
5. Jenner, Matthew S. "International Drug Trafficking: A Global Problem with a Domestic Solution." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, vol. 18, no. 2, 2011, pp. 901–27.
6. Grillo, Ioan. "Mexican Cartels: A Century of Defying U.S. Drug Policy." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2013, pp. 253–65.
7. Buxton, Julia. "Drug Control and Development: A Blind Spot." *Drug Policies and Development: Conflict and Coexistence*, edited by Julia Buxton et al., Brill, 2020, pp. 13–42.