2013

Different Wars Require Different Strategies: Separating the "War on Drugs" from the "War on Drug [Traffickers]"

Liana Eustacia Reyes
Florida International University

Different Wars Require Different Strategies:
Separating the "War on Drugs" from the "War on Drug [Traffickers]"

by Liana Eustacia Reyes, J.D., M.A., Florida International University

Abstract

Using the securitization framework to highlight the arguments that facilitated the "War on Drugs", this paper highlights a separate war against drug traffickers. Facilitated by ideology through the rhetoric promoted by the "War on Drugs," the fear of communist expansion and democratic contraction, the "War on Drug Traffickers" was implemented, requiring its own strategy separate from the "War on Drugs." This is an important distinction because the play on words changes the perception of the issue from one of drug addiction to one of weak institutions and insurgent/terrorist threat to those institutions. Furthermore, one cannot propose strategy to win, lose, or retreat in a war that one has been unable to identify properly. And while the all-encompassing "War on Drugs" has motivated tremendous discourse on its failure and possible solutions to remedy its failure, the generalizations made as a result of the inability to distinguish between the policies behind drug addiction and the militarized policies behind drug trafficking have discounted the effect of violence perpetrated by the state, the rationale for the state perpetrating that violence, and the dependence that the state has on foreign actors to perpetrate such violence. This makes it impossible to not only propose effective strategy but also to persuade states that participate in the "War on Drug Traffickers" to adopt the proposed strategy.

Introduction

The "War on Drugs" is a rhetorical war that has been popularly categorized as United States (U.S.) drug prohibition in the 20th century. Looking beyond its name, is it attached to militarized drug prohibition? Military engagement must occur for a "war" to occur, and drugs cannot be personified to the extent necessary to actually go to war with them. Yet around the world countries[1] have implemented militarized counter-narcotics policies that are separate from the supply/consumption policies of the "War on Drugs." This takes the "War on Drugs" from rhetoric to military strategy and expands it to include a "War on Drug Traffickers." The distinction is necessary because one cannot propose a strategy to win, lose, or retreat in a war that one has been unable to properly identify.

The all-encompassing "War on Drugs" has motivated tremendous discourse on its failure and possible solutions to remedy its failure. The generalizations made as a result of the inability to distinguish between the policies behind drug addiction and the militarized policies against drug trafficking have discounted the effect of violence perpetrated by the state, the rationale for the state perpetrating that violence, and the dependence that the state has on foreign actors to perpetrate such violence. The lack of consideration for their rationale to perpetrate violence and their dependence on foreign actors perpetrating such violence would result in a failed proposition. The lack of consideration for the effects of violence perpetrated by the state would result in an inefficient policy. Without the distinction between these wars and the considerations involved with their distinction, it is impossible to not only propose effective strategy but also to persuade states involved in the "War on Drug Traffickers" to adopt any proposed strategy.

The purpose of this paper is to distinguish between the "War on Drugs" and the resulting "War on Drug Traffickers" so that the implementation, rationale for

[1] The terms "countries" and "states" are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

implementation, and effects of implementation of the resulting militarized drug policies can be studied. The goal of this research is to dissect the motivating factors for extreme counter-narcotics policies to effectively strategize how to transition from such policies. Since this paper is at the foundational level of this research, it is focused on the U.S. as the popularly cited creator of the "War on Drugs."

To understand the rationale behind going to war with drug traffickers and the implementation of the militarized counter-narcotics policies that invoke the "War on Drug Traffickers," a historical analysis was conducted of former President Richard Nixon's drug policy and of former President Ronald Reagan's National Security Decision Directives. The most influential arguments and intelligence that dictated – or at the very least molded – the argument for the resulting militarized counter-narcotics policies was highlighted. As a result, this paper finds that former President Ronald Reagan was the influential actor of the "Speech Act" that changed the discourse in drug policy facilitating its expansion.[2]

This paper first begins with the framework used to conduct this historical analysis, Buzan, Waever, and Wilde's (1998) "In Security: A New Framework for Analysis."[3] The framework is used to highlight the change in discourse, also known as the securitizing moves in which the United States expanded the "War on Drugs" to include a "War on Drug Traffickers." Second, this paper will use that framework to detail how the "War on Drug Traffickers" came to fruition and why it is separate from the "War on Drugs." Further research to understand what drove countries around the world to militarize their counter-narcotics policies should be conducted to understand not only what drove these countries, but what commonalities these countries share among each other and the U.S. Although research into the motivating factors that facilitated implementation of the "War on Drug Traffickers" has not been conducted, this paper will end with a discussion

[2] This paper at no point discounts the covert operations conducted by the U.S. in other countries, but only focuses on the military operations that were conducted after the drug trade was articulated as a national security threat.
[3] Buzan, Waever, and Wilde, 1998.

on the possible motivating factors that proposed policies must take into consideration.

Theoretical Framework of Buzan, Waever, and Wilde (1998): Politicization/Securitization

Traditionally, the security of a state could only be threatened by another state.[4] This limitation allowed for extreme threats such as military engagement to come from a state only. As a result, security issues were easily identified because they were always stemming from states whose political agendas, assertions or acts could be noted as a threat to another state. During the Cold War, security threats were expanded beyond states to include non-traditional threats of individual citizens/non-citizens, organizations, and drug traffickers. Identifying threats became more difficult because they began to come from anyone or anything. To control for those endless possibilities, Buzan, Weaver, and Wilde (1998) created the "securitization" framework. For this paper to identify what promoted the threat of a drug trafficker to be equal to the threat of another state, the study would have to be conducted within this framework. This section will focus on the securitization framework so that the following sections can use the framework to sift through the "War on Drugs" progression and expansion into the "War on Drug Traffickers."

For non-traditional security threats, the securitization framework establishes the process of a threat going from a minimal social threat to an existential state threat resulting in extreme policies such as military action. This framework allows for a non-traditional security threat that becomes a national security threat to be studied and properly identified. The framework is the following:

> **(1)** a claim made by the securitizing actor that something is existentially threatening some valued referent object; **(2)** the securitizing actor's audience holds value to that referent object and accepts the claim made by the securitizing actor; and **(3)** that audience allows for the implementation of extreme tactics (such as

[4] Andreas and Price, 2001, 31-52.

> military engagement) by the securitizing actor to protect their valued referent object.[5]

This is also known as the Speech Act in which the proper actor's speech gains consent from the authorizing audience to implement extreme policies.[6] The key to securitization is for the speech to gain acceptance so that the audience will allow the speaker to implement extreme policies. In other words:

> Securitization […] does not simply come into being when one actor declares an existential threat; this is merely the securitizing move. Instead, a securitization exists only at the point when a designated audience accepts the speech act. Securitization is thus both a performative speech act, whereby in speaking security it is done, as well as an intersubjective process between the securitizing actor and an audience. Once an issue has been 'accepted' by an audience, a securitizing actor is in the position to evoke emergency measures and go beyond established rules in an effort to address the threat. 'Securitization is fulfilled […] by cases of existential threats that legitimize the breaking of rules.[7]

For the state to use its own military to domestically go on the offense and/or defense with drug traffickers, the state must perceive that drug traffickers are an existential threat. But the "…discourse that takes the form of presenting something as an existential threat to a referent object does not by itself create securitization-this is a securitizing move…", hence the "War on Drugs."[8] Noting the discourse is key for pinpointing the time that drug policy shifted into the military sector and most importantly for noting the motivating factors for the resulting militarized counter-narcotics policies.

Before the securitization of drug traffickers can occur, and before the expansion of perceived threats that motivate drug policy to militarize can occur, drugs themselves have to be lifted from the social realm to the political realm, allowing for their threat to be felt by actual decision makers. Politicized issues are "…(part of public policy, requiring government decision and resource allocations

[5] As stated above, this framework is derived from Buzan, Waever, and Wilde, 1998.
[6] See Buzan, Waever, and Wilde, 1998.
[7] Floyd and Croft, 2011, 155.
[8] Buzan, Waever, and Wilde, 1998, 25.

or, more rarely, some other form of communal governance)…"[9] For the audience to be introduced and begin accepting the claim that the state, its referent object, was/is being threatened by drug traffickers requiring the implementation of militarized counter-narcotics policies, the supply of drugs would have to be politicized; also known as the securitizing move discussed above.[10] This explains how the policy regarding narcotics became political and rose to the level requiring military action.

The following sections will put this framework to use while exploring the securitizing moves that led to the "War on Drug Traffickers." The next section will use this framework to establish why the "War on Drugs" was a successful securitizing move that led to the securitization of drug traffickers around the world. A discussion of why the "War on Drugs" did not complete the framework but instead became the securitizing move for the "War on Drug Traffickers" will show that not only are we dealing with completely separate issues, but we are dealing with issues that require completely separate strategies and policies.

Background: Beginning with the "War on Drugs"

Former President Richard Nixon is recognized for his contributions with initiating the "War on Drugs." In 1971, he stated that "America's public enemy number one . . . is drug abuse" and "[i]n order to fight and defeat this enemy, it is necessary to wage a new, all-out offensive."[11] At this point, the claim was an attempt by the executive of a state to place drug abuse, or the commodities that people abuse, as the number-one threat to that state. To "wage a new, all-out offensive" would seem to signal the Speech Act requirement for securitization especially since policies were implemented, or at least referenced as being implemented, because of former President Richard Nixon's speech.[12] His speech, however, was focused on demand issues such as rehabilitation. The goal was to assist our military

[9] Id. at 23.
[10] The politicization of these drug suppliers is the securitizing move that facilitates the securitization of drug traffickers.
[11] Nixon, 1971, 202 (Remarks About an Intensified Program for Drug Abuse Prevention and Control).
[12] Buzan, Waever, and Wilde, 1998, 26.

stationed abroad, in particular Vietnam,[13] while also assisting society as a whole from succumbing to the hardships of drug addiction.

Drugs had been taken from the social realm and placed in the political realm allowing for the resulting rehabilitative, judicial, and police remedies to be put in place. Former President Richard Nixon established the Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention within the Executive Office as a "central authority with overall responsibility for all major Federal drug abuse prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation, training, and research programs in all Federal agencies."[14] Drugs had been effectively politicized and elevated into the executive branch. Although the resulting policies would involve executive control of drug policy and obstructing the ability to invoke some rights such as the "no-knock searches," actual military engagement or intrastate war did not occur, meaning that securitization did not occur.[15]

For years, drugs were deemed an uncontrollable threat with no discriminatory qualities and only horrifying effects for those who consumed them. Society as a whole was at this social issue's mercy. Former President Richard Nixon's categorizing of drugs as an addictive threat with no discriminatory qualities would allow the U.S. to begin securitizing this group of commodities due to the resulting fear of not knowing who its next victim would be – a fear potentially experienced by the securitizing audience.[16] However, the inability of a person, let alone a state, to go on the offensive with a commodity, regardless of its personification,

[13] In his speech, Nixon notes that "Vietnam … has brought to our attention the fact that a number of young American have become addicts as they serve abroad…" Nixon, 1971, 202.
[14] Nixon, 1971, 203 (Special Message to the Congress on Drug abuse Prevention and Control).
[15] See Floyd and Croft, 2011, 161 "The analyst using securitization theory must not focus on what security, is, but only on what it does – because what is done in the name of security is tantamount to the meaning of security."
[16] See Andreas, Bertram, Blachman, and Sharpe, Winter 1991-1992, 160: "The spread of crack cocaine and the dramatic escalation of drug-related violence in the 1980s led first Ronald Reagan and then George Bush to "declare war" on drugs. By the end of the decade, more Americans identified drugs as the number-one threat to the country than any other problem." For even more detail on the U.S. perception of drugs, see The White House National Drug Control Strategy, September 1989.

prevents drugs from fitting the securitization framework as a securitized issue in the military sector, and leaves it in the political sector as a politicized issue.

Even though drugs themselves are unable to fit within the framework for securitization, their politicized threat is successful enough to facilitate the securitization of its suppliers now placing drug traffickers within the scope of review for a securitized threat. This is still an incredible political move because the claim for an all-out offensive was, prior to former President Richard Nixon's declaration, a claim traditionally made against another state and/or government.[17] Up until that point, the claim was only being made against communism and/or communist states. Therefore, former President Richard Nixon placed drugs in the realm of a state threat that needed to be offensively attacked because it would have severe consequences for anyone and everyone. This meant that the door was officially open to a new area of U.S. and international security: political drug control.[18]

Former President Richard Nixon's speech facilitated the supply reduction policies that would begin looking at "source countries" versus focusing only on domestic consumption. He specifically noted:

> America has the largest number of heroin addicts of any nation in the world. And yet, America does not grow opium-of which heroin is a derivative--nor does it manufacture heroin, which is a laboratory process carried out abroad. This deadly poison in the American life stream is, in other words, a foreign import.[19]

The growing belief was that the U.S. alone could not solve its problem at home. The fact that drugs originated in foreign countries required the cooperation of foreign governments to allow the U.S. to prevent their drugs from infiltrating U.S. borders.[20] Policies that followed would involve a shift in the military sector at home and abroad.

---

[17] See Buzan, Waever, and Wilde, 1998.
[18] For further discussion on the military sector see Id at 49-70.
[19] Nixon, 1971, 203 (Special Message to the Congress on Drug abuse Prevention and Control).
[20] Bartilow and Eom, 2009, 93-116 (Citing The Domestic Council Drug Abuse Task Force 1975: 50) .

This next section focuses on placing President Ronald Reagan's National Security Decision Directives within the securitization framework. Although former President Richard Nixon did not securitize the issue of drugs, former President Ronald Reagan continued on this path securitizing the threat of those who traded drugs. The following establishes how the "War on Drug Traffickers" came to be.

Discussion: The Securitization of Drug Traffickers and the Resulting War

In 1986, former President Ronald Reagan in his National Security Decision Directive Number 221 made the Speech Act – a textually intricate argument that causally linked drugs to a trade that destabilized democratic states and/or democracies. He argued that the ability for the drug trade to fund not only criminal trafficking organizations but also insurgents and terrorist groups that were attempting to overthrow their/a democratic state/democracy was an existential threat to U.S. National Security and democracy as a whole.[21] This argument by former President Ronald Reagan solidified, through documentation[22] and unilateral action,[23] that the rhetorical "War on Drugs" would encompass an actual "War on Drug Traffickers" facilitated by ideology and fear: a precursor to the "War on Terror."

What had previously consumed the position of threat to the U.S., other states, became equalized with an individual's exploitation of a commodity. The unilateral act of a President to link the supply of drugs to drug traffickers that were also simultaneously behaving as insurgents and/or terrorists attempting to overthrow democratic governments and/or democracy is noteworthy when one acknowledges that at the time, U.S. identity was very much pro-democracy, anti-terrorist, anti-insurgent, and most importantly, anti-Soviet.[24] This sharing of threat capability between states, insurgents, terrorists, and drug traffickers to

[21] Reagan National Security Decision Directive Number, 1986, 221.
[22] For more on National Security Decision Directives, their importance, power, and use by former President Reagan, *See* Dwyer, 2002, 411-413; Gordon, 2007, 351-366; and Newman, 2001, 81.
[23] Gordon, 2007, 350.
[24] See Andreas and Nadelmann, 2006, 161; For a deeper look into U.S. ideology and the history of foreign policy, or even the rise of the National Security Doctrine, also see Andreas and Price, 2001, 37-51 and Queiser Morales, July 1989, 147-153.

existentially threaten democracy and/or democratic states not only expanded U.S. National Security, appropriation ceilings, disbursements, and Foreign Policy, but it internationally shifted political relationships, limitations to sovereignty, foreign aid, and ultimately the relationship between a state and a non-state actor.[25] This would take the rhetoric of the "War on Drugs" and turn it into actual strategy for implementing the "War on Drug Traffickers."

As Rita Floyd and Stuart Croft (2011) note, "[p]rovided that the securitization is successful, the analyst can then identify the emergency measures that follow."[26] This next section will discuss the resulting emergency measures that followed the securitization of drug traffickers. Further research is necessary to study the states that implemented such emergency measures, the relationship they share with one another, and the relationship they share with the United States.

The "War on Drug Traffickers"

National Security Decision Directive Number (NSDD) 221 was the Speech Act that securitized drug traffickers. The NSDD itself was a speech tool used by former President Ronald Reagan that gave him the authority to unilaterally act, create National Security policy, and have the force of law.[27] Former President Ronald Reagan's audience, U.S. Congress, responded in the form of this strong act with the implementation of policies that ranged from the 1986 Anti-Drug Abuse Act to militarized policies in Latin American States. Peter Andreas (2006) stated that "by the end of the 1990s, antidrug programs represented more than 92 percent of U.S. military and police aid to the Western hemisphere."[28]

Although National Security strategy had primarily been focused on the Soviet threat since former President Ronald Reagan's NSDD 32, it expanded to

[25] See Congressional Reports: Storrs, April 8, 1998; Perl, 2006; Wyler, 2011; Also see Bartilow and Eom, 2009, 93-116; Lindau, 2011, 177-200; Falco, 1995, 15; Ayling, 2005, 376-383; and Sciolino, 1988.
[26] Floyd and Croft, 2011, 173.
[27] Dwyer, 2002, 411.
[28] Andreas and Nadelmann, 2006.

include narcotics trafficking by NSDD 221. In NSDD 221, former President Reagan articulated:

> The international drug trade threatens the national security of the United States by potentially destabilizing democratic allies. It is therefore the policy of the United States, in cooperation with other nations, to halt the production and flow of illicit narcotics, reduce the ability of insurgent and terrorist groups to use drug trafficking to support their activities, and strengthen the ability of individual governments to confront and defeat this threat.[29]

NSDD 221 placed drug trafficking within the offices of the Department of Defense – drug trafficking was now legitimately within the military sector of the U.S. [30] A few months later, NSDD 238 replaced NSDD 32 as the primary source of U.S. National Security Strategy.[31] The trafficking of illicit drugs as a U.S. National Security threat would continue to evolve from NSDD 221 making its way into NSDD 238 as an official component of National Security Strategy solidifying that the threat had transitioned from the political sector to the military sector.[32]

The Western hemisphere was the focal region for former President Ronald Reagan's NSDD 221. According to former President Ronald Reagan, "[w]hile these problems are endemic to most nations plagued by narcotics, their effects are particularly insidious for the democratic states of the Western Hemisphere."[33] Before NSDD 221, former President Ronald Reagan had made it clear that the Western Hemisphere was a focal point for avoiding Soviet expansion, terrorism and insurgencies. He had asserted that "U.S. national interests in Latin America and the region dictate policies that achieve the following objectives: a region free of Soviet-dominated or hostile environments."[34] To do so required that our policies be focused on "radical insurgent movements supported by the Soviet

[29] Reagan National Security Decision Directive Number, 1986, 221.
[30] Id.
[31] Reagan National Security Decision Directive Number, 1986, 238.
[32] Id.
[33] Reagan National Security Decision Directive Number, 1986, 221.
[34] See Reagan National Security Decision Directive Number, 1986, 71.

Union and/or its surrogates."[35] The focus on Soviet influence in the Western Hemisphere, insurgencies and terrorists backed by the Soviet Union, coupled with the new threat of drug trafficking as a funding stream for these groups, promoted the threat of drug trafficking to a U.S. National Security threat.[36]

Former President Ronald Reagan saw the federal government as an institution to deal with drugs through foreign policy, and looked to the states and local governments to deal with drug consumption through local laws.[37] He was influenced by the "cocaine wars" in Miami, crack addiction in New York, and a booming drug industry within the early 1980s that was showing spectacular growth during an "…increasing economic crisis…"[38] He was also influenced by the term "narcoterrorism" that was introduced in 1983 by then Peruvian President Belaúnde Terry. Although former President Richard Nixon is noted for establishing the "War on Drugs," the credit for the "War on Drug Traffickers" belongs to former President Ronald Reagan. While the Nixon Administration was focused on the addictive qualities of drugs, the Reagan Administration, focused on the Soviet threat,[39] found that countries losing their democratic transitions were supplying drugs. The presence of leftist/Marxist insurgents or terrorists, who were all simultaneously behaving as drug traffickers attempting to overthrow the democratic process gave the necessary evidence to facilitate the securitization of drug traffickers and shift the "War on Drugs" from rhetoric to military strategy.

Two military operations that have been discussed in reference to the resulting militarized counter-narcotics policies in Latin America with U.S. military assistance are Operations Snowcap and Operation Blast Furnace. Operation Snowcap "involved extensive coordinated military operations in Guatemala, Panama, Costa Rica, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, and Mexico" with chemical control, vehicle interdiction and marine

[35] Reagan National Security Decision Directive Number, 1982, 71.
[36] Reagan National Security Decision Directive Number, 1984, 138 and Reagan National Security Decision Directive Number, 1985, 179.
[37] Benoit, 2003, 283.
[38] Vellinga, 2004.
[39] See Reagan National Security Decision Directive Number, 1982, 32.

law enforcement interdiction operations all conducted to suppress coca.[40] Operation Blast Furnace, utilizing American and Bolivian military personnel, launched a series of raids against cocaine laboratories in Bolivia.[41] By 1989, the military could arrest drug traffickers and fugitives on foreign territory with/without the host country's authorization.[42] As Andreas and Nadelmann noted, "drug enforcement became the defining feature of post-cold war U.S. military relations with many of its southern neighbors."[43]

The U.S. international counter-narcotics policy has been characteristically defined as having a strong military perspective.[44] In 1986, drug trafficking was declared a national security threat by former President Ronald Reagan, requiring the U.S. to act in its most defensive and offensive manner with military intelligence, interdiction, and aerial spraying, among other things. Three years later, former President George Bush defined an Andean strategy that included an active role of U.S. armed forces (Pentagon and Southern Command) and those of the Andean countries in the combat against drug trafficking.[45] The Reagan Administration's policy would intensify, continue, and further pressure/assist Latin American countries under The Bush and Clinton Administrations with Plan Colombia, and following with the GW Bush Administration's Andean Initiative in 2001.[46]

Foreign governments adhered to "…U.S. pressure by creating specialized drug enforcement agencies, adopting U.S. style investigative techniques, signing extradition treaties with the U.S., hosting U.S. law enforcement agents within their borders and have adopted U.S. approaches to criminal law and drug enforcement."[47] In the end, former President Ronald Reagan's NSDD 221 would be the Speech Act resulting in not only the securitization of drug traffickers, but also a war that expanded the rhetorical war requiring any counter-narcotics

[40] Andreas and Nadelmann, 2006.
[41] Id. at 164.
[42] Id. at 164.
[43] Andreas and Nadelmann, 2006.
[44] Valderrama and Cabieses, 2004, 53.
[45] Id.
[46] Astorga in Vellinga, 2004, 93; and see Perl, 2006, 15-16.
[47] Bartilow and Eom, 2009, 93-116.

policies proposed thereafter to properly identify which counter-narcotics war it was attempting to deal with. This section has established how the rhetorical "War on Drugs" expanded to include the actual "War on Drug Traffickers." This next section will focus on why proper identification of the issues matter in the context of counter-narcotics policies.

Implications

This research highlights a different war that was facilitated by ideology through the rhetoric promoted by the "War on Drugs," fear of communist expansion, and fear of democratic contraction, requiring its own study and strategy separate from the "War on Drugs." With a strong Soviet threat still looming, drug addiction booming, leftist/Marxist insurgent/terrorist drug traffickers threatening insecure democratic institutions, perceived to be weak democratic allies, and a geopolitical focus on the western hemisphere, the environment was set to facilitate the implementation of militarized policies that created the "War on Drug Traffickers." This is an important distinction because the play on words changes the perception of the issue from one of drug addiction to one of weak institutions and insurgent/terrorist threat to those institutions.

One cannot propose strategy to win, lose, or retreat from a war that one has been unable to identify properly. The "War on Drugs" has motivated tremendous discourse on its failure and possible solutions to remedy its failure, but the generalizations made as a result of the inability to distinguish between the policies behind drug addiction and the militarized policies behind drug trafficking have discounted the effect of violence perpetrated by the State, the rationale for the State perpetrating that violence, and the dependence that State has on foreign actors to perpetrate such violence. This makes it impossible to not only propose effective strategy but also persuade States that participate in the "War on Drug Traffickers" to adopt the proposed strategy.

Ironically, "[t]he drug war hinders fundamental democratic institutional development, or more accurately, fosters the expansion of non-democratic

institutions and practices."[48] Currently, many states are struggling with this reality. But, what motivated these states to implement these militarized counter-narcotics policies? It is difficult to argue that these states were overwhelmed by drug addiction, as they would have followed in former President Richard Nixon's footsteps with rehabilitative policies.

Policies that involve military engagement between the state and drug traffickers suggests other motivating factors such as a lack of institutional capacity, lack of state structure, insecurity, corruption and/or lack of trust with the judiciary and police - issues that may not be affected by consumption policies such as rehabilitation or decriminalization. If the motivating factors are lack of trust with the judiciary, for example, then the proposed policy should be a transnational trafficking court or other global assistance program that these states can lean on to develop their institutional capacity. While this does not discount consumption-focused policies, this paper merely asserts that more than consumption, or supply, or trafficking policies are necessary to deal with the underlying issues of current militarized drug policies. Most importantly, this paper asserts that the motivating factors must be studied in implementing states before strategy and policy is proposed.

Conclusion

The "War on Drugs" is arguably the most successful slogan, before the "War on Terror," to imply a strategic decision to politically engage absolutely nothing in particular. Yet it led to the strategic decision to militarily engage someone in particular. The brilliance in this was the ability of the slogan to take a group of commodities, converge them all under one label, victimize their consumer, criminalize or even demonize their supplier and therefore profiteer, while also creating a savior status for the holder of that slogan. Even more brilliant was the ability of that slogan's holder to expand that threat into a funding-stream for insurgents and terrorists threatening our democratic allies providing the ability for

[48] Lindau, 2011, 177-200.

engagement to occur militarily between the state and the now criminalized/demonized supplier/profiteer of those commodities.

However, this brilliant slogan is dimming out as it continues to suffer some serious blows to its reputation. The "War on Drug Traffickers" has never been distinguished, resulting in a lack of attention with the insecurities that led to militarized counter-narcotics policies around the world. While it was once a vibrant and aggressive slogan, its lifeline seems shorter than ever before, requiring states that have embraced the "War on Drugs" to decide where they go next. But to understand the trajectory of this war, its estimated life expectancy, and/or even possible reincarnation, one must understand the states actively participating within that war and its expanded war, the "War on Drug Traffickers."

The U.S. arguably holds a dominant position within the implementation of prohibitionist counter-narcotics policies. The relation of implementing states to the creator of the "War on Drugs" is one that may implicate the type of global policy expansion that occurred among these states. Further studies must be conducted to provide a thorough analysis into the securitizing moves of these states and their dependency on the U.S., each other, as well as competitiveness with one another, and possible socialization or prior inclination to militarized policies. A focus on the dependency these states have with the U.S. asserts that any prediction as to the implementing state's future moves would have to involve the recognition of the implementing state's sentiment toward the U.S. since the implementing state will either retaliate against the U.S. or continue to align itself with the U.S. The motives behind implementation are keys to understanding where these states have gone with drug policy, where they are now, and where they might go tomorrow.

Active participants within the "War on Drugs" have been labeled as participants/victims under the now labeled failing U.S. "War on Drugs." The unraveling of instability in these states, what many believe to be the result of

these failed policies, has socially diminished the notion that the "War on Drugs" can be won. A push for ending their part, or anyone's part, in the "War on Drugs" has become the headline catcher for today. These advocates may be failing to recognize the inability for these states to follow suit with their media blitz and retreat from the "War on Drugs" because of their inability to deal with the drug trafficking opponent through other democratic means due to the lack of institutional capacity within the judiciary and police that motivated their participation with the "War on Drug Traffickers."

The "War on Drug Traffickers" involves a play on words that forces the policy maker to perceive a different threat, and rightfully so, because the policies already implemented were based on different threats. Decriminalization and legalization do not address issues such as political and economic dependence, insecurity, conflict, or even geopolitical wants/needs. The difference in wars equates to difference in policies, difference in consequences, and difference in motivations. While the "War on Drugs" may be focused on the addictive qualities of drugs, the "War on Drug Traffickers" is most certainly not focused on the addictive qualities of drugs. An understanding of *why* is essential to dealing with that why effectively.

Works Cited List:

Andreas, Peter, and Ethan Nadelmann *Policing the Globe: Criminalization and Crime Control in International Relations.* New York, New York: Oxford University Press. 2006. Print.

Andreas, Peter and Richard Price "From War Fighting to Crime Fighting: Transforming the American National Security State." *International Studies Review* (2001) Vol. 3, No. 3 31-52

Astorga, Luis "Mexico Drugs and Politics" in *The Political Economy of the Drug Industry, Latin America and the International System,* Ed. Menno Vellinga. University Press of Florida, 2004. Print.

Ayling, Julie "Conscription in the War on Drugs: Recent reforms to the U.S. drug certification process." *International Journal of Drug Policy* (2005) 16, 376-383

Bartilow, Horace A. and Kihong Eom, "Busting Drugs While Paying with Crime: The Collateral Damage of U.S. Drug Enforcement in Foreign Countries." *Foreign Policy Analysis*, (2009) 93-116

Benoit, Ellen "Not Just a Matter of Criminal Justice: State, Institutions, and North American Drug Policy." *Sociological Forum*, (2003) Vol. 18, No. 2, 269-294

Bertram, Blachman, et al. *Drug War Politics The Price of Denial*. Berkeley and Los Angeles California: University of California Press, 1996, Print.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Waever, and Jaap de Wilde. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*" Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc. 1998. Print.

Dwyer, Catherine M. "The U.S. Presidency and national security directives: An overview." *Journal of Government Information* (2002) 29, 410-419

Falco, Mathea "Passing grades: branding nations won't resolve the U.S. drug problem." *Foreign Affairs*, 74.5, (1995)

Floyd, Rita and Stuart Croft "European Non-Traditional Security Theory: From Theory to Practice" in *Geopolitics, History, and International Relations* (2011) Volume 3(2), pp. 152-179

Gordon, Vikki "The Law: Unilaterally Shaping U.S. National Security Policy: The Role of National Security Directives." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, (2007) 37, no. 2

Lindau, Juan D. “The Drug War’s Impact on Executive Power, Judicial Reform, and Federalism in Mexico.” *Political Science Quarterly* (2011) Volume 126, Number 2, 177-200

Morales, Waltruad Queiser “The War on drugs: A New US National Security Doctrine?” *Third World Quarterly* (1989) Vol. 11, No. 3, 147-169

Nadelmann, Ethan *Cops Across Borders: The Internationalization of U.S. Criminal Law Enforcement*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University. 1993. Print.

Newman, William “Causes of Change in National Security Processes: Carter, Reagan, and Bush Decision Making on Arms Control.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* (2001) 31, no. 1

Nixon, Richard (1971) “Remarks About an Intensified Program for Drug Abuse Prevention and Control.” 202. *The American Presidency Project*, Retrieved from: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3047

Nixon, Richard (1971) “Special Message to the Congress on Drug abuse Prevention and Control.” 203. *The American Presidency Project*, Retrieved from: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=3048&st=nixon&st1=

Perl, Raphael “Drug Control: International Policy and Approaches” Congressional Research Service. IB88093 (2006) Retrieved from: http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/61518.pdf

Reagan, Ronald (1982) “U.S. National Security Strategy. National Security Decision Directive Number 32.” The White House, Washington, Retrieved from: http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/nsdd-32.pdf

Reagan, Ronald (1982) “Narcotics and National Security. National Security Decision Directive Number 71.” The White House, Washington. Retrieved from: http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/index.html

Reagan, Ronald (1984) “Narcotics and National Security. National Security Decision Directive Number 138.” The White House, Washington. Retrieved from: http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/index.html

Reagan, Ronald (1985) “Narcotics and National Security. National Security Decision Directive Number 179.” The White House, Washington. Retrieved from: http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/index.html

Reagan, Ronald (1986) “Narcotics and National Security. National Security Decision Directive Number 221”. The White House, Washington. Retrieved from: http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/index.html

Reagan, Ronald (1986) “Narcotics and National Security. National Security Decision Directive Number 238.” The White House, Washington. Retrieved from: http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/index.html

Sciolino Elaine (1988). “State Department Asks Reagan to Penalize Panama over Drug Trafficking” *The New York Times*, February 24, 1988.

Storrs, K. Larry “Mexican Drug Certification Issues: U.S. Congressional Action, 1986-1998” *CRS Report for Congress* (1998) Retrieved from: http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/524.pdf

The White House National Drug Control Strategy September 1989; Retrieved from: https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ondcp/119466.pdf

Valderrama, Marianno and Hugo Cabieses “Questionable Alliances in the War on Drugs Peru and the United States” in *The Political Economy of the Drug Industry, Latin America and the International System*, Ed. Menno Vellinga. University Press of Florida, 2004. Print.

Vellinga, Menno “The Political Economy of the Drug Industry: Its Structure and Functioning” in *The Political Economy of the Drug Industry, Latin America and the International System*, Ed. Menno Vellinga. University Press of Florida, 2004. Print.

Wyler, Liana Sun “International Drug Control Policy.” *Congressional Research Service 7-5700 RL34543*. 1-40 (2011)