

A Wider Security Approach Helps the Understanding of a Case Study

A case study of the Drug War in Mexico and the challenges
within the Mexican state

Abstract

Since 2006 when the Drug War in Mexico started, around 30,000 people have lost their lives. The Mexican state has several security issues that have threatened the state on all three pillars. Two major concerns are the violence and vast corruption within the Mexican government and its institutions.

The goal of the study is to see if a five sector scope can be applied on a single case study. This study aims to help the development and understanding of security studies. It also aims to get a better understanding of the security situation in the Mexican state.

Key Words: Security, Structures, Securitization, Mexico, Drug Wars

Characteristics: 65,340

Table of Contents

1Introduction	2
1.1Purpose of This Study	2
1.2Research Question.....	3
2Methodology	4
2.1The Method used in this study	4
2.2Data and Empirical Material	5
2.3Limitations	6
2.4Disposition	6
3Theoretical Framework	7
3.1Security.....	7
3.2Sectors	10
4Case Study: The Mexican Drug War	15
4.1A short summary of the conflict.....	15
4.2Drug-cartels.....	16
4.3The Mexican State.....	18
5Analysis	22
5.1The Violence.....	22
5.2The Corrupt State	24
5.3The Result of the Case Study	26
6Conclusion.....	27
7Referenser.....	28
7.1Books and Articles	28
7.2Data bases and Internet Websites	29

1 Introduction

The classical approach to understanding security has been through two sectors: the military and political sectors. In order to better understand the term security, Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde have broadened this classical approach by drawing up guidelines for three additional sectors in their book *Security – A New Framework for Analysis*.¹ These three sectors are the economical, societal and environmental sectors.

The situation taking place in Mexico is very interesting in the scope of security studies. The Drug War in Mexico has been raging since 2006, claiming the lives of over 30.000 people. The Mexican state has been struggling with violence and corruption is now found within every level of government. The drug cartels have grown to be very powerful and now threaten the Mexican state in several areas. In response to this threat, the Mexican president Felipe Calderon has deployed 50,000 soldiers to help fight in the war against the drug cartels.

1.1 Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study is to make a small contribution to the discussion of the contested term, security. This study is about the relationship between drug-cartels and the Mexican government and how it affects the security of the Mexican state. To better understand how the Drug War has affected the security of the Mexican state, I will use five different sectors that I have taken from the Copenhagen School Theory.² This new approach expands the meaning of the term security beyond its classical use in military agendas. The aim of this study will be to try and see if this broadened concept of security will work on a unit level. With this study I hope to make a small contribution towards developing a more specific and descriptive understanding of the term security. Security is an important term to analyze and further develop and it is a highly important area to understand in today's international and domestic politics.

¹Buzan, Barry et al 1998 *Security: A New Framework For Analysis*

²The sectors are: The Military Sector, The Political Sector, The Economical Sector, The Societal Sector and the Environmental Sector. These 5 sectors is from the Copenhagen School and is based upon Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde's book *Security: A New Framework For Analysis*

1.2 Research Question

My study has a main research question to focus the scope of my study. This main question is followed by two other research questions that will help contribute to a better discussion of the study and help in the development of security studies.

- **How is a wider scope of security affecting the understanding of a case study?**
 - How is the violence in the Drug War affecting the security of the Mexican state?
 - How can corruption affect the security of the Mexican state?

2 Methodology

This chapter is about the method that was used in this study. The first part of the chapter is to describe why I have chosen the case study and how I will analyze it with the help of the theoretical framework. The second section in this chapter has a short discussion of the data and empirical material used in this study, followed by a section of limitations and a section explaining the disposition.

2.1 The Method used in this study

This study has a qualitative approach in order to get a better description and understanding of the case study.

I will use a case study as a research strategy to test the theory of the wider concept of security by adding an additional three sectors (economical, societal and environmental) to the classical two sectors (military and political).

A case study is proven to be an effective strategy when it comes to developing theories. It is a valuable method because you can measure the theories scope and its actors. A case study is generally used when trying to prove whether a theory does or does not work.³

The Mexican government and the drug-cartels are the two main actors in the Drug War and are important to understand for the sake of this study. Therefore they are described in more detail in chapter four.

The Drug War is a major event taking place in Mexico and that has international connections and spillover effects. The aim of this study is only to study the Drug War that takes place inside of Mexico. The main focus will be on the *unit* and *subunit* levels.⁴ This is an attempt to narrow the focus of the study to only include the government and the drug-cartels.

To further narrow the scope of the case study, I intend to analyze the Drug War through only the vast corruption and violence taking place in Mexico. I chose to focus on the corruption and the violence because they are the two main conflicts in the Drug War.

Important terms to understand in this study are: *state*, *actor(s)* and *security*. These terms will be operationalized in the chapter called Theoretical Framework.

³Bjereld, Ulf et al 2002. 86

⁴The levels will be operationalized in the theoretical section

The term security is important to be operationalized in this study for several reasons. For one thing, security has a large scope and it is therefore important to find a definition that is narrow and suitable for this study. It is also important to show the reader of this study what my definition of the term security is. This operationalization of the term security can be found in the chapter Theoretical Framework.⁵ Security is a hard term to measure in statistical forms and therefore this study is more suitable with a qualitative approach.⁶

This study is trying to prove the theory that using an additional three sectors in the analysis of the case study can be adaptable and improve the understanding of security relations. In order to do this I have to have an actor(s) to analyze in every sector. This operationalization is important for the scope and direction of the study.⁷

To analyze each sector I will use an approach from the work of Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde (*Security – A New Framework for Analysis. 1998*). There are three actors to be analyzed in this approach, the referent object, the securitizing actor and the functional actor. This approach is described further in the chapter Theoretical Framework.

This is a very specific case study and therefore it can be hard to generalize to a greater extent, even though it can be very useful to similar cases of security studies on the unit and subunit level. I believe that if another researcher tested the same study on the same or a similar case, they would come to the same conclusion.

2.2 Data and Empirical Material

The major source of the empirical material is from scientific articles and different databases online. I chose to use secondary material because I found it very hard to gather first hand material on my own; distance, time and language were the main deterrents. The secondary material I use is mostly from scientific articles, government reports or material from larger and internationally recognized databases for political science. This is a choice I have made because the information is from credible sources and helps the intersubjectivity of the empirical material used.

I have also chosen not to use news articles from the Mexican media because of the unreliability of the reports. According to Freedom House, the Mexican media is partly free. There are several reports of journalists and newspapers being targeted if they write about the drug cartels, and this tendency has increased during the last couple of years.⁸

⁵The operationalization of security is found in the third chapter in this study *Theoretical Framework*

⁶Teorell, Jan & Svensson, Torsten 2007 p. 10-11

⁷The operationalization of the actors is found in the third chapter in this study *Theoretical Framework*

⁸Freedom House 2010. *Freedom of the Press 2010: Mexico* p. 1-3

<http://freedomhouse.org/images/File/fop/2010/Mexico%20FOTP%202010%20draft%20KDK%20re-edited.pdf>

2.3 Limitations

This study mainly focuses on the conflict inside Mexico, not the international or regional effects. The five sectors have a wide scope and in order to narrow it I will only focus on information and actors that are valid for the purpose of this discussion.

This study does not have all the information about this conflict and its actors, but since it is a qualitative approach it has key information in understanding the conflict and the actors involved. This is important for the discussion and conclusion of this study. It is also important to acknowledge that this study does not aim to provide a new operationalization of the key terms in this study. I will therefore use already existing definitions of the terms.

2.4 Disposition

This study contains four additional chapters. The chapter that follows contains the theoretical framework that this study is based upon. It also contains the operationalization of the key terms used in this study. The third chapter describes the case study about Mexico and the Drug War. There, I give a description of the Drug War followed by a history and description of the four main drug-cartels. The chapter continues with a history of the Mexican government followed by a description of the Mexican military, the Mexican law enforcement and the judicial system. The fourth chapter contains the main discussion of this study. The fifth and last chapter holds the conclusions and the results of this study.

3 Theoretical Framework

This chapter presents the theory I will use for my research question. My theory is based upon the 5 different structures that Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde describe in their book "*Security – A New Framework for Analysis*". In this chapter I will describe these structures and operationalize these structures so I can use it in my analysis. I will start by having a small discussion about the key terms used in this study.

3.1 Security

In the area of political science we are familiar with the word security. It is often used in a theory, for example national security, human security and so on. It can also be an institution of a state, like the agency of Homeland Security in the USA. We also have the Security Council in the UN. In this way, security is an important word in political science but it is still very hard to have one single definition of what security is.

The use of the term security first began around the 1930s and back then it had a much more narrow definition. Security was used in military terms and the subject of security could only be the state. This view of security is based on realism where the focus is on the state. It wasn't until the late 1970s that the meaning of security started to be contested and explored.⁹

Barry Buzan argues in his book "*People, State & Fear*"¹⁰ that our understanding of the term security is underdeveloped. It is a difficult concept that has been put aside for other important concepts like freedom, power and justice. These are examples of concepts used within many different spectrums of political science and therefore its definition is continually contested and discussed. It cannot have one definition that fits all, but it can still be used in a specific case, area, theory and so on.¹¹

Buzan et al describes the meaning of security as: "*survival in the face of existential threats*".¹² However, this interpretation still leaves a lot of questions. For example, on a basic level: "What is/are the threats? For whom is the security for? Why is security used? What results does it bring and under what conditions is

⁹Sheehan, Michael. 2005 p. 5

¹⁰Buzan, Barry 2009 p. 29

¹¹Ibid. p. 29-30

¹²Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p 27

it used?” And one more question is “Who is using the security?” In other words, who securitizes?¹³

Securitization is an important term in the security discussion. Securitization can best be described as a socially constructed term and is used to make an object feel a sense of threat or insecure.¹⁴

3.1.1 The State

The definition of what a state is and what a state contains is based on Buzans work in this study. According to Buzan, a state has three pillars: the idea of the state, the physical base of the state and the institutions in a state.¹⁵

The physical base of a state determines population and geographical territory. This has some limits when it comes to size, a state must have a minimum population for it to be able to run, for example, a state with 100 000 people is considered a small state. A state's institutions are supposed to run the physical base of the state and the institutions must be so comprehensive that it can run itself. The idea of the state means that the physical base and institutions must be legitimate in the eyes and minds of the population.¹⁶

3.1.2 Levels

Buzan argued that security can be used in areas other than just in a strictly military form; it could be used in politics, economics, social and environmental discussions. The idea of the state as the main object was too narrow according to Buzan. He widened the concept by involving more levels than just the state, like the international systems as a higher level and an individual as a lower level.¹⁷ This widening of the different levels when it comes to security is further divided into 5 different levels. The first level is *international systems*, the highest systems that exist. It involves the whole planet and has no system above it.¹⁸

The second level is *International subsystems*, this can be a lot of things. It can be a group formed of countries that has trade agreement like *the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)*, but it can also be a geographical region that is not strictly based by state boundaries.¹⁹

¹³Ibid p. 32

¹⁴Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 57

¹⁵Buzan, Barry 2009 p. 70-72

¹⁶Buzan, Barry 2009 p. 70-72

¹⁷Sheehan 2005 p. 43-44

¹⁸Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 5

¹⁹Ibid. p. 6

Level number three is called *units*, and in this level we find states, nations but it can also be big international firms.²⁰

The fourth level is *subunits*, which can be a group of individual's that's trying to affect the higher level, *units*.²¹

The last level is *individuals* and it is the lowest level of the scale. This can be a single company or a person.²²

These 5 levels can be describes as an hourglass with the *units* (states) in the middle, so even if there now are more levels and more wide then before, it's still centered around the idea of the state.²³ The theory of 5 levels is state-dominated and not state-centric, like realism is.

State-dominated means that security is not only about the state, and is not available to all actors in the same way, but the state remains as the ideal security actor. The state-centric definition of security should be about the state and the state should be about security; the focus is on political and military security.²⁴

3.1.3 Actors

If we try to see security from another a linguistic perspective, we find that security is a *speech-act*. Security in itself is not a thing you can touch so it therefore does not exist. But just by saying it or typing it is an act itself. "*By uttering 'security' a state representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims a special right to use whatever means necessary*".²⁵

In this approach, with security as a speech-act, we find three actors. The first one is the *referent object*, where we find objects like states or individuals whose survival is threatened.²⁶

The second actor is called the *securitizing actors*. This is someone or something that is securitizing a development and describing a threat to a *referent objects* existence.²⁷

Functional actors are the third kind of actor. This is an actor that can change something in a sector that can threaten the existence of someone or something else.²⁸

The securitizing actor has a lot of power when it comes to what the referent object is. For example a president for a country can easily say that the country is threatened and can therefore use more extreme measures. The problem is that the president also has to convince the residents in the country that the state is

²⁰Ibid. p. 6

²¹Ibid. p. 6

²²Ibid. p. 6

²³Neal, Andrew W 2010. p. 100-101

²⁴Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 37

²⁵Neal, Andrew W 2010. p. 102

²⁶Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 35-36

²⁷Ibid. p. 36

²⁸Ibid. p. 36

threatened.²⁹ This view is also state-dominated because if a company is threatened by the loss of a market, it cannot use all means possible, because it still has to follow the nation's rules and laws. Therefore this approach is not that strong in every case. It is of great importance to identify these actors in the next chapter about *sectors*.

3.2 Sectors

3.2.1 The Military Sector

Since the beginning of security studies, the main focus has been on the military sector. The state is also the main referent object in this sector, but not the only one. And the main securitizing actor is therefore the ruling government or the states representative. It means that the government must protect the state from internal and external military threats. The military sector can also be about using the military to meet other threats that are not strictly military threats.³⁰

This sector can be divided into two different areas, which sometimes overlap, external and internal threats. My focus is on the internal threats. Internal security is mostly about securing peace and making sure that the government and citizens are free from threats. These threats can come from, separatists, terrorists, criminal organizations or revolutionists.³¹

This is very similar to the idea of a Westphalian state, the state is the only actor that has the right to use force inside its own borders.³²

As I said above, the state doesn't have to be the only referent object when it comes to the military sector. The state itself doesn't have to be threatened, but its government and/or citizens can be threatened. But here you can discuss if that isn't a part of the state as well. My view of it is that citizens and the government is part of the state. But militias and criminal organizations are two examples of other referent objects in the military sector.

The main focus on referent objects in this sector is on the unit level and the subunit level. You can still use the other three levels, for example in the two higher levels, different alliances like Nato or the UN can be threatened in a way that it's a referent object, you can also count in other things that are not physical like international law, international stability and so on.³³

Securitizing actors in this level is normally very clear. A state for example who is the most common referent object has some rules about who its representative should be, for example a president. But it doesn't always has to end well for the

²⁹Ibid. p. 38

³⁰Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 49-50

³¹Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 50

³²Ibid. p. 51

³³Ibid. p. 54-55

securitizing actor, in a democracy the people have a lot to say, and the military might not have the same idea about the threats.³⁴

There can also be other securitizing actors in a state, the military itself, intelligence services, media is some example of other actors in a state.³⁵

The military sector involves a lot of functional actors, everything from weapon manufactures to terrorist. It can be that the military is divided in different fractions like the army, navy and air force that compete about funding.³⁶

There is one important thing in the military sector when it comes to security that is important to bear in mind, a military response to a threat isn't always the answer. For example it's not a very good idea for Sweden to declare war against USA just because they have a big army and nuclear weapons that can strike anytime. *"Societies engaged in war put at risk not only the lives and welfare of their citizens but also their collective political, economical and social achievements."*³⁷

3.2.2 The Political Sector

The main purpose of the political sector is the security of a state's survival, and its sovereignty. A lot of threats against the states sovereignty can be handled by the military and therefore all threats of violence are moved to the military sector. The political sector is about non-military threats.³⁸

There are two different approaches in this sector when it comes to threats and security: the objectivist terminology and the speech-act.

With the objectivist approach at least one of the three pillars of the state must be threatened to be destroyed. The second approach is the speech-act where the focus is on the arguments that the securitizing actor uses, which deal with issues of sovereignty.³⁹

There can be a lot of political threats against the state, both internally and externally. It can be pressure from the government to change their politics or it can be about disrupting the institutions in a state and so on. The main threat should be against the states sovereignty or the stability of the state.⁴⁰

The government is usually the securitizing actor in a state. Sometimes the state isn't threatened but the government is. In this case the government may use the security in the wrong way. This is more common in weaker state, where the three pillars of state are not as stable as a strong state.⁴¹

³⁴Ibid. p. 55

³⁵Ibid. p. 56

³⁶Ibid. p. 56-57

³⁷Ibid. p. 58

³⁸Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 141

³⁹Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 151

⁴⁰Barry Buzan 2009 p. 109; Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 142

⁴¹Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 146

3.2.3 The Economic Sector

Economic security is frequently used but also a much contested idea. Today international markets and economic systems are based on liberal and capitalist ideas. One of the main arguments about this idea is that the actors that exist in a market must be insecure for the whole international system to work. The main actors are states, companies and different treaties.⁴²

You can see the relationship between the state, politics and the markets in three different ways, you can put politics first where the state is providing the security and basic funds for the market to work (mercantilists and neomercantilists). The second approach is the liberal view, where you put the economics first. Here shall the market be free out of control of the state and politics. The state is still necessary to provide rules and laws. The last approach is somewhere in between the other two. Socialists argue that the market is important for the state to work, but in the same time the state has to have some control over the market to make sure that the laws and rules are followed and that there are some form of socialist view so that some goods is evenly distributed.⁴³

In this sector there is a big variety of referent objects from all levels, from the *individual* level at the bottom up to the *international system*.⁴⁴

It can be very hard to find economic security in this sector since it is easier to find spillovers in this sector and this affects the security in other sectors. The state can of course have threats against its economy if its people refuse to pay tax, or if another country put high tariffs on some important merchandise and so on. But these problems are still easier to deal with in other sectors. And the big reason for this is how the international economic system looks today where the actors are supposed to be insecure. We have created a paradox here where we try to find economical security where the actors are supposed to be insecure.⁴⁵

3.2.4 The Societal Sector

In the area of security studies there has been a lot of focus on the political and military sector. The societal sector is very close to the political sector but also very different. The political sector focuses on the organizational stability of the state and therefore do threats against the national identity often end up in the political sector. But societal threats can be a mix of and one of the bases for military and political threats because it is based on identity, and not by an organizational identity that is fixed to a state but to a cultural, religious or language based identity.⁴⁶

⁴²Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 95; Buzan, Barry 2009. p. 112-113

⁴³Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 95-96

⁴⁴Ibid. p. 100

⁴⁵Ibid. p. 95, 109; Buzan, Barry et al 2009 p. 112-113

⁴⁶Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 119; Buzan, Barry 2009. p. 111-112

Societal security is about collectives and communities that are defined through a common identity. This shall not be mixed up with social security that's about individuals and based upon economics.⁴⁷

Threats to an identity can actually make the identity stronger as a community but also harder for outsiders to join. With the securitizing of the identity "we" that held together the identity in the beginning is now being transformed into "us" which is more closed and specific.⁴⁸

Most of the societal security issues take place in a state. The societal threats against a national identity are mostly common in weaker states where there can be several different identities. In stronger states, the state itself can be a threat against smaller identity's and communities, where culture, religion and traditions are affected by the states laws or rules.⁴⁹ There are three common threats against societal security. One is migration -x, which is when the groups identity is being taken over by people from the outside, for example, if a large number of people migrated to an area where a weaker identity exists. The second type of threat is called the horizontal competition, where outside actors affect the identity and the old identity is being influenced by other identities. The third type is called a vertical competition. Here, people move from one identity to another identity. The identity might grow bigger and therefore loses some of its important values. It can also do the opposite, and become smaller, which risks leaving people outside the identity.⁵⁰

The most important referent object is therefore tribes, clans, nations, race, and religion. But it can also be a lot smaller communities down to a subunit level. The securitizing actors are the spokespersons for the identity, for example priests or clan leaders. When it comes to functional actors it's the same situation as in the other sectors, there is a great variety of them.⁵¹

3.2.5 The Environmental Sector

The environmental sector is the "newest" sector. It hasn't been that much focus on this sector either so it's still underdeveloped. Some analysts say that environmental security is the ultimate security and some go the opposite way saying that there isn't any environmental security because it is divided amongst the other four sectors.⁵²

Even though the environmental sector hasn't been seen as a security sector, there are still some actors in the international systems that are securitizing

⁴⁷Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 120

⁴⁸Ibid. p. 120

⁴⁹Buzan, Barry 2009, p. 112

⁵⁰Buzan, Barry et al 1998. p. 120-121

⁵¹Ibid. p. 123-124

⁵²Ibid. p. 71, 84

environmental issues. Example of actors that work internationally is Greenpeace, United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), states and scientists.⁵³

The environmental security threats can be divided into 6 areas that all have some parts in another sector as well.

- Disruption of ecosystems – pollution, climate change
- Energy problems – depletion of natural resources like oil or coal
- Population problems – uncontrollable population growth
- Food problems – scarcity and uneven distribution
- Economic problems – uneven distribution and societal instability
- Civil strife – war related damage of the environment⁵⁴

In environmental security you can have two approaches, scientific and political. The scientific approach is based work and findings from scientists and analysts, they publicize it or report it to governments. The public and politicians have no way to criticize these reports because it's made of experts on that area.

The political approach is based on scientific reports but it has to consider a variety of other things in the political sphere, for example the other four sectors. Thereby can a politician, securitize an environmental issue but that doesn't mean that it's in the environmental sector.⁵⁵

There are two kinds of referent objects when it comes to the environmental sector, it's the environment itself and the connection between the human civilization and the environment.⁵⁶

Securitizing actors are in this case normally states and organizations, as I mentioned above to different kind of organizations, Greenpeace and United Nations Environment Program (UNEP).

Functional actors can be everything from scientists to multinational companies, which have a direct or indirect impact on the environment.⁵⁷

⁵³Ibid. p. 71, 77, 79

⁵⁴Ibid. p. 74-75

⁵⁵Buzan, Barry et al 1998 p. 71-73

⁵⁶Ibid. p. 76

⁵⁷Ibid. p. 76-77

4 Case Study: The Mexican Drug War

In this chapter, with the help of my theoretical framework, I will analyze the Mexican Drug War using empiric materials. First I will start by giving a summary of the Drug War, followed by a background of the Drug-cartels and their history. The chapter ends with a short description of the Mexican government, the military, law enforcement and judicial system.

4.1 A short summary of the conflict

Mexico's geographical position is important to understand the Drug War. Mexico is in between the world's largest consumer of narcotics (USA) and the world's largest producer of narcotics (Colombia). Since 2006 the Mexican government is officially fighting a war against drug cartels, a war that has cost the life of 30,000 people. One of the world's most dangerous cities is the Mexican city of Ciudad Juarez that is in the northern part of Mexico, right at the border to the USA. In 2009 there were 2500 deaths in the city, directly related to the Drug War, that number made the city to the most dangerous city in the world.⁵⁸

Year 2006, Felipe Calderon became president in Mexico. One of his first acts as a president was to deploy 27,000 military and police officers for operations against drug-cartels. One of his main promises was to take action against the organized crime and the drug cartels, he declared war against the drug cartels, and the Drug War was official.⁵⁹ Today there are around 45,000 soldiers deployed and 5000 police officers assigned to fight in the Drug War. Regular police officers aren't counted in amongst these numbers.⁶⁰

The Drug War is affecting every corner in Mexico, from the state to individuals. The drug-smuggling to USA is a very important income for many people in Mexico. It also creates job opportunities amongst farmers and in the transportation areas. Some say that 450.000 Mexicans rely on drug trafficking.⁶¹

The main goal of the Drug-War from the government's side is to take down the big and powerful drug-cartels. The government first action was to target the leaders of the cartels in hope that the cartels would lose its strength and hopefully split up in minor cartels and therefore would be easier to take down completely after that. The Mexican government succeeded well in this task and has during the

⁵⁸<http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/> 2011-08-13; Global Issues in Context, Mexico 2011-08-13

⁵⁹GAO-07-1018, 2007 p.7

⁶⁰Mahadevan "A war without principles" s 7

⁶¹Shirk, David 2011. p. 7

last decade captured or killed the most high profile leaders of the cartels. This strategy has made the drug related violence escalate. The main violence is between the drug-cartels and the government sees this as a step in the way of taking the drug cartels down, to make them fight each other. Though some argue that the strategy is failing, the leaders are only replaced by more fierce leaders who fight over territories and power. The drug cartels are too flexible so they will still survive if their leaders would be arrested or killed.⁶²

Another goal of the Drug War is to reduce and get rid of the corruption in the Mexican government and in the law enforcement. The law enforcement and parts of the government from grassroots to the top layer of the government is infiltrated by the drug-cartels and the corruption is vast. To fight the corruption the whole law enforcement must be reshaped and get better education, equipment and higher salary to be able to withstand the drug-cartels bribes. This process is taking a long time and is not a short term solution. Therefore has the military been brought in to fight the Drug War because their training, discipline and structure are supposed to be harder to infiltrate by the cartels.⁶³ In 2006 the government claimed to have fired 945 employees and suspended 953 all suspected for having connection to the drug-cartels or taking bribes.⁶⁴ In 2010 a big investigation about police corruption ended up with over 3000 police officers was fired for working with or taking bribes from the cartels.⁶⁵

The Drug War can be divided into two different types of conflict, a low-intensive conflict between the Mexican government and drug-cartels, and one high-intensive conflict between the drug-cartels. The low-intensive conflict is fought in several areas, corruption is a big problem in this conflict. The high-intensive conflict between the drug-cartels is more regular fighting for territories.⁶⁶

4.2 Drug-cartels

Drug-cartels are organized groups which has the main purpose of controlling a market, in this case drug smuggling. The aim is economical goals and not political or ideological goals. The drug cartels seek monopoly of the market and they don't obey any laws. This makes them dangerous to people or actors outside the group

⁶²BBC-News Q&A: *Mexicos drug-related problems* <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-10681249> 2011-08-13

⁶³BBC-News Q&A: *Mexicos drug-related problems* <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-10681249> 2011-08-13; Nagel, Luz 2010 p. 107

⁶⁴Nagel, Luz 2010. p. 112; GAO-07-1018, 2007 p. 14

⁶⁵Beittel p. 19

⁶⁶Mahadevan "A war without principles" p. 7

and they use any means necessary to reach their goal. They use everything from bribes, kidnappings and executions.⁶⁷

Mexico has a long history of growing marijuana and heroin, but it wasn't until the 1980's the drugs became an important industry. It's the location in between the USA (consumer of narcotics) and Colombia (producer of narcotics) that opened up the market for drug smuggling in Mexico. In the 1970's the USA government made big improvements in their custom controls along the Florida coast, this was the mayor area of entrance of drugs into the USA from Colombia. The harder border controls in Florida made the drug smugglers change their focus to Mexico and their long boarder to the USA.⁶⁸

Miguel Felix Gallardo a former police officer took this opportunity to smuggle the Colombian drugs over the border. And 1982 he started the first Mexican drug-cartel, the Guadalajara cartel. The cartel grew strong fast with the help of bribing the Mexican law enforcement. After some minor clashes with the law enforcement of Mexico and USA, Gallardo was arrested 1989. During this time the Guadalajara cartel split up in several smaller cartels, but this was just the beginning of drug-cartels rise in Mexico.⁶⁹

4.2.1 The Big Four

Several drug cartels exist in Mexico today but there are four that stand out for their history, size and methods. The four drug-cartels are the Sinaloa cartel, the Gulf cartel, the Tijuana cartel and the Juarez cartel. They all got their name from the area they originate and control.⁷⁰

The Sinaloa cartel is one of the most powerful cartels in Mexico. It was founded 1989 by man named Joaquin "el Chapo" Guzman, who got a part of the Guadalajara cartel when it was split apart. The base and the stronghold of the cartel are in the Sinaloa state, though it also controls a lot of the pacific coast as well.⁷¹ The Sinaloa cartel is composed of smaller organizations that are working together. In this way they adapt more quickly and it is harder for the government to take them down. Since the Drug War started there is reports about that the Mexican government doesn't go as hard at the Sinaloa cartel compared to the other three cartels. There are also some indications that the Sinaloa cartel now controls 45% of the drug trade in Mexico.⁷²

In the northwestern part of Mexico we find the Tijuana cartel. Because of its favorable location right at the border to USA, the cartel quickly grew to one of the

⁶⁷Carpenter, Ami 2010 p. 404

⁶⁸<http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/2011-08-13>

⁶⁹Mahadevan "A war without principles" s 7-8; Pacheco, Fernando 2009 p. 1026-1027

⁷⁰Mahadevan "A war without principles" s 8; <http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/2011-08-13>

⁷¹Uppsala Conflict Database http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdatabase/gpcountry.php?id=107®ionSelect=4-Central_Americas# 2011-08-13

⁷²Beittel, June 2011. p. 8

most powerful and successful cartels in Mexico. The cartel was run by the "Arellano-Felix" brothers (5 brothers) that founded the cartel in the end of the 1980's. In 2008 the last of the five brothers was arrested by the Mexican police. When no one was left in charge of the cartel, a big violent struggle inside the cartel struck out, dividing the cartel into two fractions. The cartel has lost a lot of power and market in the drug market in the last couple of years due to the heavy fighting inside the cartel.⁷³

The Juarez cartel is based in the city Ciudad Juarez. The city is an important gate to the USA and is thereby very important to control. The cartel was founded in the 1980's but has been in an alliance with the Sinaloa cartel for many years.⁷⁴ The alliance was interrupted briefly in 2008 when the head of the Juarez cartel was murdered, rumors was that the killing was ordered by the Sinaloa. The Juarez cartel has been losing some power in several areas when it comes to drug smuggling but is still powerful when it comes to its military branches. The cartel is involved in human trafficking, kidnappings and extortions to make money so they can keep fighting for control over drug passing's to USA.⁷⁵

The last of the four big cartels in Mexico is the Gulf cartel. The Gulf cartel is also the only cartel that doesn't have its roots in the Guadalajara cartel. The Gulf cartel is from Mexico's east coast, thereby the name. It was founded in the early 1970's and was in the beginning smuggling alcohol to USA. In the late 1980's it went over to smuggle drugs instead, and with smuggle roots already in place, the cartel grew rapidly.⁷⁶ The cartel exists of four different branches, intelligence gathering, look outs, a technical and engineering branch and the last group that is used at gatekeepers that also control the military branch. The Gulf cartel is famous for its military branch and its very violent tactics. In the 1990's the Gulf cartel managed to buy of a group of Mexican soldiers, Special Forces to be exact. They got the name Los Zetas and were very successful in combat. This made the Gulf cartel the most successful cartel in the beginning of the 21st century. Los Zetas grew powerful during a long time and in 2010 they broke free from the Gulf cartel and are now its own drug cartel and have joined the fight over power.⁷⁷

4.3 The Mexican State

Mexico is a large nation with almost 113 million inhabitants (2011). Mexico's northern border is against USA and its southern border is with Belize and Guatemala. To the west of Mexico is the Pacific Ocean and the Mexican gulf is to

⁷³Beittel, June 2011. p. 8; <http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/2011-08-13>

⁷⁴<http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/2011-08-13>

⁷⁵Uppsala Conflict Database http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdatabase/gpcountry.php?id=107®ionSelect=4-Central_Americas# 2011-08-13

⁷⁶<http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/2011-08-13>

⁷⁷Uppsala Conflict Database http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdatabase/gpcountry.php?id=107®ionSelect=4-Central_Americas# 2011-08-13

the east of Mexico. The capital of Mexico is Mexico City and the type of government in Mexico is a Federal Republic with a president, Felipe Calderon. Mexico is a big oil producer and is the second largest economy in the Latin America, which makes Mexico an important state in the region.⁷⁸

4.3.1 Short history of the Mexican government

Mexico's earliest signs of a state is the Mayan empire around 600-900 A.D. And it was taken over by the Aztecs who was a strong military actor in the 13th century. The first large expedition of Europeans came ashore in Mexico the year 1519. The expedition was led by Hernan Cortes. The Aztec empire fell under Spanish rule just two years later after Cortes's expedition started. Mexico was then under Spanish rule up till 1810 when a priest called Hidalgo started a war for independence from Spanish rule. The civil war lasted for 11 years, with the result of the independence for Mexico and the Mexican state was formed.⁷⁹ The next big event that has formed the state was the Mexican revolution in 1910. It was poor farmers and the Indian population that started the revolution in order to improve their situation. They have long been neglected of the Mexican government in favor for the middle and upper classes. The revolution succeeded in reforms of land distribution, education and employment. The revolution also brought chaos to the government and during a long time there were minor violent outbreaks between groups.⁸⁰

To make the Mexican state more stable, the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) was formed in 1929. The party took full control over Mexico and was the only party allowed. The PRI was in power for over 70 years in Mexico and lost the election in 2000 to the National Action Party (PAN).⁸¹

During the first 40 years in power for the PRI the Mexican state grew rapidly. Mexico is also a mayor oil producer and exporter. But when the oil started to create big revenues for the state, the first signs of corruption started to show in the Mexican government.⁸² There were several reports that Mexico's president in the 1980's received a house from oil producers. The corruption scandals and the slower economy in the 1980's started to weaken the government and the party. The PRI tried to clean up the corruption during the 1990's without any greater success and in the election in 2000 they lost the power to the PAN party. And in

⁷⁸ GIC

<http://find.galegroup.com/ludwig.lub.lu.se/gic/docRetrieve.do?inPS=true&searchPageType=BasicSearchForm&prodId=GIC&docId=CP3208530110&userGroupName=lununi>

⁷⁹ <http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/>; GIC

<http://find.galegroup.com/ludwig.lub.lu.se/gic/docRetrieve.do?inPS=true&searchPageType=BasicSearchForm&prodId=GIC&docId=CP3208530110&userGroupName=lununi>

⁸⁰ <http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/>

⁸¹ GIC

<http://find.galegroup.com/ludwig.lub.lu.se/gic/docRetrieve.do?inPS=true&searchPageType=BasicSearchForm&prodId=GIC&docId=CP3208530110&userGroupName=lununi>

⁸² BBC News – *Mexico Country Profile* http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/country_profiles/1205074.stm

2006, the PAN candidate for presidency Felipe Calderon, won the presidential election.⁸³

4.3.2 The Use of the Military

After Felipe Calderon declared war against the drug related problems one of his first action was to use of the military. This was an attempt to take harder action against the drug cartels and also to help out the police departments that were under equipped for going into fierce battles with the drug-cartels. One main reason for using the army was the hope that the army wasn't as corrupt as the police departments.⁸⁴ The army should be in charge until the police department had enough training, equipment and manpower to be the main public security function. According to Calderon it will take more than 6 years to get the police and justice departments free from corruption and therefore will the army have the lead role against the drug-cartels for at least 6 years.⁸⁵ Calderon wanted to use the military because they are better trained, more disciplined and less prone against corruption, that combination should make them better at fighting the drug-cartels.⁸⁶

When the Mexican government started using the army in the war against drug-cartels it started to create problems. One problem was the interaction between regular law enforcement agencies and the military command. Some of the main problems here was the communication and collaboration, who was in charge of the operations and who could you trust when it came to information.⁸⁷

The second problem was that the first effect of the use of the military was that there were several arrests of high profile leaders in the drug-cartels. But this didn't stop the violence, instead it backfired and the war between the drug-cartels was worse than before. This meaning that the army managed to create some form of stability in one area but the violence moved to a second area instead.⁸⁸

4.3.3 Law Enforcement & Juridical System

The law enforcement agencies and the juridical system in Mexico are in a really bad shape. Corruption and bad education is the main reasons. Around 75% of all crimes in Mexico never get reported because the public doesn't trust the

⁸³<http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/>

⁸⁴Shirk, David 2011 p. 9

⁸⁵Beittel, June 2011 p. 19

⁸⁶Nagel, Luz 2010 p. 107

⁸⁷Shirk, David 2011 p. 9

⁸⁸Ibid. p. 10; Beittel, June 2011. p. 19

juridical system.⁸⁹ Some estimates show that 80% of the Mexican population believes that the police are in general corrupt.⁹⁰ And the same numbers believes that the juridical system is corrupt and in the hands of the elite or cartels.⁹¹ Reports say that only two out of a hundred crimes committed in Mexico reaches a sentence.⁹² These numbers describes how the law enforcement and the juridical system work in Mexico.

The corruption and the ineffective system in Mexico are problems that were created during the PRI era. The PRI created an authoritarian system where the politicians had a lot of power and the legislative and judicial branches were weak and in control by the politicians.⁹³ This made the whole system very vulnerable for corruption. Corruption is still illegal, the problem is that the corruption is so vast that the will of prosecute those who use illegal means for personal benefit is lost.⁹⁴

The law enforcement is divided into two police units, the local police and the Federal Preventive Police (Federales). There are big differences among these units, the local police have around 350,000 employees and the Federales only have around 15,000-25.000 officers. A normal local police officer has one month of police education, and most of the officers haven't had any higher education. The salary is between 230\$ - 500\$ a month. The educational level, the salary and poor equipment is one of the reasons why the local police in most cases can't do a good job. In 2008 the where an evaluation of 56,000 police officers to see how they performed in their job, alarming 49% of them failed to perform their duties. The Federales on the other hand must have a minimum of a high school diploma and has at least 3 months of formal police training. They have a starting salary of 1000\$ a month.⁹⁵

The government has under Calderon started to reorganize and restructure the whole juridical system from the basics. This is a process that will take years and is not a short term solution even though there are some visible proofs. For example, in 2005 the government put in \$500 million, an increase of 36 % of the budget the year before, just to help in the Drug War in the northern part of Mexico along the border. This can be compared to that a study that was made in the late 1990's that showed that the drug cartels approximately spent \$500 million just on bribes.⁹⁶ In some cases the bribe doesn't contain a lot of money but a threat, if you don't take the bribe you can lose your job or even be killed. The threat that comes with the bribes helps preserving the corrupt system.⁹⁷

⁸⁹Shirk, David, 2011. p. 11

⁹⁰Nagle, Luz, 2010. p. 99

⁹¹Ibid. p. 110

⁹²Shirk, David, 2011 p. 11

⁹³Nagle, Luz, 2010. p. 96

⁹⁴Nagle, Luz 2010. p. 96

⁹⁵Ibid. p. 104

⁹⁶Nagle, Luz. 2010. p. 101, 106

⁹⁷Nagle, Luz 2010. p. 108

5 Analysis

This chapter holds the discussion and analysis of the theoretical framework and the case study. It is in this chapter I will try to find the answers to my research questions. This will be completed when I analyze the case study through the scope of the theoretical framework and operationalization from chapter 3.

5.1 The Violence

As showed in the case study, violence is a major concern in the Drug War. The fighting amongst the drug-cartels and the fighting between drug-cartels and the Mexican police and military is affecting the Mexican state. In this part of the chapter I will discuss how the security of the state is threatened of the violence through analyzing it with theoretical framework from chapter 3. Here I will hope find evidence if and how the Mexican state is affected through the help of the 5 different sectors.

5.1.1 The Classic Security Approach

The classical security approach is as showed in the third chapter of this study the political and military sectors. This is also the easiest sectors to find the relations between violence and security.

To start from the beginning of the Drug War, the pure act from the Mexican President Calderon to give the drug related problems a name such as the Drug War is an example of making the problems more visual as a security concern. War as a term means a violent threat usually between states or a state and a non-state actor, as in this case.

By using the term war, the drug problem becomes securitized, and the Mexican government and President Calderon becomes the securitizing actor. The referent object here is the Mexican state or the Mexican nation. The state is threatened by the drug cartels because their capability to violence exceeds the capability of the Mexican law enforcement. This prevents the Mexican law enforcement to be able to perform its duties. This problem can be viewed through the political and military sector. Violence can obstruct government institutions from performing its duties and can therefore be considered a security threat in the political sector. The military threat is that violence is not only affecting the

government but also the states citizens, and the state is supposed to protect its citizens.

The securitization and use of the term war makes the government take extraordinary actions, which in this case is the deployment of the military inside its own borders.

In the subunit level, we can find another dimension of the Drug War. In Mexico it is easier to find a referent object and securitizing actor in the military sector than in the political sector. One main reason is that the cartels are economically driven and not political.

5.1.2 The Wider Security Approach

With a wider approach it is harder to see the connection between violence and security in the unit level. It is hard to find evidence of the state being threatened by violence to a degree that the states security is threatened. In this level the state is the main referent object.

In the subunit level it is a lot easier to find referent objects in two sectors, the societal and the economical sectors. The drug-cartels, companies and communities are the three mayor referent objects in this case study.

In the societal sector I find that the communities are the referent object. The violence can threaten the identity of the communities by obstructing traditions, culture and religion. The violence can be directed against communities who have or have a similar identity of a drug cartel. For example a horizontal threat of a community can be if a part of a drug-cartels identity is based upon where it originated, another cartel can strike by force in that area, aiming to cripple the other drug cartel. The community identity can therefore be mixed up with a drug-cartels identity.

In the economical sector the violence can be a threat against all three referent objects. The violence can obstruct the people to go to work and is therefore affecting the communities and the companies. Both the companies and drug cartels are economically driven and can thereby see the violence as a threat. The economical sector is still hard to analyze because the economical threats is easier to deal with in other sectors.

The functional actors in the case of violence, is seen as the actors who create the violence, the drug-cartels and the governments security forces.

I have had a hard time finding any actors in the environmental area. For violence to be a case of security threat in the environmental area, the violence has to be extreme. For example a nuclear bomb is an example of a threat of the environment.⁹⁸ The Drug War is far from having spillover effects that can be a security concern in an environmental sector.

⁹⁸Buzan, Barry et al 1998. p. 75

5.2 The Corrupt State

In this section of the chapter I will discuss the impact that corruption can have on the states security in the five different sectors. Corruption is vast and exists on all level in the government. I will in the following section analyze the relationship between a corrupt state and security. I will in this section as in the one previous to section analyze the relationship through the lens of the 5 sectors.

5.2.1 The Classic Security Approach

Both in the military and the political sector the corruption inside the state is seen as security threat. The corruption can be seen as an attack against both the physical base and the institutions of the state. The drug cartels have with the help of the corrupt government a lot of influence in Mexico. Some of the effects of the government that can be seen as an attack on the institutions are the failure of the law enforcement.

In the political sector the government and politicians must have the trust of the people. This is not the case in Mexico where an estimate of 80 % thinks the juridical system is corrupt.⁹⁹ The reports of the cartels spending around \$500 million on bribing the states institutions is also evidence that the state is corrupt.¹⁰⁰

The unit level is the most interesting in the military sector, because the main referent object is the state. The corruption of the government is easy to securitize. Here the securitizing actors can be the intelligence service or highly placed military officers. An example can be that the military in some cases don't want to share information to the local police because the vast corruption. The information can easily be spread to the drug cartels and it can end up with heavy fighting between the military and the drug cartels. The functional actors here can be the drug-cartels, governmental employees that takes bribes but also employees who doesn't take bribes.

In the political sector the corrupt system shows that the government itself can be a security concern against the state. Here we see the same connection as in the military sector that the corruption can be seen as a threat against the two pillars of the state. The corruption makes outside actors have a direct impact on the physical base and the states institutions. This is a threat against the states sovereignty.

The focus in the in the political system is on the unit level. In the political level you can see the state and the government as two different referent objects. The corruption as we already have gone through is a threat against the state, but it can also be a threat against the government on its own. In a democratic system the government is depended on the people's approval, otherwise the government will

⁹⁹Nagel, Luz 2010. p. 110

¹⁰⁰Nagel, Luz 2010. p. 106

change in the next election. The corruption can therefor affect the people's opinion of the government in a negative way and can therefore be seen as a threat against the sitting government.

The securitizing actors are usually the spokespersons for the referent objects. In a corrupt system there can be a lot of functional actors and I don't think it will help this study if I go through every one of them.

5.2.2 The Wider Security Approach

To start with the economical sector, the corruption in Mexico is a very interesting phenomenon. In this study the focus is on the unit and subunit level. This means that the referent objects is the state and companies.

In the economical sector the state is the referent object. There are three different approaches to analyze the state. In the mercantilist approach the politics is in the center and the state must provide the basic needs to create a good environment for the market.¹⁰¹ In this case the state can be a threat against itself because corruption can make the state unable to provide a good environment for the market.

The second approach is the liberalism view of the market and state to be divided. The state among other actors is supposed to make sure that the rules and laws for the market is followed. Here a corrupt state can fail to provide that in some cases.¹⁰²

The last approach is the socialist approach. This is a mix of the two other approaches. This makes the socialist approach have similar results with state having problems creating a healthy environment for the market.¹⁰³

The companies can have both advantages but also severe problems that can threaten the company. The advantages are that a small bribe can be very helpful, both on the market and with the government. It can be everything from not having to pay tax to be able to land big contracts. The downside is that it also can have an opposite effect. The company must also contribute to the corruption by paying "extra tax" or else have trouble with getting contracts.

The societal sector is about the identity of an actor. A very good example how the corruption can be a security issue for that state is to look at the local police. The police is supposed to work for law and order inside a state. If the police become corrupt, as in the case of Mexico, the identity of the police can be threatened. An example of a horizontal threat of the police identity is that around 80% of the Mexican population believes that the Mexican local police are corrupt.¹⁰⁴ If the identity of the police changes, this can threaten the identity of the state and the idea that the state shall protect its citizens. The police are an institution of the state and are therefore a threat against the third pillar of the state.

¹⁰¹Buzan, Barry et al 1998. p. 95

¹⁰²Ibid. p. 95-96

¹⁰³Ibid. p. 96

¹⁰⁴Nagle. Luz 2010. p. 99

The only environmental threat that I have found is if a company can bribe its way out of one or several environmental laws. This can affect ecosystems through pollution.

5.3 The Result of the Case Study

The Drug War has a big impact on the Mexican state with mixed results. The government's strategy of securitizing the problems has resulted in a higher level of violence. The biggest contributor to the increased violence is conflict between the cartels. In this case, the increased violence means that the state does not have control over the violence and is failing to protect its citizens.

The Drug War also has effects on the corrupt system. The big reconstructions of the state institutions can result in clearing out the corruption. An example is that there have been several arrests for corruption, both in the government and in the law enforcement.

The Drug War has shown a lot of weaknesses of the state and the question this study will leave is: has the Drug War has made the state more secure than before or has it had an opposite effect? There is also the relationship of how the state looked before the Drug War started.

The results of this case study have shown that the security of all three pillars of the Mexican state is threatened. The government has tried to respond to attacks but it is hard to say if the attacks have grown stronger or starting to tap of.

*"Societies engaged in war put at risk not only the lives and welfare of their citizens but also their collective political, economical and social achievements."*¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵Buzan, Barry et al 1998. p. 58

6 Conclusion

This study has showed that the additional three approaches can help understand a conflict on a unit and subunit level. This widen approach of five sector instead of two is still underdeveloped and it's critical that the three new sectors is brought up to the same level as the classical military and political sectors.

I believe that using a wider scope of five sectors is better than to use only the classical two sectors. This is because it provides a wider scope and creates more actors that contribute to a better understanding of security. Though in some cases the use of all five sectors can be unnecessary and only have an opposite effect by creating a too wide scope. And as showed in this study, some sectors are easier to apply in some case studies. For example I found it harder to find actors in the environmental sector than in the other four. I also have the opinion that the environmental sector didn't have a lot to contribute when it came to reach a result of the case study.

Thus the main reason of this study was to see if all the five sectors could be applied on this case study. I have come to the conclusion that all five sectors could be applied, some more than others. The study also showed that the five sectors create a too wide scope for a case study like this. This should be considered before using the five sectors in a similar case study.

In this case study I think it would be better to only use the political, military, economical and societal sectors because I don't think the environmental sector contributed to the results in the case study.

To discuss security and ways to analyze the term is of big importance of its development and to help future scientists or politicians understand events in the international and in the domestic political sphere.

7 Referenser

7.1 Books and Articles

- Beittel, June S. 2011 "Mexico's Drug Trafficking Organizations: Source Scope of the Rising Violence" *Congressional Research Service (R41576)*
- Bjereld, Ulf, Demker Marie, Hinnfors Jonas. 2002. *Varför vetenskap?* Second edition Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Buzan, Barry, 2009. *People, State and Fear* second edition. Colchester: ECPR Press
- Buzan, Barry, Weaver, Ole, de Wilde, Jaap. 1998. *Security: A New Framework For Analysis* London: Lynne Reinner Publisher Inc.
- Carpenter, Ami C, 2010. "Beyond Drug Wars: Transforming Factional Conflict in Mexico" *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 4
- Johannessen, Asbjörn & Tuffte Per A. 2007. *Introduktion till Samhällsvetenskaplig Metod* Ljubljana: Liber AB
- Mahadevan, Prem, 2011 "A war without principles: Narco-Violence in Mexico" *Research Institute for European and American Studies*
- Nagel, Luz E. 2010. "Corruption of Politicians, law enforcement, and the judiciary in Mexico and complicity across the border" *Small Wars & Insurgencies* Vol. 21 No. 1 page: 95-122
- Neal, Andrew W. 2010. *Exceptionalism and the Politics of Counter-Terrorism* Oxton:Routledge
- Pacheco, Fernando C. 2009 "Narcoterrorism: How has Narcoterrorism Settled in Mexico" *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* Vol. 35 Nr. 12 page: 1021-1048
- Sheehan, Michael. 2005. *International Security: An Analytical Survey* London: Lynne Reinner Publisher Inc.
- Shirk, David 2011. "The Drug War in Mexico" *Council on Foreign Relations Special Report* no. 60
- Teorell, Jan & Svensson, Torsten 2007. *Att Fråga och att Svara – Samhällsvetenskaplig Metod* Ljubljana: Liber AB

7.2 Data bases and Internet Websites

BBC-News *Q&A: Mexico's drug-related problems* <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-10681249> 2011-08-13

Freedom House 2010. *Freedom of the Press 2010: Mexico* p. 1-3
<http://freedomhouse.org/images/File/fop/2010/Mexico%20FOTP%202010%20draft%20KDK%20re-edited.pdf> 2011-08-10

Global Issues In Context. *Mexico*
<http://find.galegroup.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/gic/docRetrieve.do?inPS=true&searchPageType=BasicSearchForm&prodId=GIC&docId=CP3208530110&userGroupName=lununi>
2011-08-10

Säkerhetspolitik.se (published) 2010-10-01 *Fördjupning av Mexico*
<http://www.sakerhetspolitik.se/Konflikter/Mexico/Fordjupning-Mexiko/> 2011-08-13

United States Government Accountability Office, 2007. (GAO-07-1018) *Drug Control: U.S. Assistance Has Helped Mexican Counternarcotics Efforts, but Tons of Illicit Drugs Continue to Flow into the United States* 2011-08-13

Uppsala Conflict Database
http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdatabase/gpcountry.php?id=107®ionSelect=4-Central_Americas# 2011-08-13