

Utilizing Tools Used to Tackle Terrorism in the Fight Against Drugs

Adriana Ávila-Zúñiga-Nordfjeld, Associate Senior Lecturer - Maritime Safety and Security,
Law & Defence Systems, Swedish Defence University

Dimitrios Dalaklis, Professor - Maritime Safety & Security, World Maritime University

George Theocharidis, Professor - Maritime Law & Policy, World Maritime University

Abstract

Even though the term of terrorism has been discussed by several authors in the past, there is not a sole definition. However, it can be observed that most approaches from previous research efforts have several features in common: there must be a) an actual threat of violence; b) a political motive and; c) the terror actions must be directed or planned to influence a targeted audience. It must also be emphasized that the overall common contribution is that certain activity cannot be approached under the prism of terrorism unless it has a clear deliberate political motive. Certainly, the strong connection between international drug crime organizations and terror groups has been brought into the forward of attention by an extended number of national authorities (in numerous concerned countries). However, the question is if these illegal operations, including the large damage to the health of entire societies they are producing, can provide a sufficient justification to include the relevant illegal groups in the list of terror organizations. An initiative was presented before the US Congressional Foreign Affairs Committee to designate as “terrorists or Terror Foreign Organizations” to a total of nine of the organized crime groups from Mexico (drug cartels), endorsing the US armed forces act against third countries where these criminal organizations have their operations. Resolution 18, called “Resolution on the Authorization of the Use of Military Force to Combat, Attack, Resist, Target, Eliminate and Limit the Influence” (of drugs), would allow US armed forces to act against “*those foreign nations, foreign organizations or foreign persons affiliated with foreign organizations*” who have violated the law to traffic fentanyl or related substances into the United States. They would also be endorsed to act when “*Foreign organizations have participated in kinetic actions against personnel of US federal, state, local, tribal or territorial security forces operating in US territory or abroad (...). Against police, military or other government personnel from a country that has a common border with the United States or any other country in the Western Hemisphere (...). Or has used violence and intimidation in order to establish and control a territory to be used for illicit purposes*”. Yet, such actions can also fall under the term of “invasion” or “violation of a sovereign nation’s authority”. On the other hand, national authorities from Mexico have critiqued such resolution and interventionism, since Mexico is an independent, sovereign country with a well-established governance body. Thus, this paper will broadly discuss and analyse the concept of foreign terror organization, within the framework of drug cartels and criminal ring groups, including the legal aspects related to such resolution as violence of sovereignty rights. At the same time, it will explore other friendly legal alternatives (binational or international agreements) to fight these types of activities, such as formulations of defence and security alliances with a narrow focus, as well as stressing the importance of international cooperation and partnerships in defence and security systems in relation to short-term alliances or coalitions organised to face common security challenges.

Keywords: Terrorism; Fight Against Drugs; International Alliances and Partnerships

ISMS Working Groups:

Security and Defense Policy Strategy
Armed Forces and Society

Military Strategy
Military Law and Ethics