A Predictive Study on the Likelihood of

Restoring Order to Ciudad Juarez

By

Anthony W Sprouse

Submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements for course

Analytics I (INTL504)

American Military University

February 27, 2011

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

The United States and Mexico share over 1900 miles of border stretching from as far west as San Diego, California then passes through the Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, where the border ends in Brownsville, Texas. This border is often the debate of many U.S. national policy issues such as illegal immigration, human trafficking, and narcotics smuggling. The primary culprit in many of these incidents is Mexico's notorious drug cartels. Drug cartels within Mexico are infamous in their ability to conduct illegal operations out of Mexico and export their products to the United States easily. Therefore the drug cartel issues that lie within Mexico are of extreme importance to the United States drug enforcement policies and to the protection of the citizens of this country

Ciudad Juarez is a major city within the state of Chihuahua, Mexico with an estimated population of 1.5 million people. Juarez, as it often referred to as, is located on the northern border of Mexico and the United States, and is connected to the U.S. city of El Paso, Texas by bridges arching over the Rio Grande. The estimated population of El Paso in 2009 was about 620,000; together El Paso and Juarez comprise one of the world's largest multi-national populations with over 2 million citizens. Juarez and El Paso, according to many of its citizens, consider themselves one giant metropolitan area.

Juarez is one of the primary transportation hubs in Mexico for illegal narcotics being exported by Mexican drug cartels to the United States through El Paso. There are two major cartels that operate out of Juarez, the Juarez Cartel and the Sinaloa Cartel, and both are extremely rich, influential, powerful and dangerous. These Cartels were at one time part of the same organized Drug Trafficking Organization (DTO), but in 2007 the Juarez Cartel decided to split from the Sinaloa Cartel. The events that followed this separation have led to an extremely bloody

turf war in Ciudad Juarez. Several experts have asserted that Juarez is now one of the most deadly cities outside of a declared war zone. The war continues to rage on to this day, and evidence shows that there is no definitive sign of a peaceful resolution.

. The primary objective of this research report is to utilize the Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP) methodology to determine the likelihood of restoring some order to the city of Juarez. With this idea in mind this research paper will further address the following questions:

1. What measures is Mexico taking to quell the cartel drug war within Juarez?
2. What actions could the United States and Mexico take in order to prevent violence from spilling into El Paso?
3. Could the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels create a cease fire agreement and reunite organizations?

This study will attempt to answer the above questions and create scenarios along with a predictive analysis to illustrate possible courses of action for restoring order to Juarez, Mexico.

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

When the Sinaloa and Juarez cartels began fighting in 2007 there were multiple murders throughout the city of Juarez, which have continued to increase annually through 2010. The increase in violence within this border town have many political leaders wondering if the violence can be subdued and if El Paso will be directly affected by the increased cartel violence.

A literature review of published information has been conducted and the majority of all the information available details DTO violence throughout Mexico. There are few publications that concentrate primarily on the city of Juarez itself. A book written by Charles Bowden titled Murder City is a great resource of firsthand accounts of the violence within Juarez. This book in conjunction with newspaper articles, news reports, and reports prepared for and by member of the United States Congress by the Congressional Research Service, as well as U.S Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing will serve as the primary source of data for addressing the DTO violence within Juarez. Within this literature review the following information will be addressed:

> ➢ Why this issue is important to the United States and Mexico.
>
> ➢ Who the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels are.
>
> ➢ Why the two cartels are fighting.
>
> ➢ How many people have been killed as a result of the drug war?

The Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels are drug trafficking organizations that rose out of prominence from the U.S. drug enforcement operations within Colombia during the 1970s and 80s. Their quick rise to prominence in being able to transport large amounts of narcotics to the United States, has allowed them to prosper financially and successfully assert their influence upon the Mexican police, military, and government officials. Of the seven known Mexican

DTOs the Juarez and Sinaloa organizations are the two most prominent within the city of Juarez. The one time allies have grown apart over the past few years and are now at war over drug trafficking operations within Juarez. This war has come at the great cost of several thousand Mexican and American lives.

In March 2009, Democratic Senator John Kerry and Republican Senator Richard Lugar; who are both members of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, held a hearing at the University of Texas, El Paso to address the issue of U.S. – Mexican Border Violence. In addition to the Senators in attendance the following people testified at the hearing: Mr. Jamie Esparza, District Attorney for El Paso, TX; Mr. William McMahon, Deputy Assistant Director US Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives from Washington, DC; Mr. Joseph Arabit Special Agent in charge Drug Enforcement Administration from El Paso, TX; Mr. Ricardo Garcia Carriles Former Police Chief of Ciudad Juarez; The Honorable Harriet C. Babbitt Former Ambassador to Organization of American States, Washington, DC; and Mr. Howard Campbell Professor at the University of Texas at El Paso. The primary focus of this hearing was to address the current Juarez drug cartel violence, and the importance of U.S. and Mexican foreign relations.

In his opening remarks to the hearing Senator Kerry felt the obligation to express the concerns and interests of the United States. His statements are powerful and provide an understanding of the important issues that are vital to the U.S. and Mexico's efforts to combat Mexican Drug Cartels.

Senator John Kerry stated:

"Our decision to hold the Foreign Relations Committee's first field hearing here in El Paso underscores the commitment of this committee and the Senate to working with Mexican authorities to end the

violence that is endangering our valued neighbor to the south… We have all been deeply shocked at the brutal attacks occurring just a stone's throw across the Rio Grande from where we are sitting this morning. Policemen, soldiers and innocent bystanders are being killed by drug cartels armed with high-powered weapons smuggled in from the United State… Mexico's institutions are under enormous stress from the rising level of violence. The fallout from the warring cartels is visible just across the border in Ciudad Juarez… Beyond those vital concerns, Americans are worried that the cartels will turn our cities and neighborhoods into the next front in the war. Drug trafficking and the ruthless violence it spawns know no borders. So far, the United States has largely been spared. But it is in our national interest, and it is our solemn obligation, to take steps today to help curtail the killing in Mexico. Americans are consumers of the drugs that pass through Mexico. As long as there is demand, the trade will produce the billions of dollars that fuel the cartels, corrupt public officials in Mexico and buy the guns killing those who get in their way. It is our responsibility to try our best to curb America's addiction to drugs. We have another responsibility. The vast majority of the weapons used by the cartels as they fight each other over drug smuggling routes and target army and police officers come from the US. And they are horrific weapons. In Juarez and other battleground cities, the thugs aren't armed with Saturday night specials. The cartels maintain well-trained paramilitary hit squads that are often better equipped than the police. Their encrypted communications gear is state-of-the-art, and they have mobilized up to 80 vehicles in simultaneous strikes against multiple targets.. We often hear politicians fall back on the mantra that "we must fight them over there so we don't have to fight them here." When it comes to the drug cartels in Mexico, this happens to be undeniably true. We must help our neighbors reclaim their streets because it is the right thing to do – and because we will keep ours safer in the process." (16)

Senator Richard (Dick) Lugar followed Senator Kerry's remarks by reiterating the importance of combating illicit cross border activity and cooperating with the Mexican government to combat Mexican Drug Cartels. Additionally Senator Lugar emphasizes the fact

that the United States and Mexico are linked in multiple ways, not just drugs and violence. The United States and Mexico are allies and share a rich history and culture with one another.

Senator Lugar stated:

"As much as 90 percent of the assault weapons and other guns used by Mexican drug cartels are coming from the United States, fueling drug-related violence that is believed to have killed more than 7,000 people since January 2008, according to estimates by Mexican and U.S. law enforcement officials… The basis of U.S.-Mexico ties is a strategic relationship that goes far beyond the problems of drugs and violence. Our nation is inextricably intertwined with Mexico historically, culturally, and commercially. The flow of goods and people across our borders helps drive our economy and strengthen our culture. But our land borders also serve as a conduit for illicit activity. This is a problem that bears shared responsibility and requires cooperative action." (16)

To add further substantial information to the declarations of Senators Kerry and Lugar, U.S. District Attorney (DA) Jamie Esparza highlighted during his testimony that:
"Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico has long been referred to as "our sister city." Five international bridges connect us to our neighbors in the south. The daily northbound crossings on these bridges are as follows: privately owned vehicles 44,481; trucks 2,293; and pedestrians 23,878." (16)

In DA Esparza's testimony he mentioned that 2,293 trucks arrived from Mexico. This is imporant to point out because the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has allowed the U.S and Mexico to import and export commodities essentially free of import and export taxes. According to the U.S. Census Bureau the 2,293 trucks, in part, helped deliver an estimated $176,654,373 worth of goods to the United States. Conversely the five bridges connecting El Paso and Juarez helped deliver an estimated $128,892,138 worth of commodities to Mexico,

according to the U.S. Census Bureau in 2009. The import and export of commodities to Mexico and the United States provides a vital source of revenue and jobs helping bolster U.S. and Mexican economies.

In order to understand why drug cartels are at war with one another, we must first identify who the drug cartels are and what they represent. This part of the literature review will derive information from multiple sources including, Stratfor Global Intelligence and publications from the Congressional Research Service (CRS). The first item addressed will be what Mexican drug cartels are and who operates within Juarez.

The definition of a cartel is defined as a group of autonomous organizations formed to limit competition by controlling the production and distribution of a product or service; therefore a drug cartel is a cartel that focuses on the distribution of illegal narcotics.

According to an article written by Stratfor Global Intelligence titled "Organized Crime in Mexico" the primary rise behind the most notorious drug cartels began as early as the 1980s. This was a result of U.S. government operations combating Columbian drug smuggling through the Caribbean. "In response to this move, drug traffickers began using Mexico as a transshipment point for U.S.-bound cocaine, as the country represented the path of least resistance to the movement of contraband." (15) It was during this time that several drug cartels began to create their organizations and establish their areas of control. Most of the drug cartels within Mexico are large organizations that were established by large families that were able to assert their control and dominance on the local communities and Mexico.

According to a CRS report for congressional members published in 2007 titled *"Mexico's Drug Cartels"* there are seven major cartels operating within Mexico. Furthermore the CRS states that three major drug cartels The Gulf, Sinaloa and Juarez represent the majority of all

illegal narcotics trafficking within Mexico. As of 2007 "the Juárez cartel could be found in 21 Mexican states and its principle bases are: Culiacán, Sinaloa; Monterrey, Nuevo León; the cities of Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, and Ojinaga, Chihuahua; Mexico City; Guadalajara, Jalisco; Cuernavaca, Morelos; and Cancún, Quintana Roo. The Sinaloa cartel has a presence in 17 states, with important centers in Mexico City; Tepic, Nayarit; Toluca and Cuautitlán, Mexico State; and most of the state of Sinaloa." (6) The information that is detailed in this report does not take into account recent drug wars in which the Juarez and Sinaloa cartels have been fighting for control of drug trafficking areas, therefore it should be noted that the Juarez Cartel at this time may not have complete control of all the areas that the CRS lists. The city of Juarez is the battle ground for this bloody turf war, and until it is resolved there will be questions as to who has control of what areas in Mexico.

The influence that DTOs have is not limited to just Mexico. According to another CRS report titled "Southwest Border Violence: Issues in Identifying and Measuring Spillover Violence" written in January 2011, they state that "Mexican DTOs maintain drug distribution networks—or supply drugs to distributors in at least 230 U.S. cities" (7) This data is thus illustrated in Figure 1 below. This CRS report continues to explain that DTOs within Mexico generate hefty revenue based upon their annual sale of illegal narcotics to the U.S. per year. The estimated revenue for Mexican and Colombian DTOs averages between $18 and $39 billion dollars. According to a Time Magazine article "Joaquin "El Chapo" (Shorty) Guzman Loera, leader of the Sinaloa Cartel, is estimated to have a net worth of $1 billion, putting him at #701 on the *Forbes* list, between a Swiss oil tycoon and an American heir to the Campbell Soup fortune." (14)

Figure 1. U.S. Cities Reporting the Presence of Mexican Drug Trafficking Organizations
January 1, 2006-April 8, 2008

Cities Reporting the Presence of Mexican Drug Trafficking Organizations

Source: Federal, State, and Local Law Enforcement Reporting January 1, 2006 through September 30, 2008

Source: National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC), National Drug Threat Assessment, 2009, Map A5. U.S. cities reporting the presence of Mexican DTOs, January 1, 2006, through September 30, 2008, U.S. Department of Justice, Product No. 2008-Q0317-005, December 2008, http://www.usdoj.gov/ndic/pubs31/31379/ appenda.htm#Map5.

The Sinaloa Cartel was as previously mentioned established by Joaquin "El Chapo" (Shorty) Guzman Loera. According to literature obtained from Time Magazine El Chapo "Began his career in the drug trade as an apprentice of "El Padrino" (Godfather) Miguel Angel Felix Gallardo, who once headed Mexico's most powerful drug cartel. Guzman founded his own cartel in 1980, quickly establishing posts in 17 Mexican states. Sinaloa, his organization, takes its name from a Mexican state along the Pacific coast long known as a hotbed for drug trafficking. After Gallardo's arrest in 1989, Guzman inherited some of his territory." (14)

The literature available on the Sinaloa Cartel is vast; however the same cannot be said about the Juarez Cartel. According to information published online from Fox News Latino on

February 25, 2011; the Juarez Cartel "was founded in 1993 by Amado Carrillo Fuentes, who was known as the "Lord of the Skies" for his fleet of aircraft." (8) Further literature obtained from the Druglord.com stated that "Amado Carrillo Fuentes was a long-time *socio*, or partner, of Pablo Acosta. The enigmatic Amado was believed to be part of the Guadalajara drug cartel, sent to Ojinaga to oversee cocaine shipments that belonged to his bosses and to learn about border operations from Pablo Acosta. Through a protection scheme with Mexican federal and state police agencies and with the Mexican army, Acosta was able to ensure the security for five tons of cocaine being flown by turboprop every month from Colombia to Ojinaga—sometimes landing at the municipal airport, sometimes at dirt airstrips on ranches upriver from Ojinaga." Ojinaga is a border town of Mexico and Texas located to the Southeast of Juarez. Eventually Amado created a partnership with the Sinaloa drug cartel in Juarez creating one of the largest drug trafficking operations within Mexico.

In 1997 Amado Carrillo Fuentes died after undergoing a plastic surgery operation trying to disguise his identity. This death left a giant vacuum in the leadership of the Juarez Cartel. Eventually Amado's brothers assumed control of the Juarez Cartel. El Chapo noticed the vacuum within the Juarez Cartel and began taking over parts of Juarez. Throughout the past few years the leaders of the Juarez Cartel have either been arrested or executed by El Chapo. In retaliation the Juarez Cartel has executed members of the Sinaloa Cartel. This tit-for-tat killing eventually led to the separation of the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels; while in the process creating a drug war within the city of Juarez leaving behind a trail of death and destruction.

According to several publications the number of homicides within Juarez in 2007 was around 310; in 2008 that number rose to 1,607; in 2009 it rose further to around 2,754; and in 2010 those number surpassed 3,000. The majority of experts believe that the number has

increased due to the drug war between the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels. Although this is what experts ascertain these numbers cannot be corroborated because the city of Juarez and Mexico does not keep thorough records about violent crimes like that of the United States.

According to a press release by the City of El Paso there were only 5 homicides reported as of December 21, 2010. In comparison to Juarez the city of El Paso saw 17 murders in 2007, 18 in 2008, and 13 homicides in 2009. These numbers are only murders that have occurred within the city of El Paso. The number of El Pasoans (citizens from El Paso) killed in Juarez during those years is not reflected within the cities report. Thus far El Paso has been successful in preventing DTO violence within the city of El Paso; however it is remains unclear if this trend will continue into the future.

For the purpose of the research report the preceding literature review has concluded that the drug cartels and their violence are important to the United States and Mexico for the following reasons:

1. Innocent Americans and Mexicans are being murdered visiting or living in Juarez by drug cartels.
2. The violence in Juarez has the potential to spill into El Paso.
3. The drug cartels in Juarez supply the United States with massive amount of illegal narcotics.
4. The Juarez and Sinaloa DTOs currently have members operating within the United States.
5. Illegal gangs and organizations within United States supply Juarez drug cartels with illegal firearms and money through drug trafficking.
6. The five bridges that connect Juarez and El Paso serve as a major conduit for free trade between the U.S. and Mexico.
7. Mexico and the U.S. are international trade partners and have deep cultural and historical ties.

CHAPTER 2: ACTORS and PERCEPTIONS

There are four primary actors for this research report; The United States, Mexico, Juarez Cartel, and the Sinaloa Cartel. For this portion of the report the Juarez and Sinaloa cartel will be combined into one group called the Juarez Drug Trafficking Organizations. The purpose of combining these organizations is due to their common perceptions on the violence in Juarez. The organizations have a common goal, even though they are at war with one another, thus their perceptions will not vary beyond a common battle for control of the Juarez drug trade route.

The United States and Mexico have taken great measures to combat DTOs within Mexico and the city of Juarez. The United States has created The Border Enforcement Security Task Forces (BEST) initiative, and the Merida Initiative. Another CRS report to congress stated that Mexican President Felipe Calderón began his assault on organized crime shortly after he took office in December 2006 and made combating the DTOs a centerpiece of his policy. When President Barrack Obama was sworn into office he also made a similar decree vowing to continue the objectives set forth in the Merida Initiative by former President George W. Bush. The United States and Mexican governments understand that there is a lot at risk combating drug trafficking organizations, but both understand that cooperation is among the best options for continued success. (6)

MEXICO'S PERCEPTION

The Calderón government has devoted billions of dollars to the offensive against Mexico's entrenched drug trafficking organizations, and deployed 45,000 soldiers and thousands of federal police in nearly a dozen of Mexico's states in the fight." In another display of cooperation with the United States and President Calderon's intent on ridding Mexico of DTOs; "in February 2009 he sent a surge of 5,000 troops to hyperviolent Juárez, supplementing 2,500 troops and federal police already in place there. The Mexican military took over all the local law

enforcement functions and the running of the prisons in the border city. With more troops added in March that brought the overall federal force to 10,800 (approximately 8,000 military)" (2) This report then states that the murder rate in Juarez began to fall, this might be true for the month of May 2009 in which this report was published, but in fact the murder rate rose even higher in 2009.

In the book Murder City written by Charles Bowden he talks about how everyone within the city of Juarez is corrupted by money and greed, and no one is able to escape it. He states that there are two Mexicos. One is the one that President Calderon wants the United States to see; as a cooperative country that is willing to use every resource possible to fight DTOs. Upon further reading Bowden states that there is also a second Mexico. "There is a second Mexico, where the war is for drugs, for the enormous money to be made in drugs, where the police and the military fight for their share, where the press is restrained by the murder of reporters and feasts on a steady diet of bribes, and where the line between government and the drug world has never existed." (3) Bowden's book and first hand reporting gives a clear indication that almost everyone within the city of Juarez is filled with the lust for drugs and their profits; this includes the military and the police officials that President Caldron has sent to Juarez.

Therefore there are two perceptions within Juarez. The first is that of President Caldron who sees the problem of drug trafficking organizations, and the need to eradicate them from the city in order to create a peaceful city. The second perception is that of the local population of Juarez who sees the military, police, and drug traffickers fighting amongst one another in order to control the drug trade to the United States and become wealthy in doing so.

14

AMERICA'S PERCEPTION

America perceives the violence in Juarez in various ways. First is the perception that violence within Juarez between warring drug cartels has the possibility of spilling into the United States not only in El Paso, but into one of the other 230 cities in which drug traffickers have been identified. Second the United States recognizes the drug addiction problem within the U.S. and understands the need to deny, detect, delay, and deter drug traffickers from importing illegal narcotics into the United States. Third the U.S. government wants to ensure that free trade between Mexico and the United States will not be affected by warring factions at major U.S. border crossings, including Juarez. Finally, U.S. Federal law enforcement agencies understand that the majority of weapons used by drug cartels within Juarez are supplied by gangs and organizations within the U.S. and therefore feel the need to ensure that Mexican citizens are protected as equally as U.S. citizens.

In order to ensure that the four perceptions are conveyed to the government of Mexico, the United States has established several initiatives within the U.S. and in partnership with Mexico. The two most prominent initiatives are The Border Enforcement Security Task Forces (BEST) and the Merida initiative.

One of the first initiatives to combat DTOs by the U.S. was the Merida initiative. In a report written by The National Security Program the Merida Initiative was outlined as an agreement between the United States and Mexico, over a three-year span that will provide security cooperation with the funding of $1.3 billion. The agreement was made between President Bush and President Calderon on October 27, 2007 and expired at the end of fiscal year 2010. "The four goals of the initiative were: 1) break the power and impunity of criminal organizations; 2) assist the Mexican and Central American governments in strengthening border,

air, and maritime controls; 3) improve the capacity of justice systems in the region; and 4) curtail gang activity in Mexico and Central America and diminish the demand for drugs in the region." (11)

"After several months of consultations, the Obama and Calderón governments agreed to a new strategy, which has been called "Beyond Mérida," that broadens the scope of bilateral security efforts and focuses more on institution building than on technology and equipment transfers." (13) The new four pillars are similar to the old with few exceptions, primarily focusing on infrastructure. The new four pillars are 1) Pillar One: Disrupting the Operational Capacity of Organized Crime; 2) Pillar Two: Institutionalizing the Rule of Law in Mexico 3) Pillar Three: Creating a "21st Century Border" and 4) Building Strong and Resilient Communities. This initiative is slated to be continued beyond 2012; after the Mexican Presidential elections.

The second initiative is a joint collaboration with U.S. law enforcement and international agencies known as the BEST initiative. The BEST initiative is lead by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency (ICE) agency. The task forces seek to identify, disrupt, and dismantle criminal organizations posing significant threats to border security, both along the Southwest border with Mexico as well as along the northern border with Canada. Other agency participants include the Customs and Border Patrol (CBP), Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco Firearms and Explosives (BATFE or ATF), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), United States Coast Guard (USCG), El Paso Intelligence Center (EPIC), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the U.S. Attorneys Offices, as well as state and local law enforcement. "The Mexican law enforcement agency Secretaria de Seguridad Publica is a partner along the Southwest border. In testimony to Congress the Assistant Secretary for ICE

noted that the El Paso BEST is working collaboratively with Mexico's Tactical-Operative Intelligence Unit (UNITO) Juárez taskforce to address four primary threats in the El Paso-Juárez corridor: 1) narcotics smuggling; 2) weapons violations; 3) money laundering; and 4) human smuggling/trafficking." (7)

JUAREZ DRUG TRAFFICKING ORGANIZATIONS PERCEPTION

The Juarez drug trafficking organizations perception of the violence in Juarez is seen as justified; in the sense that it is necessary in order to control the flow of narcotics into the United States and receive weapons and money from organizations within the U.S. Furthermore if the DTOs see a drug addiction problem within the U.S and are able to exploit the problem for financial gain then they will continue to do so until they are completely eradicated. The DTOs in Juarez have been established there for several years. They have seen the rise and fall of several DTO leaders, and understand that when one group falls another will rise to exploit the drug trade. Warring cartels will continue as long as there is a vacuum within powerful drug cartels leadership, or they can create a truce. They perceive the entire city of Juarez as living in poverty and as long as they can continue to make a profit over exploiting an American weakness they will continue to do so to keep from having to live in poverty.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN

There are a number of different analytical models to use when attempting a predictive study. For this study I have chosen to use the LAMP method (the Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction) over the more well-known methods such as the Delphi Technique and the Analytic Hierarchy Process. The LAMP method makes use of a number of the characteristics and processes of other predictive methods. However LAMP's primary differentiation from other predictive methods is the recognition of the importance of "free will" on potential events (10). When dealing with political relations, each actor has an individual voice who, at any given time, can make a decision of "free will" that will change the perception and behavior of all those actors influenced by the original decision. Therefore the key to an effective predictive study by the LAMP method is to understand not just the actors, but the actors' perceptions of events so as to effectively assess and compare the potential "decisions" to be made by each actor. As the LAMP designers point out, "…we can only know the probability of a given alternate future relative to all other possible alternate futures (Ibid, p. 26)." LAMP is organized for the express intention of determining possible future actions by forcing the analyst to take into account the perceptions of all of the actors involved in the scenario instead of focusing on one perspective and therefore only one set of potential "free will" choices and alternate futures.

LAMP is a twelve step program, noticeably lacking in quantitative measures – instead focusing on relative probability. Each step of the LAMP process requires a review of both the event that you are trying to predict the most likely future for as well as the perceptions of each actor involved in the event. The steps of the LAMP method as dictated by LAMP's creators are:

1. Determine the issue for which you are trying to predict the most likely future.

2. Specify the national "actors" involved.

3. Perform an in-depth study of how each national actor perceives the issue in question.

4. Specify all *possible* courses of action for each actor.

5. Determine the major scenarios within which you will compare the alternate futures.

6. Calculate the total number of permutations of possible "alternate futures" for each scenario.

7. Perform a "pairwise comparison" of all alternate futures to determine their relative probability.

8. Rank the alternate futures for each scenario from highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of "votes" received.

9. Assuming that each future occurs, analyze each alternate future in terms of its consequences for the issue in question.

10. State the potential of a given alternate future to "transpose" into another alternate future.

11. Determine the "focal events" that must occur in our present in order to bring about a given alternate future.

12. Develop indicators for the focal events (10).[1]

Studying the possible responses of the United States, Mexico, Juarez, and Sinaloa Cartel is particularly adaptable to the LAMP process, in part because of the widely variant perceptions of each of the interested actors. Doing a simple quantitative, cost and/or benefit analysis of the situation would be unlikely to determine how each state could be convinced to respond in a specific matter based solely on historical precedent or the "free will" decisions of the heads of

---

[1] For a more complete description of the LAMP method and the requisite steps please see: The Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction, Jonathan Lockwood and Kathleen O'Brien Lockwood, JMIC and MBS Publishing, 1993 or http://www.lamp-method.com.

state.   Analyzing the potential behavior of the U.S., Juarez Cartel, and Sinaloa Carte to possible Mexican scenarios, is both timely and useful, and more likely to prompt some response from those states most interested in Mexico's activities.

There is always some concern related to any predictive study. While LAMP attempts to address the vagaries of free will, it is likely impossible to conceive of every permutation of behavior of any actor, much less three or four actors whose behavior is intertwined and often dependent on others. Similarly, while the LAMP method tried to incorporate the perceptions of each actor in order to effectively weigh potential decisions and possible futures, the inclusion of perception is only as effective as the analyst's understanding of those perceptions. As an American student it is possible that this author's understanding of the perceptions of Mexico and the drug cartels will be skewed either consciously or unconsciously based on personal education and experience. However, I have made every effort to deduce the perceptions of those actors not immediately familiar through strenuous research into past and present behavior by each state. There is also the possibility that I may have skipped or missed parts of whole steps in the analytic process making any conclusions reached questionable at best. There are a variety of possible sources for bias in the general field of research and analysis and it is likely the determination of the reader and future events to determine the level of bias and error contained in this discourse. I can only offer the assurance that there was a conscious effort to avoid any type of bias or error. (10)

CHAPTER 4: LOCKWOOD ANALYTICAL METHOD for PREDICTION

This portion of this research paper will be the employment of the 12 step LAMP method. Each portion of this chapter will be marked as steps henceforth.

STEP 1: Determine the issue for which you are trying to predict the most likely future.

What is the likelihood of restoring order to Ciudad Juarez?

STEP 2: Specify the national "actors" involved.

The national actors involved with this analysis will be the United States, Mexico, Juarez Drug Cartel, and the Sinaloa Drug Cartel.

STEP 3: Perform an in-depth study of how each national actor perceives the issue in question.

This step has already been completed and is located within Chapters 1 and 2 of this report.

STEP 4: Specify all *possible* courses of action for each actor.

For each actor involved there will be three possible courses of action.

The United States:

➤ The first possible course of action for the U.S will be to maintain its current position on combating DTOs by reinforcing the Beyond Merida and BEST initiatives.

➤ The second possible course of action is to send U.S. military troops into Juarez and enforce military control of the city.

➤ The third course of action is to withdraw all funding and cooperation with Mexico. This course of action is highly unlikely due to amount of money and resource already committed to combating DTOs, as well as, the possible ramifications that come with it.

Mexico:

➤ The first possible course of action for Mexico is to maintain its current stance on combating DTOs with the aid of U.S. funding and assistance through the Beyond Merida and BEST initiatives.

- ➢ The second course of action is to cooperate with the Juarez Drug Trafficking Organizations and create a cease fire agreement with all warring parties.

- ➢ The third course of action is to seek international assistance for additional military personnel, weapons, and firepower and increase combat operations within Juarez

Juarez Drug Cartel:

- ➢ The first possible course of action for the Juarez Drug cartel is to create and internal cease fire agreement with the Sinaloa Cartel in order to create a more powerful drug trafficking operation, while creating the perception of a decrease in violence within Juarez.

- ➢ The second course of action is to continue fighting over territory within Juarez, and battling the Mexican military and police.

- ➢ The third course of action is to cooperate with the Mexican government and create a cease fire agreement without losing the drug trafficking operation.

Sinaloa Drug Cartel:

- ➢ The first possible course of action for the Juarez Drug cartel is to create and internal cease fire agreement with the Juarez Cartel in order to create a more powerful drug trafficking operation, while creating the perception of a decrease in violence within Juarez.

- ➢ The second course of action is to continue fighting over territory within Juarez, and battling the Mexican military and police.

- ➢ The third course of action is to cooperate with the Mexican government and create a cease fire agreement without losing the drug trafficking operation.

STEP 5: Determine the major scenarios within which you will compare the alternate futures.

There are two major scenarios in which I will compare the alternate futures. Each scenario provides a different perspective and also different alternate futures.

Scenario 1:

The Mexican government requests a cease fire agreement with the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels. Mexico allows the cartels to continue drug trafficking as long as they stop killing each other and innocent citizens in Juarez. Mexico will then rely upon the United States to enforce the BEST initiative to combat DTOs at border crossings into the United States.

Scenario 2:

The United States and Mexico continue the Beyond Merida and Best initiatives and fighting DTOs within Mexico. Mexico additionally asks the U.S. to reinforce border security. DTOs are given an ultimatum to either cooperate with the Mexican government and discontinue drug trafficking operations or face serious recourse.

STEP 6: Calculate the total number of permutations of possible "alternate futures" for each scenario.

In order to effectively predict the most likely future, there now must be an analysis of all possible permutations of actions by the interested actors related to the two possible scenarios posed by Mexico's most likely courses of action.

According to LAMP analysis, the basic equation for determining how many "alternate futures" are possible for the interested state actors in the study (United States, Juarez Cartel and Sinaloa) is $X^Y = Z$. In this equation X equals the number of actions available to each actor; Y equals the number of national actors involved; and Z equals the total number of alternate futures to be compared (10). In this analysis there are three possible courses of action for each interested

actor (not including Mexico whose actions are covered by the two different scenarios), and there are three interested actors involved (again with Mexico's actions covered by the two major scenarios.) Therefore the equation for this analysis becomes $3^3 = 27$, meaning there are 27 possible "alternate futures" to compare for the United States, Juarez Cartel, and Sinaloa Cartel, with each of the two scenarios dictated by Mexico. Because each scenario posed provides the same number of permutations for possible alternate futures (27), the next step is to create a table of alternate future permutations, which will then be used to perform a "pairwise comparison" of the alternate future permutations for each scenario. (10)

For simplification purposes, there will be abbreviations used to identify alternate future scenarios and courses of actions in all tables to follow:

Courses of Action for the United States, Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels:

Maintain Current Position = M

Withdraw any possible cooperation with Mexico = W

Cooperate with Mexico's Request = C

Alternate Future Scenarios for Mexico:

Scenario 1 = Cease fire agreement with Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels (CF)

Scenario 2 = Continue Beyond Merida and BEST Initiatives (CI)

Table I – Alternate Future Permutations

Possible Future #	United States	Russia	Israel
1	M	M	M
2	M	M	W
3	M	M	C
4	M	W	M
5	M	W	W
6	M	W	C
7	M	C	M
8	M	C	W
9	M	C	C
10	W	M	M
11	W	M	W
12	W	M	C
13	W	W	M
14	W	W	W
15	W	W	C
16	W	C	M
17	W	C	W
18	W	C	C
19	C	M	M
20	C	M	W
21	C	M	C
22	C	W	M
23	C	W	W
24	C	W	C
25	C	C	M
26	C	C	W
27	C	C	C

STEP 7: Perform a "pairwise comparison" of all alternate futures to determine their relative probability.

Using the Alternate Futures Table (Table 1) from the previous section, it is now possible to

conduct a pairwise comparison of each alternate future for each scenario. A pairwise

comparison is, very simply a way of comparing the likelihood of each alternate future against

each other possible future. For example, using Table 1, we compare alternate future #1 to

alternate future #2 in relation to the overall scenario, determining which is more likely based on

the analyst's understanding of the viewpoints of the actors. Next, the analyst compares alternate future #1 to alternate future #3 again determining which is most likely to occur, again relating to the specified scenario. This continues until all possible futures have been compared to each other. The equation for determining how many pairwise comparisons are necessary is:

$X = (n-1) + (n-2) \ldots + (n-n)$. In this equation *n* equals the total number of alternate futures to be analyzed and *X* equals the total number of pairwise comparisons that must be made. For this analysis *n* equals 27, therefore *X* equals 351 pairwise comparisons to be made for each scenario. Using the alternate futures table (plus a fourth column labeled "votes") for each scenario, it is possible to create a new table that can be sorted and weighed based on the number of votes each alternate future receives. These votes will indicate which alternate futures seem more probable than then the rest, allowing for an analysis of the most likely possible futures related to each of the three scenarios. (10)

Tables 2 and 3 contain the voting results from the pairwise comparisons made of all alternate future related to each of the two scenarios posed by the Mexican government.

Table 2

Alternate Futures Table
Scenario 1 = Cease fire agreement(CF)

Possible Future #	United States	Juarez	Sinaloa	**Votes**
1	M	M	M	18
2	M	M	W	8
3	M	M	C	17
4	M	W	M	6
5	M	W	W	10
6	M	W	C	10
7	M	C	M	19
8	M	C	W	22
9	M	C	C	25
10	W	M	M	10
11	W	M	W	6
12	W	M	C	20
13	W	W	M	6
14	W	W	W	0
15	W	W	C	9
16	W	C	M	18
17	W	C	W	16
18	W	C	C	26
19	C	M	M	6
20	C	M	W	4
21	C	M	C	17
22	C	W	M	3
23	C	W	W	3
24	C	W	C	15
25	C	C	M	17
26	C	C	W	19
27	C	C	C	21
Total Votes				351

Maintain Current Position = M

Withdraw any possible cooperation with Mexico = W

Cooperate with Mexico's Request = C

Table 3

Alternate Futures Table
Scenario 2 = Continue Initiatives (CI)

Possible Future #	United States	Juarez	Sinaloa	**Votes**
1	M	M	M	21
2	M	M	W	21
3	M	M	C	13
4	M	W	M	21
5	M	W	W	21
6	M	W	C	6
7	M	C	M	16
8	M	C	W	18
9	M	C	C	15
10	W	M	M	5
11	W	M	W	4
12	W	M	C	2
13	W	W	M	10
14	W	W	W	13
15	W	W	C	1
16	W	C	M	8
17	W	C	W	7
18	W	C	C	3
19	C	M	M	26
20	C	M	W	21
21	C	M	C	7
22	C	W	M	23
23	C	W	W	23
24	C	W	C	5
25	C	C	M	15
26	C	C	W	14
27	C	C	C	12
Total Votes				351

Maintain Current Position = M

Withdraw any possible cooperation with Mexico = W

Cooperate with Mexico's Request = C

STEP 8: Rank the alternate futures for each scenario from highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of "votes" received.

Tables 2 and 3 from Step 7 show each alternate future and the number of votes that those same alternate futures received in the pairwise comparisons for the two scenarios posed by Mexico. The next step of analysis is to rank the alternate futures from the highest to the lowest based on the number of votes received by each future. Tables 4 and 5 are the alternate futures tables arranged numerically from highest to lowest votes.

Table 4
Alternate Futures Table
Scenario 1 = Cease fire agreement(CF)

Possible Future #	United States	Juarez	Sinaloa	**Votes**
18	W	C	C	26
9	M	C	C	25
8	M	C	W	22
27	C	C	C	21
12	W	M	C	20
7	M	C	M	19
26	C	C	W	19
1	M	M	M	18
16	W	C	M	18
3	M	M	C	17
21	C	M	C	17
25	C	C	M	17
17	W	C	W	16
24	C	W	C	15
5	M	W	W	10
6	M	W	C	10
10	W	M	M	10
15	W	W	C	9
2	M	M	W	8
4	M	W	M	6
11	W	M	W	6
13	W	W	M	6
19	C	M	M	6
20	C	M	W	4
22	C	W	M	3
23	C	W	W	3
14	W	W	W	0
Total Votes				351

Maintain Current Position = M

Withdraw any possible cooperation with Mexico = W

Cooperate with Mexico's decisions = C

Table 5
Alternate Futures Table
Scenario 2 = Continue Initiatives (CI)

Possible Future #	United States	Juarez	Sinaloa	**Votes**
19	C	M	M	26
22	C	W	M	23
23	C	W	W	23
1	M	M	M	21
2	M	M	W	21
4	M	W	M	21
5	M	W	W	21
20	C	M	W	21
8	M	C	W	18
7	M	C	M	16
9	M	C	C	15
25	C	C	M	15
26	C	C	W	14
3	M	M	C	13
14	W	W	W	13
27	C	C	C	12
13	W	W	M	10
16	W	C	M	8
17	W	C	W	7
21	C	M	C	7
6	M	W	C	6
10	W	M	M	5
24	C	W	C	5
11	W	M	W	4
18	W	C	C	3
12	W	M	C	2
15	W	W	C	1
Total Votes				351

Maintain Current Position = M

Withdraw any possible cooperation with Mexico = W

Cooperate with Mexico's decisions = C

31

STEP 9: Assuming that each future occurs, analyze each alternate future in terms of its consequences for the issue in question.

Scenario 1:

In Scenario one, the Mexican government requests a cease fire agreement with the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels. Mexico allows the cartels to continue drug trafficking as long as they stop killing each other and innocent citizens in Juarez. Mexico would then rely upon the United States to enforce the BEST initiative to combat DTOs at border crossings into the United States. When analyzing the potential responses to the cease fire agreement scenario posed by the Mexican government, most of the possible alternative futures involved cooperation with the government of Mexico. An analysis of this size should be limited to three to five top choices to be given as possibilities for alternate futures. Assuming that each alternate future actually occurs and each actor take the course of action of that particular future; the three most likely futures for Scenario 1 are 18, 9, and 8.

Alternate Future #18 (26 Votes)

In Alternate Future 18, The United States would withdraw all cooperation with Mexico if they chose to cooperate with the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartel. In addition the two Cartels would agree to a cease fire agreement that would allow them to continue drug trafficking as long as they stop killing. This future seems most likely because the United States does not have a policy that allows them to cooperate with "terrorists" who would here imply the Juarez and Sinaloa Drug Cartels. It would not be unlikely to see the Juarez and Sinaloa drug cartel create a cease fire considering that they were at one time allies. In addition they would be able to continue their operations without interference from the Mexican government.

Alternate Future #9 (25 Votes)

In Alternate Future 9, The United States would maintain its current partnership in the Beyond Merida and BEST initiatives, but not assist with cease fire agreement. The Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels would agree on a cease fire and not murder any more people in Juarez. This alternate

future is also highly likely only receiving one vote less than Alternate Future 18. The reason this alternate future ranked highly is because the United States understands that even though we will not negotiate with terrorists, there is a lot at stake if the U.S. does not somewhat comply with the current initiatives. Therefore in this instance the U.S. will not be part of the cease fire, but will continue the Beyond Merida and BEST initiatives.

Alternate Future #8 (22 Votes)

In Alternate Future #8, The United States will maintain its current partnership with the Beyond Merida and BEST initiatives, and not participate in the cease fire agreements. The Juarez Cartel will comply with the cease fire agreement, and the Sinaloa Cartel will withdraw all cooperation. This scenario is also highly likely because the Juarez Cartel is not as powerful as the Sinaloa Cartel and will be able to benefit from cooperation with the Mexican government. The Sinaloa Cartel is currently more powerful and has a lot more at stake if they cooperate with the Juarez Cartel. They will be less likely to cooperate if that means they will have to remit part of their current income from illegal narcotics.

Scenario 2:

In Scenario 2, The United States and Mexico will continue the Beyond Merida and Best initiatives and fighting DTOs within Mexico. In addition Mexico will ask that the U.S. to reinforce border security. DTOs will be given an ultimatum to either cooperate with the Mexican government and discontinue drug trafficking operations or face serious recourse. A pairwise comparison of possible futures was conducted, and assuming that each alternate future actually occurs and each actor take the course of action of that particular future; the three most likely futures for Scenario 2 are 19, 22, and 23.

Alternate Future #19 (26 Votes)

In Alternate Future 19, The United States will cooperate fully with Mexico's request to continue the Merida and BEST initiatives as well as increasing border security. The Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels will not cooperate nor will they fully withdraw any possibility of cooperation. This situation is most plausible because it allows the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartel time to analyze the actions of what the U.S. and Mexico will do, and allow them time to develop a strategy for the near future.

Alternate Future #22 (23 Votes)

In Alternate Future 22, The United States will once again fully cooperate with Mexico's request to continue the Beyond Merida and BEST initiatives. The difference in this scenario is that the Juarez Cartel will withdraw any possible cooperation with Mexico, and the Sinaloa Cartel will maintain its current position. The most likely reason the Juarez Cartel will withdraw cooperation is because they have the least to lose overall. They are already being dominated by the Sinaloa Cartel therefore if they refuse to cooperate they can create a strategy that will target the Sinaloa Cartel while the U.S. and Mexico target both Cartels. In essence the Juarez Cartel will view this as a way to conduct a 2 on 1 operation that will eventually make them equal to or more powerful than the Sinaloa. On the other hand the Sinaloa Cartel will still be evaluating the situation before they decide how they want to proceed in the future.

Alternate Future #23 (23 Votes)

In Alternate Future 23, The Unites States will once again comply fully with all of Mexico's requests. The Sinaloa and Juarez cartels will both withdraw all possibility of cooperation with Mexico. The most probable reason both cartels will withdraw is because of the increased pressure from the United States on the border. This alternate future does not provide either cartel

a good outcome; therefore they will dig in and prepare for a fight. This situation received the same number of votes as Alternate Future #23 therefore this situation has the same likelihood of occurring as #22.

Now that all possible alternate futures have been analyzed it becomes apparent that Mexico cannot quell the violence in Juarez without cooperation. Mexico is going to have to either rely on cooperating with the drug cartels, or the United States. Scenario 1 illustrates that if Mexico relies on cooperation with the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels they are less likely to receive full cooperation from the United States. The second scenario further illustrates that if Mexico relies upon an alternate future that uses the full cooperation of the United States they are less likely to receive support from the drug trafficking organizations. The data does show us that overall Mexico is more likely to receive full cooperation from a cease fire agreement than from continuing the Merida and BEST initiatives. Taking the data from the chart it demonstrates that the cease fire agreement cooperation from all parties received a total of 21 votes and full cooperation of continuing the initiatives received 12 votes. This is because Scenario 1 still allows the U.S. to continue the BEST initiative to combat violence at border crossings.

STEP 10: State the potential of a given alternate future to "transpose" into another alternate future.

"The transposition of one alternate future to another occurs when the actions of one actor change the perceptions of one or more of the other actors. This change in perception provides the opportunity for one alternate future to "transpose" into another alternate future, potentially changing the relative probability of all possible futures as time and action progresses. Focusing once again on the five alternate futures within each scenario that were ranked "most probable"

through the pairwise comparisons, a brief discussion of the possibility of transposition follows."

(Lockwood)

Scenario 1:

Alternate Future 9 transposes into Alternate Future 8. In Alternate Future 9, the United States maintains its current position and both Cartels cooperate. In order for a transposition into Alternate future 8 to occur, the Sinaloa Cartel would have to change how they perceive the cease fire agreement. If the Sinaloa feel they are being cheated by the Juarez Cartel or by the Mexican government, then the probability for them to withdraw all cooperation becomes extremely high.

Scenario 2:

Alternate Future 19 transposes into Alternate Future 23. In Alternate Future 19, the United States fully cooperates with all of Mexico's demands and increases border security. Both the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels decide to maintain their current status in order to determine if cooperation or withdraw will be more beneficial. In order for Alternate future 19 to transpose the Juarez Cartel would have to perceive that fully withdrawing from any possible cooperation with the government is going to benefit them long term.

STEP 11: Determine the "focal events" that must occur in our present in order to bring about a given alternate future.

The LAMP technique defines a "focal event" as an occurrence of sufficient magnitude that it changes the relative probability of the universe of alternate futures. (10). This means what "focal events" need to occur now in order to produce a given alternate future presented in the preceding analysis. The U.S. and Mexico both want the violence in Juarez to quell in order to bring security and safety to the citizens of Mexico and the United States, and to deter or delay drug smuggling operations. For the six alternate futures discussed, certain events must occur in our present to create the alternate futures.

Focal Events for Scenario 1 Alternate Future 18

➢ Mexican government would have to create a cease fire agreement acceptable by both the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels.

➢ The Sinaloa and Juarez Cartel leadership would have to become available in order to review the agreement and to notify all members of the organization to stop fighting.

➢ The Mexican government would have to meet with the U.S. government and discuss the possibility of creating a cease fire agreement between the warring cartels.

➢ The U.S. government would have to review the current policies and determine the next course of action.

Focal Events for Scenario 1 Alternate Future 9

➢ Mexican government would have to create a cease fire agreement acceptable by both the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels.

➢ The Sinaloa and Juarez Cartel leadership would have to become available in order to review the agreement and to notify all members of the organization to stop fighting.

➢ The Mexican government would have to meet with the U.S. government and discuss the possibility of creating a cease fire agreement between the warring cartels.

➢ The U.S. government would have to decide that it is within their best interest to continue to employ the power of the Merida and BEST initiatives in order to combat DTOs

Focal Events for Scenario 1 Alternate Future 8

➢ Mexican government would have to create a cease fire agreement for ending violence in Juarez

- ➤ The Sinaloa Cartel would have to decide that cooperation is not within their best interest at to not cooperate with Mexico or the Juarez Cartel

- ➤ The Juarez Cartel would have to agree with all of the cease fire agreements and stop fighting the Sinaloa and government immediately.

- ➤ The United States would have to review the cease fire and agree to back the Mexican government.

Focal Events for Scenario 2 Alternate Future 19

- ➤ The Mexican government would have to stop the corruption within the military and police forces and begin serious talks with the U.S. government.

- ➤ The United States would have to hire more personnel to accommodate the increase in forces at the U.S. border.

- ➤ The Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels would have to begin examining the current situation within Juarez to determine whether or not they will capitulate.

Focal Events for Scenario 2 Alternate Future 22

- ➤ The Mexican government would stop the internal issues and begin bilateral talks with the United States.

- ➤ The Juarez Cartel would have to immediately tell the Mexican government that they will not surrender under the terms outlined.

- ➤ The Sinaloa Cartel would have to remain quiet and begin deciding their next course of action.

- ➤ The United States would have to reinforce the border to El Paso.

Focal Events for Scenario 2 Alternate Future 23

➢ The Mexican government would have to create a plan for ending corruption and preparing to increase use of force against the DTOs

➢ The Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels would tell their organizations and Mexico that they will not surrender under the terms outlined by Mexico

➢ The United States would have to agree to Mexico's terms and reinforce the border.

STEP 12: Develop indicators for the focal events

For a focal event that is associated with a particular Scenario or alternate future, there needs to be a list of indicators which will identify if a particular focal event is being achieved. The indicators listed below will help identify if a particular actor is moving toward the predicted alternate future.

Indicators for Scenario 1

➢ The Mexican government convenes and discusses the possibility of a cease fire. (Alternate Futures 18, 9, and 8)

➢ The Mexican government begins drafting a cease fire. (Alternate Futures 18, 9, and 8)

➢ The leadership of the Sinaloa and Juarez cartels are spotted meeting within the city of Juarez. (Alternate Futures 18, 9, and 8)

➢ The U.S. government states that it will no longer cooperate with Mexico (Alternate Future 18)

➢ The U.S. government states that it will continue the Merida and BEST initiatives but not support a cease fire agreement with the DTOs (Alternate Futures 9 and 8)

➢ The Sinaloa Cartel continues killing members of the Juarez Cartel after cease fire has been discussed. (Alternate Future 8)

Indicators for Scenario 2

➢ Mexican government asks United States for additional border security (Alternate Futures 19, 22, 23)

➢ The United States sends additional security to the El Paso border (Alternate Futures 19, 22, 23)

➢ The Mexican government demands a reform within the military and police forces in Juarez (Alternate Futures 19, 22, 23)

➢ The Mexican government gives the DTOs an ultimatum (Alternate Futures 19, 22, 23)

➢ The Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels continue to fight after ultimatum is issued (Alternate Future 23)

➢ The Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels fighting decreases few weeks then increases at previous levels (Alternate Futures 19 and 22)

➢ The Sinaloa attacks decrease and leaders are spotted meeting in the city (Alternate Future 22)

➢ The Juarez and Sinaloa leadership is seen meeting with their respective organizations (Alternate Future 19)

SUMMARY and CONCLUSION

Ciudad Juarez is a border town in Mexico that is connected to El, Paso Texas by 5 bridges that cross over the Rio Grande. While El Paso is considered one of the safest cities in America, Juarez is considered one of the most dangerous cities in the world. The Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels are currently battling on the street, and responsible for more than 3,000 killings in 2010. The United States and Mexico both understand that if the violence in Juarez is not controlled there is a potential it could spill into the United States and/or have serious economic and political impacts to the Mexican and United States Governments and way of life.

Taking into consideration the dangers that the Juarez drug violence is causing, I have used the Lockwood Analytical Method of Prediction for two scenarios that would help quell the violence in Juarez. The first scenario assumes that Mexico will create a cease fire agreement with the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels. The second scenario assumes that the United States and Mexico will continue the current Beyond Merida and BEST initiatives to combat the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels. The LAMP method then allows for me to assume 27 possible alternative futures for each scenario. I then took each possible alternate future and compared them against each other individually giving each one a respective vote for the most likely course of action. Upon completion of the voting of each possible alternate future each one was ranked from the highest probability to the lowest based upon the number of votes that each alternate future received. The three highest alternate futures for each scenario were then explained in more detail. Finally the six highest alternate futures were given key factor and indicator for future analysts to determine the most likely alternate future.

After the analysis was completed I have a high amount of confidence that the violence in Juarez can be quelled. The LAMP method has shown that Mexico cannot quell the violence on their own and will require cooperation from either the United States or the Juarez and Sinaloa

41

Cartels. The United States policy of not negotiating with terrorists may prove ineffective resolving the conflict in Mexico, and further review of this policy may need to make in order to ensure the citizens of the United States are protected from drug trafficking organizations in Mexico. Furthermore the Beyond Merida initiative has only recently been adopted by the United States and Mexico. It may be plausible that by continuing this course of action that The United States and Mexico can form a cohesive relationship that will allow for the deterioration of the Juarez and Sinaloa Cartels.

I order for the LAMP method to maintain its validity on this topic, it must be continually updated based upon the key factor and identifiers given by this first approach to the problem. If future analysts want to ensure that the violence in Juarez is on the decline, then they must update the data found within this research report to include the newest intelligence and factors of influence. Peace and order can be restored in Juarez, and as long as we have the LAMP method we can continue to make accurate predictions on the possible courses of action that need to be made.

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous. Drug chief, 7 others, killed in gunbattles. CNN 2004. February 25, 2011.

    http://www.latinamericanstudies.org/drugs/rodolfo-carrillo.htm

2. Beitterl, June. Mexicos Drug – Related Violence. Congressional Research Service. 2009

3. Bowden, Charles. Murder City: Ciudad Juarez and the Global Economy's New Killing

    Fields. Nation Books 2010.

4. Brooks, Karen. Mexico's drug cartels waging bloody turf war. Fort Worth Star Telegram. 2004.

5. Congressional Research Service. February 24, 2011. http://www.loc.gov/crsinfo/

6. Cook, Colleen. Mexico's Drug Cartels. Congressional Research Service. 2007.

7. Finklea, Kristen, William Krouse, and Mark Randol. Southwest Border Violence: Issues

    in Identifying and Measuring Spillover Violence. Congressional Research Service. 2011

8. Fox News Latino. Cartel Boss Killed in Northern Mexico. February 25, 2011.

    http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/news/2011/02/25/cartel-boss-killed-northern-mexico/

9. Hesterman, Jennifer. The Mexican Drug War Spills over the United States Border. The

    Counter Terrorist 2009.

10. Lockwood, Jonathan & Kathleen O‟Brian Lockwood. 1994. The Lockwood Analytical

    Method for Prediction (LAMP), Washington DC: joint Military Intelligence College.

11. National Security Program. Combat the Cartels: Institutionalize US-Mexico Security

    Cooperation. 2010.

12. Petry, Darrel. The City of El Paso Texas. El Paso Records Lowest Number of Murders

    Going into December. 2010. February 26, 2011.

13. Seelke, Clare and Kristen Finklea. U.S.-Mexican Security Cooperation: The Mérida

    Initiative and Beyond. Congressional Research Service. 2011.

14. Stephey, M.J. Joaquin Guzman Loera: Billionaire Drug Lord. Time Magazine Online. February 26, 2011. http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1884982,00.html

15. Stratfor. Organized Crime in Mexico. 2008. February 23, 2011. http://www.stratfor.com/memberships/112710/analysis/organized_crime_mexico

16. U.S. Senate on Foreign Relations. U.S. – Mexican Border Violence Hearing 2009. February 26, 2011. http://foreign.senate.gov/hearings/hearing/?id=979ce86f-d0b7-046f-5a0c-0c1eb3f1d4a8

17. Vinson, Tessa. The Sinaloa Cartel: A Study in the Dynamics of Power. February 25, 2011. web.wm.edu/so/monitor/issues/14-2/4-vinson.pdf