

Unlocking the Decision-Making Process: An Analysis of U.S. Counter-narcotic Policy Making towards Mexico and Colombia

Susana Dominguez
International Studies
American University
4400 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20016 USA

Faculty Advisor: David Mislan

Abstract

By inquiring on why U.S. counter-narcotic policy differed in Colombia and Mexico, this project sought to understand why a similar problem, drug trafficking, has been dealt with dissimilar policies. The researcher hypothesized that through the rational actor model, these differences in policy-making could be explained. By using congruence procedure type 1 on a comparative case study, Plan Colombia and the Merida Initiative, the researcher determined if the rational actor's variables were present. The variables included: ranking of options, agreement on rankings, consideration of the probability of success, and agreement on beliefs and values.

The results of this project did not support the hypothesis. Policy makers ranked options and considered the probability of success, but did not agree on rankings or agree on beliefs and values in the decision-making process for both cases. Therefore, this project did not support the rational actor model. Although with the assistance of the observations for these two cases, the researcher hypothesizes that the government politics model and the operational code school of thought could explain the differences in United States' counter-narcotic policy. Further research must be conducted in order to confirm or disconfirm these hypotheses.

Keywords: counter-narcotics, policy, rational actor model

1. Introduction

According to the United States Central Intelligence Agency, Colombia is "the world's leading coca cultivator with 83,000 hectares in coca cultivation" and "an important supplier to heroin in the U.S. Market."¹ In addition, Mexico is a "major drug-producing and transit nation" and the "largest foreign supplier of marijuana and methamphetamine to the U.S. Market."² These facts demonstrate the large problem the United States faces when assisting these two states in reducing drug trafficking. With this information in mind, this project seeks to comprehend U.S. foreign policy by asking the question "Why is U.S. counter-narcotic policy towards Mexico and Colombia different?"

In 1971, President Richard Nixon declared the war on drugs a main priority for the United States.³ From that point on, the United States became involved in assisting the fight against drug trafficking. By inquiring on why U.S. involvement differs in these two countries, this project is seeking to understand why a similar problem, drug trafficking, has resulted in with dissimilar policies. This project used the rational actor model to explain how these differences are made looking at ranking of options, agreement on rankings, consideration of the probability of success, and agreement on beliefs and values. Ultimately, this study demonstrated that the rational actor model did not explain why these two policies are different and referenced the operational code school of thought and the government politics model as probable explanations for these differences.

2. Theoretical Explanation for the Differences in U.S. Counter-narcotic policy towards Mexico and Colombia

There is a variety of scholarly work written on this issue, but this project attempts to explain the work of these scholars based on four schools of thought: the rational actor, the government politics, the strategic culture, and the operational code.

In the rational actor school of thought, scholars argue that the rational actor model can explain international decisions.⁴ The rational actor model emphasizes rational behavior, “behavior motivated by conscious calculation of advantages that in turn is based on [an] explicit and internally consistent value system.”⁵ This ranking of options then determines the action of a unitary actor known as the national interest.⁶ Policy is determined by a decision that maximizes the greatest utility or best end goal, the rational choice, which is decided by a unified national interest based on the ranking of preference over the outcome.⁷ When applying this school of thought to my research question, these scholars argue that there is a difference in counter-narcotic policy towards Mexico and Colombia because there is a unitary actor, the U.S. policymakers, which use rational choice to determine the national interests, through ranking of options and considering the probability of success of each option, when making policy decisions regarding these two countries.⁸

Unlike the rational actor school of thought, the government politics school of thought does not have a unitary actor, but does assume rationality.⁹ The government politics school of thought argues that policy decisions can be understood “as results of bargaining games.”¹⁰ This means that each political advisor represents a department or agency along with the interests and constituencies their organization serves, and pulls policy towards their favor in a model known as the governmental politics model.¹¹ Every policy is the result of a negotiated outcome of a “complex multi-participant process” with individual parochial interests.¹² The government politics school of thought argues that when studying U.S. counter-narcotic policy the differences in Mexican and Colombian policies can be attributed to the “inconsistent set of strategic objectives” or parochial interests of different agencies which together influence policy and determine a negotiated decision.¹³

Similar to the government politics school of thought, the strategic culture school of thought does not assume a unitary actor.¹⁴ Although unlike the government politics school of thought, the strategic culture school of thought assumes policy is influenced by each governmental organization's norms and behaviors or a state's culture, otherwise known as strategic culture.¹⁵ Strategic culture is “shared assumptions and decision rules that impose a degree of order on individual and group conceptions of their relationship to their social, organizational, or political environment.”¹⁶ Therefore when applying the strategic culture school of thought to counter-narcotic policy, these scholars argue that there is a difference in U.S counter-narcotic policy because of the influence strategic culture, the organization's norms and appropriate behavior, has on policy making; policy is shaped by how problems are seen and solved.¹⁷

Lastly, the operational code school of thought, written by scholar Alexander George, argues that policy making is determined by “the role that subjective perceptions and beliefs of leaders play in decision-making.”¹⁸ Unlike the other schools of thought, the operational code school of thought relies on the “psychological theories of cognition” arguing that policy decisions are influenced by the psychology of the individuals involved in the decision-making process.¹⁹ Such beliefs are non-rational and “can influence the actor's perceptions and diagnoses of the flow of political events, his definitions and estimates of particular situations.”²⁰ Scholars in this school of thought argue that differences in counter-narcotic policy are due to the influence each decision maker's psychology has on policy making.²¹

The four schools of thought offer answers to why there are differences in U.S counter-narcotic policy in Mexico and Colombia. This research project finds the rational actor school of thought most compelling and therefore hypothesizes that all policy makers act as a homogenous unit working on behalf of the United States. The rational actor model is the basis for the factors tested in this project: ranking of preferences, agreement on rankings, similar beliefs and values, and the consideration of each decision's success.

3. Methodology

This study uses two cases: Plan Colombia and the Merida Initiative. This study looks at Plan Colombia specifically from 1999 to January 13, 2000, when President Clinton signed the bill establishing Plan Colombia.²² In addition, the Merida Initiative is studied from early 2007 when it was first proposed to late June 2008, when the legislation was passed.²³ These cases were chosen because they are both cases where assistance from the United States was deemed necessary in the war against drugs, but they both vary in the type of assistance given and budget. The method of

analysis used in this research is a comparative case study method of congruence procedure type 1. This method requires the researcher to measure the congruence or incongruence between the independent and dependent variables.²⁴ The method was chosen because it focuses on comparing across different cases by looking at the variation of variables and their implication. This project did not have any ethical issues to consider, as the sources used are public documents that do not bring harm to any of those involved. The project concluded when all sources available, between the dates described, were studied and analyzed.

This project hypothesizes that foreign policymakers follow a rational procedure when choosing between options. The rational actor model states that a study of the making of US counter-narcotics policy in Latin America will find evidence of the following behaviors: a ranking of options, an agreement on rankings, a consideration of probability of success, and agreements on beliefs and values. Thus, a clear example of a decision using the rational actor model is where options were ranked unanimously, there was a discussion on the probability of success, and an agreement on beliefs and values as a whole. This suggested answer relates to the literature because it corresponds to the rational actor model school of thought. It hypothesizes that the differences in the two policies are determined by a unitary and rational actor making choices based on objectives, options, estimates and net valuation of consequences, and perceived alternatives; “an action is chosen in response to the strategic situation an actor faces.”²⁵

The dependent variable in this case is the clear differences between Plan Colombia and Plan Merida: type of assistance given from the US to the country receiving help (state building or institutional assistance) and the budget for each program. Plan Colombia focuses on state building assistance (internal security, social justice, development, and, and anti trafficking) on a budget of 3.5 billion,²⁶ while the Merida Initiative focuses on institutional assistance (internal security, justice, and law enforcement) at a budget of 1.4 billion.²⁷ When applying the rational actor model, ranking of options is expressed using a ranking of outcome/ consequence for the strategy chosen. Ranking of options is present when cause and effect of a decision is stated. Agreement on rankings is present when one choice is deemed “optimal” and there is no further verbal negotiation or haggling over the proposed policy once approved by a majority. Consideration of the probability of success is the probability of success and the likelihood of failure (pros and cons) of each option being stated, discussed, and considered. Lastly, agreement on beliefs and values is present when there is a consensus by all policy makers establishing the optimal choice in a decision.

This research project focuses on analyzing primary sources including legislative hearings, executive branch transcripts, or cables where the decision is being discussed by the Senate, Defense Department, or the Executive branch during the allotted time period.

4. Plan Colombia: Case Study

Plan Colombia was first developed by Colombian President, Andres Pastrana, and presented to the Clinton Administration on June 8, 1998 at Bogotá's Tequendama Hotel.²⁸ President Pastrana's plan called for the U.S. to fund 3.5 billion and provide military assistance.²⁹ The plan focused on eradicating illicit crops and promoting peace talks.³⁰ On January 11, 2000, the Clinton administration announced a package that unlike the Colombian government's plan was a new comprehensive plan focused on Colombia's internal conflict and providing military and police aid.³¹ After an extensive process of review, by the White House, State Department, Defense Department, and the Senate, President Clinton signed H.R 4225 on July 13, 2000 establishing Plan Colombia.³²

This case study analyzed the U.S. decision-making process and determined that the hypothesis, based on rational actor model, was not supported by evidence; a clear ranking of options and consideration of success are highlighted, while an agreement on rankings and an agreement on beliefs and values are not present.

In the policy making process of Plan Colombia, it is apparent that policy makers ranked their options as hypothesized by the rational actor model. Policy makers first ranked their options based on their outcome when the U.S. government commenced meeting with President Pastrana. During a meeting with the Secretary of Defense and President Pastrana, the Defense Department stated that they relied on their “[examination of] the possibility of increasing military assistance” to determine how to rank their options on what the best defense policy for this plan would consist of.³³ The Defense Department ranked their options, in regards to increasing military assistance, to establish a successful policy and determine the policy that would be used.³⁴ In addition, in a Senate hearing shortly after, *Plan Colombia: An Initial Assessment*, Senator Sessions stated that the main goal was to be “honest and analyze the situation objectively and make a good decision about how [they could] help and do it in a way that helps Colombia the most and their interests.”³⁵ Additionally, Senator Dodd remarked, “if the policy is not a balanced plan... it will not work.”³⁶ Both Senator Sessions' and Senator Dodd's words demonstrate that when making a decision on Plan Colombia Senate members ranked their options to ensure the best outcomes. Furthermore, Secretary Pickering highlighted that

throughout the decision-making process with the Colombian government, the State Department “reviewed with the Colombians a wide array of coordination and implementation of issues,” therefore it can be concluded that the State Department ranked their options and determined policy by reviewing the options with the assistance of the Colombian government.³⁷ Evidently, decision-makers ranked their options based on their outcome in accordance with the rational actor model.

Throughout the analysis of U.S. decision-making for Plan Colombia, unlike the rational actor claims, there was a disagreement on rankings between policy makers. For example, in a memorandum sent out by the Under Secretary of Defense, the Defense Department was only willing to approve of the administration’s proposal if it addressed all elements of the Colombian Crisis that the Defense Department demanded.³⁸ This included specific protocols on land, sea, river, and air assistance, in addition to an emphasis on Colombia’s social and human rights problems.³⁹ The Defense Department haggled that their requests be met to receive their support for Plan Colombia, establishing that there was no agreement on rankings and priorities between the administration and the Defense Department. Additionally, in a Senate hearing on Plan Colombia, many senators haggled for certain portions of the plan to be removed or added.⁴⁰ For instance, Senator Coverdell and other senators’ goals differed from the Clinton administration’s goals as they haggled for an “insurance that U.S funds to Colombia go only to soldiers respecting human rights” stating they could not “support military aid of conditions were not altered to “ensure military personnel who violate HR or aid and abet the paramilitaries are prosecuted in civilian courts.”⁴¹ Unlike the initial proposal, the senators disagreed with the administration and asked for an emphasis on human rights to receive their approval. The senators ranked human rights as a priority over the priorities set forth by the administration. It is evident that the hypothesized agreement on rankings was not present in the decision-making process.

Consideration of the probability of success was consistently present amidst the U.S. decision-making process for Plan Colombia. Policy makers in the Defense Department’s Southern Command Sector focused on insuring Plan Colombia’s success by drafting coordination papers with appendices and instructions needed to create a “desired end state.”⁴² The State Department also considered the probability of success by establishing the need for Colombian leaders and senior officials to assist in planning, drafting, and approving the plan, a tool the department deemed necessary for success.⁴³ In the Senate, senators established their own opinion concerning what factors were needed to ensure success in Plan Colombia. Senator McConnell considered the probability of success by questioning the success of Plan Colombia and what change was needed from the then current strategy to ensure success.⁴⁴ Furthermore, Senator Coverdell considered the probability of success as he calculated the measures needed to succeed, commenting, “Without modernization, and re-training, and the building of an effective military force, the odds are that [Colombia] will continue to face the effects of destabilization, not only in Colombia, but expanding throughout the region.”⁴⁵ The hypothesis was correct in establishing that decision makers consider the probability of success in the decision-making process.

In a State Department cable, *Proposed U.S. Assistance Packet for Colombia Announced*, the State Department’s initial goals for Plan Colombia included training security to instill democracy and rule of law, to help President Pastrana’s efforts to settle conflicts with armed groups, to strengthen local governments, to protect human rights, and promote judicial reform.⁴⁶ According to the rational actor model, all policymakers would agree on the beliefs and values set by the State Department. This is not evident from the sources analyzed in this research. For instance, in the hearing, *Crisis in Colombia: U.S. Support for Peace Process and Anti-Drug Efforts*, by United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator Dodd disagrees with the plan’s goals because he believed that “demand side [policy] is something that must be taken into account.”⁴⁷ In addition, many congressional policy makers believed that the crisis in Colombia was “overstated” and “U.S. assistance was unwanted.”⁴⁸ Furthermore, in the hearing by the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs, policy makers argued against the plan by stating that the plan could not focus solely on Colombia, but must consist of a regional solution to insure regional stability.⁴⁹ These examples demonstrated that the hypothesized agreement of beliefs and values was not present as there was clear deviation in the beliefs and values in the decision-making.

4.1 Observations

After observing that this hypothesis was not confirmed, the researcher continued to analyze the decision-making process and highlighted observations that could lead to a better understanding of how the decision for Plan Colombia was made. It was concluded that Plan Colombia was continually updated; each department issued their requirements for the plan and changed the plan in order to receive their individual approval. These changes then led to the final version of Plan Colombia that was signed by President Clinton.

It is noted that initially, the State Department met with President Pastrana and Colombia's Foreign minister to discuss the proposed U.S. assistance for Colombia and adapt the plan to fit both parties' needs.⁵⁰ The State Department along with the Clinton administration valued the assistance received from Pastrana's government and placed a high priority in helping Colombia's democracy in facing the challenges of narcotics, guerrillas, paramilitaries, and poverty.⁵¹ As for the decision-making process, the State Department, with the Clinton administration's priorities in mind, focused on working closely with Pastrana's administration by holding various meetings that "[established] building blocks, which [made] up the plan... the plan was formulated, drafted and approved in Colombia by President Pastrana and his team."⁵² Multiple meetings were held on topics such as aid strategy, refugees, and implementation of the plan.⁵³ In addition, the Defense Department was also incorporated into the decision-making process by assisting in the adaptation of the proposed plan to fit the Defense Department's needs in terms of military programming. The Defense Department held meetings with the Pastrana Administration highlighting Southern Command's role; drafting land, sea, river, and air strategies; and addressing the possibility of an increase in military assistance.⁵⁴ The Defense Department adapted Plan Colombia to demonstrate the goals of the department. After changes from these agencies were made, the plan's bill was presented to the legislative branch where both the Senate and House altered the bill through amendments that highlighted the demands and requirements set for by House and Senate members.⁵⁵ For instance, "the House's appropriation committee increased \$42 million more for alternative development activities in Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador."⁵⁶ On May 9, the Senate Appropriations Committee included Plan Colombia funding in its versions of the FY 2001 Military Construction.⁵⁷ The Senate Appropriations Committee altered the plan, previously modified by the House, by eliminating the \$388 million that the House established for the use of 30 Blackhawk helicopters.⁵⁸ The Senate also placed six limitations on Plan Colombia and one restriction on the funds for Plan Colombia.⁵⁹ From this information, it can be concluded that the decision for Plan Colombia was made by altering the plan to incorporate the different priorities of the organizations involved in the decision-making process: the State Department focused on diplomacy and cooperation with the Colombian government, the Defense Department focused on security procedure, and the House and Senate provided the appropriate mandates to approve the plan and ensure its success.

5. Merida Initiative: Case Study

The Merida Initiative was formed in October 2007 as a response to Mexican President Felipe Calderon's request to increase U.S. cooperation and assistance in the region.⁶⁰ Calderon's administration proposed the Merida Initiative, which established a U.S. funded 1.4 billion counterdrug and anticrime assistance package for Mexico and Central America.⁶¹ On February 7, 2008 the House Foreign Affairs Committee carried out a hearing on Merida.⁶² Shortly after, on June 11, 2008 the House approved the Legislation, H.R. 6028, with a vote of 311 to 106. The Merida Initiative became "a new kind of regional security partnership among the United States, Mexico and Central America."⁶³

This case study analyzed the U.S. decision making process for the Merida Initiative and determined that the hypothesis, based on the rational actor model is not confirmed. A clear ranking of options and a consideration of the probability of success are present, while an agreement on beliefs and values and agreement on rankings are not.

In the policy making process of the Merida Initiative, it is clear that U.S. policy makers, in accordance with the rational actor model, ranked their options. The ranking of options first began in roundtables between the State Department and the Mexican government.⁶⁴ The State Department considered the "best objectives for enhanced law enforcement cooperation in Mexico" to determine the best strategies for implementation (based on outcome) when drafting the initiative.⁶⁵ Furthermore, both the House and Senate ranked the options available to them before approving the initiative.⁶⁶ For instance, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations examined specific budgets and programs within the initiative and evaluated which policies had the best "ability to respond" and emit the proposed objective.⁶⁷ In addition, the House of Representatives sent congressional staffers to Mexico to inquire on the initiative's specific strategies and Mexican professionals' opinions to determine what strategy was best.⁶⁸ Thus, the hypothesized ranking of options was present in the decision-making process.

Agreement on rankings was not consistent throughout the decision making process of the Merida Initiative. In a memorandum to directors, the State Department highlighted such fact when stating that those working on the project were "encouraged to be responsive to Hill inquiries on issues ranging from absorptive capacity to human rights to anti-corruption."⁶⁹ This statement implied that there were differences on what was important to the Legislative branch versus the Executive branch, and therefore a disagreement on rankings. Such disagreements were present in various legislative hearings.⁷⁰ For instance, some members disagreed on the need to emphasize drug reduction issues domestically rather than in the United States' southern border.⁷¹ In addition, the representatives haggled for more

experienced coordinators to manage the programs set forth by the initiative; an assurance that Mexican judiciary officials were not involved in drug smuggling; and a discussion with the American president on the need for flexibility in funding's ceiling for the Foreign Affairs appropriation as necessary objectives for their approval of the initiative.⁷² These instances of bargaining demonstrate that there was no clear agreement of ranking among U.S. policymakers.

The decision-making process of the Merida Initiative involved considerations of the probability of success. Both the Executive branch and Legislative branch determined that cooperation between Mexico and the United States was necessary because the risks were smaller compared to the "large potential payoff of authorizing the proposal."⁷³ By working with regional partners on regional initiatives, the two branches determined that the success of the initiative was imminent and thus considered the success of the policy in their decisions. In addition, the Department of Homeland Security stated that the success in security for both nations would grow due to the initiative.⁷⁴ Policy makers also considered the probability of success by worrying about the lack of information presented by the Mexican government.⁷⁵ They considered the possibility that the plan would lead to a "corrupt and equipped police force" as a hazard that could become reality.⁷⁶ The State Department also considered this possibility and reassured these beliefs by finding that the Mexican government would "assure that that resources provided by arrangement were truly used for the purposes for which there were intended."⁷⁷ By considering the probability of success, the policymakers presented the third variable of the rational actor model.

Lastly, the decision-making process for the Merida Initiative did not follow the rational actor model because there was no agreement on beliefs and values amongst the policy makers. When drafting the Merida initiative, the State Department established the goals, strategies, and management of the initiative. Although there was some agreement on what these factors should be, there were also multiple instances where there was disagreement among policy makers. For example, in the Senate hearing, *The Merida Initiative: Guns, Drugs, and Friends*, senators voiced their concerns stating that human rights should be of higher importance in the initiative's agenda, along with the problem of domestic drug demand.⁷⁸ The senators disagreed with the State Department's beliefs and values by highlighting how their priorities for the initiative are misguided.⁷⁹ Additionally, multiple congressmen shed light on the initiative's failure to focus on the Mexican law enforcement's corruption.⁸⁰ The congressmen highlighted the possibility that the U.S. training of Mexican troops could lead to the troops using the skills learned to commit more violence and enhance cartel power.⁸¹ On the other hand, other congressional representatives argued that the initiative failed to provide enough funding for Mexico, in addition to its failure of providing funding for other states in need of counter narcotic assistance, such as Haiti and the Dominican Republic.⁸² Ultimately, it is clear that there was no agreement on beliefs and values as there were multiple controversies in the Merida Initiative.

5.1 Observations

Although the Merida Initiative does not confirm the hypothesis of the rational actor model, observations in the decision-making processes provide an explanation on how decisions are made. It was noted that the decision-making process for the Merida Initiative first began with discussions between the State Department, Mexican officials, and the Bush administration.⁸³ These conversations consisted of updating the initiative that was originally proposed by the Mexican government to fit the needs of all parties involved.⁸⁴ After this, the process is greatly characterized by the anger shown by Congress and the Senate because of the President's failure to notify the House on the initial meetings for the Initiative.⁸⁵

The policymakers in the legislative branch found out about policy negotiations and the drafting process through the media, and deemed the President's action as "disrespectful to the authority of the legislative branch," voicing their concerns multiple times.⁸⁶ Due to the administration's previous actions, the administration had difficulty gaining the acceptance of their proposal from the legislative branch. Although no member raised notable objections against the proposal, the administration and State Department worried about the extended period of time required to pass the initiative.⁸⁷ The State Department even recruited Texas governor, Richard Perry, to contact the congressional legislation and tell them to support the initiative.⁸⁸ The State Department was also concerned about the funding reductions the policymakers would impose.⁸⁹ Congress was strict when determining if they would approve the proposal, sending in delegates and congress members to inquire on the potential success of the initiative in Mexico before approving the funding.⁹⁰ Ultimately, both Congress and the Senate set requirements for the initiative in return for their approval and also reduced funding of the initiative. From this information, it can be concluded that the decision for the Merida Initiative was made by altering the initiative to incorporate the different priorities of the organizations involved in the decision-making process. In addition, the psychology of decision makers, due to their anger, could have played a role in how the decision for the Initiative was made.

6. Analysis

This research provides evidence that the rational actor model does not explain why there are differences in U.S. counter-narcotic policy making towards Mexico and Colombia, because all of the variables were not present in the two cases. As shown in table 1, both cases demonstrated a pattern of having agreement on rankings and an agreement on beliefs and value and while not having ranking of options or the consideration of the probability of success. With the help of the previously stated observations and this pattern, it is clear that the government politics model could explain why U.S. policymaking varies. In both cases the decisions for the policy came as a result of bargaining between different sectors of the government that led to a negotiated decision, an action that explains why agreement on rankings and an agreement on beliefs and value were not present in both cases. Moreover, both cases demonstrated that rationality was used to make decisions, both ranking of options and consideration of the probability of success were present without being a unitary decision, like the government politic model explains.⁹¹ On the other hand, the operational code school of thought could also explain the differences between the two policies by looking at the psychology of the individuals involved in the decision-making process. The anger displayed by the House and Senate due to the president's failure of notifying them on his plans for the Merida Initiative is a clear example of how personal psychology played a role in the decision making process that created variation between the two policies.

Table 1. Analysis of variables in Plan Colombia and Merida Initiative

Variable	Plan Colombia	Merida Initiative
- Ranking of Options	✓	✓
- Agreement on Rankings	✗	✗
-Consideration of the probability of success	✓	✓
- Agreement on beliefs and values	✗	✗

5. Conclusion

Ultimately, the decision-making process described by the rational actor is not the reason why policymaking is different for Colombia and Mexico. In both cases, the variables of ranking of option and consideration of the probability of success were present, while agreement on beliefs and values and agreement on rankings were not present disconfirming the hypothesis. With the help of observations and the pattern of not having agreement on rankings and beliefs and values, this study concluded that the government politics model or the operational school of thought could explain these differences. The psychology of policy makers and the interests of each organization involved played a role in the policymaking process disconfirming the rational actor model.

6. References

- 1 "Field Listing :: Illicit Drugs." Central Intelligence Agency United States of America. January 1, 2015. Accessed January 19, 2015. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2086.html>.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Branson, R. (2012, December 7). War on drugs a trillion-dollar failure. Retrieved October 5, 2014, from <http://www.cnn.com/2012/12/06/opinion/branson-end-war-on-drugs/>
- 4 Graham T. Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, revised edition. New York: L Longman, 1999 [1972], pp.13-27.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Ibid.

- 9 Graham T. Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, revised edition. New York: Longman, 1999 [1972], pp.255-263
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Graham T. Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, revised edition. New York: Longman, 1999 [1972], pp.255-263
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Alexander L. George, "The Operational Code: A Neglected Approach to the Study of Political Leaders and Decision-Making," *International Studies Quarterly* 13:2 (1969), pp. 190-222.
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 Ibid.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Crandall, Russell. *Driven by Drugs: U.S. Policy toward Colombia*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.
- 23 Congressional Research Service, Mérida Initiative for Mexico and Central America: Funding and Policy Issues, H.R. Doc. (2009).
- 24 Evera, Stephen Van. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- 25 Graham T. Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, revised edition. New York: Longman, 1999 [1972], pp.13-27.
- 26 Crandall, Russell. *Driven by Drugs: U.S. Policy toward Colombia*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.
- 27 Congressional Research Service, Mérida Initiative for Mexico and Central America: Funding and Policy Issues, H.R. Doc. (2009).
- 28 Crandall, Russell. *Driven by Drugs: U.S. Policy toward Colombia*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Department of State, Breakfast with secretary of defense and President From Embassy in Bogota to Washington, Rep. (2000) (Conf. Rep.).
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 *Plan Colombia: An Initial Assessment* Hearings before the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, 107th Cong., 1st (2001).
- 36 *Crisis in Colombia: U.S. Support for Peace Process and Anti-Drug Efforts*: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, 106th Cong., 1st (1999).
- 37 *Supplemental Request for Plan Colombia*, 106th Cong., 2d Sess. (2000) (statement of Secretary Pickering).
- 38 Department of Defense Coordinator for Drug Enforcement Policy and Support, Memorandum Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Doc. (1999).
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 *Crisis in Colombia: U.S. Support for Peace Process and Anti-Drug Efforts*: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, 106th Cong., 1st (1999).
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Department of Defense Coordinator for Drug Enforcement Policy and Support, Memorandum Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Doc. (1999).; Department of State, Breakfast with secretary of defense and President From Embassy in Bogota to Washington, Rep. (2000) (Conf. Rep.).
- 43 Department of State, UNHCR OFFICIALS REVEAL PLANS AND APPREHENSIONS SECRET Meeting, Doc. (2000). ; Department of State, Mission "Plan Colombia" Meeting, Doc. (2000). ; Department of State, COLOMBIA: SECRETARY-PASTRANA MEETING, Doc. (1999).
- 44 *Supplemental Request for Plan Colombia*, 106th Cong., 2d Sess. (2000).
- 45 Ibid.

- 46 Department of State, Proposed U.S. Assistance Package for Colombia Announced, Doc. (2000).
- 47 *Crisis in Colombia: U.S. Support for Peace Process and Anti-Drug Efforts*: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, 106th Cong., 1st (1999).
- 48 *Ibid.*; *Supplemental Request for Plan Colombia*, 106th Cong., 2d Sess. (2000).; *Plan Colombia: An Initial Assessment* Hearings before the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, 107th Cong., 1st (2001).
- 49 *Supplemental Request for Plan Colombia*, 106th Cong., 2d Sess. (2000).
- 50 Department of State, UNHCR OFFICIALS REVEAL PLANS AND APPREHENSIONS SECRET Meeting, Doc. (2000). ; Department of State, Mission "Plan Colombia" Meeting, Doc. (2000). ; Department of State, COLOMBIA: SECRETARY-PASTRANA MEETING, Doc. (1999). ; Department of State, Breakfast with secretary of defense and President From Embassy in Bogota to Washington, Rep. (2000) (Conf. Rep.); Department of Defense Coordinator for Drug Enforcement Policy and Support, Memorandum Under Secretary of Defense. (1999).
- 51 Department of Defense Coordinator for Drug Enforcement Policy and Support, Memorandum Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Doc. (1999).
- 52 *Supplemental Request for Plan Colombia*, 106th Cong., 2d Sess. (2000).
- 53 Department of State, UNHCR OFFICIALS REVEAL PLANS AND APPREHENSIONS SECRET Meeting, Doc. (2000). ; Department of State, Mission "Plan Colombia" Meeting, Doc. (2000). ; Department of State, COLOMBIA: SECRETARY-PASTRANA MEETING, Doc. (1999). ; Department of State, Breakfast with secretary of defense and President From Embassy in Bogota to Washington, Rep. (2000) (Conf. Rep.); Department of Defense Coordinator for Drug Enforcement Policy and Support, Memorandum Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Doc. (1999).
- 54 Department of Defense Coordinator for Drug Enforcement Policy and Support, Memorandum Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Doc. (1999).
- 55 *Supplemental Request for Plan Colombia*, 106th Cong., 2d Sess. (2000). ; *Crisis in Colombia: U.S. Support for Peace Process and Anti-Drug Efforts*: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, 106th Cong., 1st (1999). ; *Plan Colombia: An Initial Assessment* Hearings before the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, 107th Cong., 1st (2001).
- 56 *Supplemental Request for Plan Colombia*, 106th Cong., 2d Sess. (2000).
- 57 Congressional Research Service, Colombia: Plan Colombia Legislation and Assistance (FY2000-FY2001), Rep. (2001).
- 58 *Ibid.*
- 59 *Ibid.*
- 60 Congressional Research Service, Mérida Initiative for Mexico and Central America: Funding and Policy Issues, Doc. (2009).
- 61 *Ibid.*
- 62 *Ibid.*
- 63 Congressional Research Service, Mérida Initiative for Mexico and Central America: Funding and Policy Issues, Doc. (2009).
- 64 Department of State, The Deputy Secretary's Breakfast Roundtable with the Mexican Council of International Affairs (COMEXI), Doc. (2007).
- 65 *Ibid.*
- 66 Committee On Foreign Relations United States Senate, The Merida Initiative: "Guns, Drugs, and Friends", S. Rep. No. 110, 1st (2007). ; *The Merida Initiative: Assessing Plans: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 1st (2007) ; *The Mérida Initiative: Examining United States Effort To Combat Transnational Criminal Organizations: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counter terrorism*, 110th Cong., 2d Sess. (2008).
- 67 Committee On Foreign Relations United States Senate, The Merida Initiative: "Guns, Drugs, and Friends", S. Rep. No. 110, 1st (2007).
- 68 Embassy of Mexico, Congressional Staffers Descend on Mexico to Discuss Mérida Initiative, Doc. (2008). ; Department of State, GOM Officials Discuss Mérida Initiative with CODEL Cuéllar, Doc. (2008).
- 69 Department of State, DCMS gather to discuss Merida Initiative, Leadership Challenges, (2008).
- 70 Committee On Foreign Relations United States Senate, The Merida Initiative: "Guns, Drugs, and Friends", S. Rep. No. 110, 1st (2007). ; *The Merida Initiative: Assessing Plans: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 1st (2007) ; *The Mérida Initiative: Examining United States Effort To Combat Transnational Criminal Organizations: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counter terrorism*, 110th Cong., 2d Sess. (2008). ; *Central America and the Merida Initiative: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 2d Sess. (2008).

71 Committee On Foreign Relations United States Senate, The Merida Initiative: "Guns, Drugs, and Friends", S. Rep. No. 110, 1st (2007).

72 *The Merida Initiative: Assessing Plans: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 1st (2007) ; *The Mérida Initiative: Examining United States Effort To Combat Transnational Criminal Organizations: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counter terrorism*, 110th Cong., 2d Sess. (2008). ; *Central America and the Merida Initiative: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 2d Sess. (2008).

73 Committee On Foreign Relations United States Senate, The Merida Initiative: "Guns, Drugs, and Friends", S. Rep. No. 110, 1st (2007)

74 *The Mérida Initiative: Examining United States Effort to Combat Transnational Criminal Organizations: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism*, 110th Cong., 2d Sess. (2008).

75 *The Merida Initiative: Assessing Plans: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 1st (2007)

76 Ibid.

77 Department of State, Foreign Secretary Espinosa Courts Congressional Support for Mérida Initiative, Doc. (2007).

78 *The Mérida Initiative: Examining United States Effort to Combat Transnational Criminal Organizations: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism*, 110th Cong., 2d Sess. (2008).

79 *The Mérida Initiative: Examining United States Effort to Combat Transnational Criminal Organizations: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism*, 110th Cong., 2d Sess. (2008).

80 *The Merida Initiative: Assessing Plans: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 1st (2007)

81 Ibid.

82 *Central America and the Merida Initiative: Hearings Before the Committee On Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 2d Sess. (2008).

83 Department of State, Deputy Secretary Negro Ponte Has Cordial Meetings Senior Mexican Security and Law Enforcement Officials, Doc. (2007). ; Department of State, The Deputy Secretary's Breakfast Roundtable with the Mexican Council of International Affairs (COMEXI), Doc. (2007).

84 Department of State, Deputy Secretary Negro Ponte Has Cordial Meetings Senior Mexican Security and Law Enforcement Officials, Doc. (2007). ; Department of State, The Deputy Secretary's Breakfast Roundtable with the Mexican Council of International Affairs (COMEXI), Doc. (2007).

85 *The Merida Initiative: Assessing Plans: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 1st (2007); Committee On Foreign Relations United States Senate, The Merida Initiative: "Guns, Drugs, and Friends", S. Rep. No. 110, 1st (2007).

86 *The Merida Initiative: Assessing Plans: Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 110th Cong., 1st (2007)

87 State Department, The Deputy Secretary's Phone Call with Texas Governor Richard Perry, Doc. (2008).

88 Ibid.

89 Ibid.

90 Embassy of Mexico, Congressional Staffers Descend on Mexico to Discuss Mérida Initiative, Doc. (2008). ; Department of State, GOM Officials Discuss Mérida Initiative with CODEL Cuéllar, Doc. (2008).

91 Graham T. Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, revised edition. New York: Longman, 1999 [1972], pp.255-263