

**Border Security Risk Assessment:  
Illegal Immigration, Weapons Smuggling, and Drug Trafficking**

Capstone Report for  
Centra Technology

*Prepared by:*

Chris Causey  
Jason Hahn  
Terry Heichelbech  
Lindsay Malecha  
Stephen Meiners  
Brandon Race

*Supervised by:*

Professor Jeffrey Engel, Ph.D.

The Bush School of Government and Public Service  
Texas A&M University

April 30, 2009

## **Executive Summary**

This report offers a risk assessment strategy to understand the implications of border security posed by illegal immigration, weapons smuggling, and the narcotics trade. It presents a model, employing quantitative and qualitative metrics, for analyzing the risks associated with each of these three issues -- both individually as well as collectively -- inside the United States. This model reveals relationships among these risk factors, and their impact upon the quality of life in communities where they occur.

Quantitative analysis was limited to county-level data from U.S. counties within five miles of the Mexican border. In this analysis, we controlled for factors such as county population. Throughout our quantitative analysis, we relied on qualitative research to interpret and explain the statistical findings.

Comparing these issues to quality of life metrics, the findings support several conclusions. First, illegal immigration has been occurring at a relatively consistent rate throughout the last few decades, and could affect the quality of life in small population counties differently from large population counties. Second, the counties analyzed appear to be primary transshipment points for many illegal drugs that enter the United States, and the presence of these drugs is correlated with increases in unemployment, poverty, and high school dropout rates, among other variables. Third, the findings for weapons smuggling -- for which limited data were available -- were less conclusive, though the analysis showed some correlation between a county's murder rate and other quality of life measures.

We also correlated each of the three issues with each other, to measure the extent to which they may be related. While it was difficult to make strong conclusions, our findings showed that marijuana appears to have the greatest correlation with illegal immigration. In addition, the small weapons-drugs correlation is small only for the years we examined, and, there appears to be no correlation between weapons and immigration.

Given the fact that these three issues (immigration, guns, and drugs) are broad and frequently overlapping topics, these findings offer a wide range of implications for policymakers, which include areas such as foreign policy, public health, law enforcement, and economics, among others. The report concludes with implications for policy makers and recommended areas of future research.

## **Introduction**

This report assesses the risks associated with the border issues of illegal immigration, weapons smuggling, and the narcotics trade inside the United States, both individually as well as collectively. It focuses specifically on border areas as a feasible project given the short duration of this assignment.

Throughout the following discussion and analysis, we use the term *illegal immigrant* interchangeably with *undocumented immigrant*, *illegal alien*, and *deportable alien*. Likewise, we use the term *narcotics* to refer to all illicit drugs, including such non-narcotic substances as marijuana as well as legal prescription narcotics that are bought and sold illegally. Similarly, we

define the term *weapons smuggling* as the illegal trade of firearms, and we use the term *weapon* interchangeably with *guns* and *arms*.

## Methodology

Our team conducted research using academic journals and U.S. government reports regarding these three topics. These are noted below when appropriate. We also collected statistical information of quantitative metrics that can be used as measures of these topics. This section describes the process we followed for collecting and analyzing the statistical data.

To determine the relationships, if any, between illegal immigration, drug smuggling, and weapons smuggling and the effects they have on quality of life and county characteristics, we correlated different variables to measure their relationships, fully recognizing that correlation does not equal causation. The data were analyzed using the following scale (Cohen 1988, 115):

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| No correlation:     | $0 \leq  \text{correlation coefficient}  < 0.1$   |
| Small correlation:  | $0.1 \leq  \text{correlation coefficient}  < 0.3$ |
| Medium correlation: | $0.3 \leq  \text{correlation coefficient}  < 0.5$ |
| Large correlation:  | $0.5 \leq  \text{correlation coefficient}  < 1.0$ |

### *Unit of Analysis*

Counties were used as the unit of analysis because they provide a small unit of analysis and the span the entire border, unlike cities or metropolitan areas. The analysis examined all 25 counties on or within five miles the U.S.-Mexico border. Border counties face a unique set of challenges since smugglers must pass through these areas. This analysis also included counties that are not on the border, but within five miles of the border because, although they do not border Mexico, their proximity suggests they face the same issues as the border counties. Further away from the border, these issues are more diffuse. The U.S.-Mexico border was chosen because of the prevalence of illegal immigration, drug smuggling, and weapons smuggling. An analysis of illegal activity along the U.S.-Canada border would likely look much different.

Further correlations were calculated after the counties were divided into groups of similar population size: Group 1: > 500,000; Group 2: 100,000 – 500,000; Group 3: 10,000 – 100,000; Group 4: < 10,000. (See Appendix A for a map of the counties, and Appendix B for county groupings.)

### *Variables*

We collected data in five areas: illegal immigration, drug smuggling, weapons smuggling, quality of life, and county characteristics. To determine the volume of illegal immigration, we used the number of illegal immigrants apprehended. To determine the volume of drug smuggling, we used the amount of drugs (marijuana, opiates, cocaine, other, and total) seized. Our assumption is that the majority of many types of drugs enter the U.S. through Mexico. The National Drug Intelligence Center estimates that approximately 90% of cocaine enters the U.S. from Mexico, as do large but unestimated quantities of marijuana and methamphetamines (DOJ

2008, 2). In our analysis of weapons smuggling, we examined murder rate, based on the assumption that most murders (68%) involve the use of a firearm and that many such weapons are obtained illegally (FBI 2007). To measure quality of life, we analyzed the homeownership rate, high school graduation rate, poverty rate, property value, per capita income, and unemployment rate, as we assess those to be potential factors affecting the scope of cross-border criminal activity. The variables for county statistics are county area, border length, ports of entry, and population. (See Appendix C for a detailed description of the variables.)

### *Data Challenges*

There were a number of challenges encountered in the data collection as illegal immigration, drug smuggling, and weapons smuggling are illegal industries and it is impossible to collect perfect data on them. In some cases, proxy variables had to be used because of the unavailability of data. Further analysis and data could correct these deficiencies.

Though we chose to analyze counties because of their size and ability to find data at this level, only 25 counties were used, which represents a small proportion of counties in states along the border. Although much data was available at the county level, some data had to be forgone because it could not be disaggregated to this level, but rather was only available at the state, metropolitan or other jurisdictional level. Some data was not available for counties with a very small population. See Appendix for detailed information on county selection and data.

Ideally, we would have found data for each variable over time, to identify trends. In some instances, historical data was not available. Our analysis was limited to three years (2005-2007). Increasing the time span could enable a more extensive analysis of trends.

Drug seizure data was not available for all of the counties used. The drug analysis includes only Texas counties, because we could not obtain similar data from other states. The drug data is also limited in that it does not indicate the country origin of the drugs.

### **Illegal Immigration**

The issue of illegal immigration in the United States is multifaceted and involves aliens from more than 100 countries who enter the U.S. by various means for various reasons. The motivations, nationalities, methods and volume of illegal immigrants are dynamic.

Based on law enforcement metrics of how many deportable aliens were located per fiscal year, the volume of illegal immigration to the U.S. appears to have increased dramatically during the second half of the 20th century, though in recent decades it also tends to fluctuate greatly from year to year. Between 1997 and 2007, for example, the number of deportable aliens located per year ranged from 960,756 (in 2007) to 1,814,729 (in 2000). Similar variation within that range can be observed during the previous two decades as well. Prior to that, there was a steady annual increase in deportable aliens located, climbing from 59,918 in 1957 to 1,042,215 in 1977. This increase was much slower than the uptick in immigration following World War II, during which the numbers increased drastically from a steady rate of 11,175 in 1943 to 1,089,583 in 1954 (DHS 2007, 91).

Illegal immigration today involves almost exclusively immigrants from Latin American countries that enter the United States for economic reasons. The available data from 2007, for instance, show that the overwhelming majority (88.9%) of deportable aliens located in the United States were Mexican nationals. Immigrants from Central America and the Caribbean composed the next largest group (8.7%), followed by South America (0.9%), Asia (0.7%), Africa (0.3%), and Europe (0.3%) (DHS 2007, 92).

Various studies have attempted to describe the decision-making process that potential immigrants make when considering whether or not to migrate to another country. The process includes so-called "push" factors that motivate them to leave their current home, and "pull" factors that draw them to one place as opposed to another (Fotheringham and Pellegrini 2002, 493). General consensus exists that economic imperatives both push would-be immigrants from Mexico and pull them into the United States, while geographic proximity and relative ease of entry to the U.S. help account for the volume of the immigration.

An example of the impact of proximity can be seen in the large illegal southern movement of immigrants from Nicaragua (by far the poorest country in Central America) into Costa Rica (the wealthiest country in the region). In this case, the pull factors from the United States may actually be stronger than those of Costa Rica, but the fact that the latter shares a land border with Nicaragua makes it a more popular destination for Nicaraguans (Castro Valverde 2002, 4).

### *Correlations*

The 2006 border county immigration statistics used in this study offer a detailed understanding of how illegal immigration operates at a county level. For example, there was small to moderate correlation between apprehensions and county population in all groups but in Group 3, no correlation was found. (See Appendix D for correlation tables.)

Legal crossings correlated largely with illegal immigrant apprehensions in Groups 3 and 4, while in Group 2 there was no correlation, and in Group 1 there was a small negative correlation. This finding could suggest, at least in part, that the level of illegal immigration follows similar patterns of the flow of legal immigration in less populated areas, which does not occur in more highly populated counties.

We find important conclusions for quality of life. Most notably, there was a large negative correlation between apprehensions and the percent of the population living below poverty in Groups 1, 2, and 3, while in Group 4 there was a small positive correlation.

### *Conclusions*

The illegal entry of immigrants into the United States is not a new problem, nor is it one that seems to have been increasing or decreasing by any significant amount over the past few decades. The fact that such a large number of immigrants continue to enter the country at what appears to be a relatively persistent rate underscores the challenge facing policymakers. In addition, the data analyzed here suggest that illegal immigration could affect larger communities differently from how it could affect smaller communities.

## **Drug Trafficking**

The United States is primarily a consumption market, as opposed to a production country (such as Colombia or Afghanistan) or a transit country (such as Mexico) of illicit drugs. While a wide variety of drugs are consumed in the U.S., marijuana, cocaine, and methamphetamines (meth) are the most abundant. (See Appendix E for drug trafficking correlations.)

With the exception of meth, the U.S. is not considered a major production center of any of these drugs. Therefore, a large quantity of them enters the country from international sources. According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime's 2008 World Drug Report, roughly 100% of cocaine production occurs in Bolivia, Peru, and Colombia, and the vast majority of the drug consumed in the United States enters the country through Mexico. Representing an estimated 46% of worldwide cocaine consumption, North America is the world's largest market for the drug, though it has been steadily decreasing over the past decade.

Afghanistan and Myanmar are responsible for roughly 95% of opiates production. Relative to cocaine, opiate trafficking is a more intraregional business. As a result, North Americans' consumption of the drug as a percentage of the global population roughly equals their share of the world population, at 14% (UNODC 2008). As shown in the following paragraphs, this could explain why opiates are often an outlier when measuring the extent to which they correlate with other variables.

Of the reports of methamphetamine lab seizures in 2006, the United States accounted for 88% worldwide, though it ignores the production capacity of each individual lab, making it difficult to measure the potential quantity being produced (UNODC 2008). However, law enforcement in the U.S. has recently made production of methamphetamines more difficult by regulating the sales of certain chemicals necessary for the production process. As a result, U.S. domestic meth production reduced dramatically, but Mexico-based cartels have increased their production. Between 2001 and 2006 seizures of methamphetamines on the border more than doubled.

Marijuana is the largest illicit drug market in the world, and the U.N. estimates that only 13% of marijuana produced is seized by governments (UNODC 2008). North America is the world's largest producer of marijuana, making 31% of the worldwide total. Within North America, Mexico is the largest producer, followed by the U.S. then Canada. Marijuana use in the U.S. has increased at a faster rate than any other illegal drug use. Though it is relatively easy to produce, Mexico remains the largest supplier of marijuana for the U.S. (Katel 2008, 1012).

### *Correlations*

There appears to be a strong link between the quantity of one drug seized with the quantities of other types of drugs seized during the same year. There is also significant continuity throughout the three-year period in terms of the amount seized of each type of drug.

The quantity of marijuana seized in 2006 has a large correlation with the amount of cocaine, "other" drugs, and total drugs seized during 2006. It also has a large correlation with marijuana seized in 2005 and 2007. It is moderately correlated with opiate seizures in 2006. It has a 0.92

correlation with cocaine, which is higher than its correlation with any other drug. This probably reflects the fact that Mexico is the largest supplier of cocaine and marijuana for the U.S. As such, variability in the total volume of drugs originating from Mexico will correspond most with these two drugs, which, in turn, will make these two drugs highly correlate with each other.

Furthermore, marijuana has a 1.00 correlation with the total amount of drugs seized. This is unsurprising since marijuana is the largest export from the cartels.

In general, cocaine, opiates, and other drugs seized in 2006 have similar links to each other and consistency throughout 2005, 2006, and 2007. Each has a large or moderate correlation with the other numbers with two exceptions: the amount of cocaine seized in 2005 has no correlation with the amount seized in 2006, and 2006 “other” drugs and 2006 opiates have only a small correlation. This indicates that the Mexican and American efforts to curb the flow of drugs into the United States made little progress between 2005 and 2007.

Surprisingly, the length of a county’s border appears to have little impact on the volume of drugs trafficked through it. Of the five drug categories, three had a small correlation and two had no correlation. Furthermore, there appears to be an inverse relationship between the area of the county and the amount of drugs seized. Each category has a small or moderate negative correlation with the size of the county.

Marijuana, opiates, and total drugs each have a large positive correlation with the number of ports of entry. Cocaine and “other” drugs have moderate and small correlations respectively. The number of legal crossings is also linked with drug trafficking. “Other” drugs are the only types which do not correlate with legal crossings. The correlation value zero may be due to data limitations.

There are also correlations between the prevalence of drugs in a county and quality of life indicators. The clearest correlation is with unemployment. Only with opiates is there not a large correlation.

There are large correlations between economic prosperity and the existence of drugs in a county. The presence of opiates does not correlate with the percentage of people living below the poverty line, but all other categories have large or moderate correlations. Cocaine, marijuana, “other” drugs, and total drugs have small or moderate negative correlations with per capita income; and opiates have a small positive correlation.

Drugs also appear to have a negative effect on high school graduation rates. Opiates have a 0.14 positive correlation with graduation rates, but each other category has either a moderate or small negative correlation.

While the number of violent crimes committed increases with the amount of drugs seized, drugs seem to have a negligible impact on the violent crime rate. With each category, there is either a large or moderate positive correlation with the volume of violent crimes committed. However, opiates have a small negative correlation with the violent crime rate, and the rest have none. Only with marijuana and the total amount of drugs seized is there a small positive correlation with the murder rate. This can be explained by the large and moderate positive correlations between the amount of drugs seized in a county and its population.

Of the quality of life indicators used in this analysis, the rate of homeownership in a county seems to be the only one unrelated to drugs. There is a moderate negative correlation with opiates, but the rest have no relationship.

Finally, each category positively correlates with property value. Four categories have a small correlation and opiates have a moderate correlation.

### *Conclusions*

Based on the data, cocaine, marijuana, and other drugs (primarily meth) have substantial links with the quality of life of U.S. citizens. Unemployment, poverty, and dropout rates all increase with the presence of these drugs. Mexico is the largest supplier of cocaine and marijuana in the U.S.; and it is increasing its share of meth supplied for domestic consumption. Interdiction of drug shipments from Mexico could significantly decrease drug consumption and possibly improve the quality of life of U.S. citizens.

### **Weapons Smuggling**

Government agencies and nongovernmental organizations around the world recognize weapons smuggling, commonly referred to as the illicit weapons trade, as a social problem that undermines the quality of life and erodes the social fabric of communities. The weapons discussed in this report are firearms.<sup>1</sup> The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) does not publish county-level illicit firearms availability data. The Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) publishes county-level violent crime data in its annual Uniform Crime Report (UCR). Unfortunately, these reports do not include the firearm crime data below the state-level, and no mention is made of whether the firearms used were obtained legally or illegally. As a result, this report uses murder rates as a proxy for weapons smuggling, based on the supposition that the availability of illicit firearms has a strong influence on murder rates. (See Appendix F for weapons smuggling correlations.)

Previous scholars determined that the availability of illicit firearms has a strong influence on firearm crime levels. Firearm crimes increase, according to their research, as illicit firearms became more available (Stolzenberg 2000, 1472). Their study did not find a significant relationship between the availability of legal firearms and firearm crimes. The FBI reports that firearms were involved in 68% of murders nationwide in 2005 through 2007 (FBI UCR, Table 10). This section of the report will examine the correlation between murder rates and quality of life variables in the twenty-five counties along the U.S.-Mexico border.

### *Correlations*

The correlations between murder rates and quality of life indicators appeared to be much larger in counties with larger populations. In Group 1, for instance, the 2005 murder rate had a large positive correlation with the percent of the population living below the poverty level and a moderate positive correlation with unemployment. The 2005 murder rate had a large negative correlation with per capita income and property value. The 2006 murder rate had large positive

---

<sup>1</sup> Firearms are commonly defined as “any weapon which expels a projectile by means of an explosive.” The FBI includes handguns, shotguns, and rifles in its firearms statistics.



correlation with homeownership, and a moderate positive correlation with unemployment and the percent of the population living below the poverty level. The 2006 murder rate had a large negative correlation with per capita income and property value, and a moderate negative correlation with high school graduation rates. The 2007 murder rate still had a large negative correlation with per capita income and property value; however, it appeared to have a less significant relationship with the other quality of life variables. The 2007 murder rate had a small positive correlation with the percent of the population living below the poverty level in 2005 and 2006 and no correlation with the percent of the population living below the poverty level in 2007. These correlations indicate a large to moderate relationship between quality of life and murder rate. While it is outside the scope of this paper to determine causation, a drop in quality of life seems to correspond with a rise in the murder rate in a county with over 500,000 residents.

In Group 2, the 2005 murder rate had a large negative correlation with property value and a moderate positive correlation with percent of the population below poverty level. The correlation between the 2005 murder rate and other quality of life variables was small to none. The 2006 murder rate had a large positive correlation with high school graduation and a large negative correlation with the percent of the population living below the poverty level. The 2006 murder rate had a moderate positive correlation with per capita income and a moderate negative correlation with property value. The 2007 murder rate had a large negative correlation with property value. The 2007 murder rate has a moderate negative correlation with percent of the population living below the poverty level. These correlations indicate a moderate to large relationship between quality of life and murder rate. A drop in the quality of life seems to correspond with a rise in the murder rate in a county with a population between 1000,000 and 500,000 residents.

In Group 3, the 2005 murder rate had a large positive correlation with percent of the population living below the poverty level and a large negative correlation with per capita income and high school graduation. The 2005 murder rate had a moderate positive correlation with unemployment and 2007 percent of the population living below the poverty level and a moderate negative correlation with property value. The 2006 murder rate had a large positive correlation with the 2006 percent of the population living below the poverty level and a large negative correlation with high school graduation and 2006 per capita income. The 2006 murder rate had a moderate positive correlation with the 2007 percent living below the poverty level and unemployment and a moderate negative correlation with property value. The 2007 murder rate had a large positive correlation with the 2007 percent living below the poverty level and a moderate positive correlation with property value. These correlations indicate a moderate relationship between quality of life and murder rate. A drop in the quality of life seems to correspond with a rise in the murder rate in a county with a population between 10,000 and 100,000 residents, but the relationship is less significant than it was in counties with larger populations.

In Group 4, the 2005 murder rate had a large positive correlation with the 2007 percent of the population living below the poverty level and moderate positive correlation with 2005 and 2006 percent of the population living below the poverty level. There was a moderate negative correlation between the 2005 murder rate and high school graduation and per capita income. The 2006 murder rate had a large positive correlation with 2006 and 2007 percent of the population living below the poverty level and a moderate positive correlation with the 2005 percent living

below the poverty level. It had a moderate negative correlation with property value. The 2007 murder rate had a moderate negative correlation with property value and unemployment. These findings suggest there is no consistent correlation from year to year between quality of life and murder rate in counties with populations of less than 10,000.

### *Conclusions*

If murder rates have a negative effect on a county's quality of life, or vice versa, it is reasonable to expect a large to moderate positive correlation with percent of the population living below the poverty level and unemployment; and large to moderate negative correlation with high school graduation rate, per capita income, property value, and homeownership. If contiguous counties have similar socioeconomic situations and crime rates, then correlations may not be helpful in determining the relationship between quality of life and murder rates. However, based on our research, efforts to reduce the availability of illegal firearms could have a positive impact on quality of life, particularly in counties with large populations. The correlations show that murder rates have a significant impact on quality of life in counties with larger populations, Groups 1 and 2. Counties in Group 3 show a slightly less significant correlation between murder rates and quality of life variables. The relationship between murder rates and quality of life in Group 4 were insignificant. The most surprising implication is that there is consistently, regardless of year or population, a large to moderate positive correlation between the murder rate and homeownership. High school graduation also has a curiously random relationship with murder rates.

### **Relating Illegal Immigration, Drug Trafficking, and Weapons Smuggling**

The above sections correlated each of our three issues to quality of life statistics. However, it is also important to analyze how these three topics interact with each other to determine policies that may be able to simultaneously address more than one problem. This section explores those relationships with an eye on implications and policies.

#### *Drugs – Weapons*

Narcotics and guns are more closely related but still have important differences. Mexico's location next to the United States and the significant U.S. demand for drugs makes Mexico a natural thoroughfare for a variety of substances. Drugs move north from South America and continue through Mexico and into the United States. Narcotics trafficking cartels engage in a significant amount of violence to ensure sources, payment and freedom of action. To maintain this control, these groups provide a large market for weapons that are illegally bought in the U.S. and then smuggled and, perhaps, sold to drug lords. Although our research suggests a large portion of illegal weapons end up in Mexico, there is a market for illegal weapons within the U.S., which elevates the risk and likelihood of increased violence in the U.S.

Using murder rate as a proxy for weapons, we see only small correlations between murder rate and total drug seizures for all years. In 2005 and 2006, murder rate positively correlated to total drug seizures (at 0.11 and 0.27 respectively) but in 2007, negatively correlated (-0.16). In fact, in 2007 the murder rate always negatively correlated with all types of drug seizures, whereas in

2005 only opiates, cocaine, and other drugs negatively correlated, and in 2006, only opiates and other drugs negatively correlated. The cause of this negative trend may be because of a law enforcement focus on only one of the issues. Contrarily, the trend could suggest that law enforcement can best focus on one issue, drugs or crime, but the other issue then increases. Because correlations do not imply causation, further research is necessary to explore this issue.

It is similarly interesting to note that, with the exception of cocaine in 2005, there is generally a large correlation between the seizures of different types of drugs. This could suggest that all types of drugs are imported in greater quantities each year or that law enforcement is becoming more effective at stopping more drugs. Alternatively, because the data does not account for the number of individual seizures, this pattern could show that smugglers diversify the drugs they are smuggling into the United States within shipments. Cartels typically source more than one type of drug; therefore, shipping a mix of drugs in one truck could help reduce transportation costs and increase efficiency.

Among population groups, interesting patterns also emerge. In the least populous counties, Group 1, there is a perfect correlation (either positive or negative) between drugs and weapons. What is most interesting is that in 2005, perfect negative correlations emerge between the marijuana, cocaine and total drugs for violent crime, violent crime rate and murder rate whereas in 2005 and 2006, the perfect negative correlations are between opiates and the three crime measures. This is the only population group in which drug-weapons variables are perfectly correlated. Group 2 has no noticeable correlative patterns between murder rate and total drug seizures. In Group 3, interestingly, the 2005 murder rate-total drug seizure correlation is 1; 2006 is 0.99; and 2007 is 0.26. The significant drop in 2007 seems to suggest some anomaly in the data. For the 9 counties in Group 4 it is interesting that the correlation drops from a perfect positive in 2005, to a small negative (-0.25) in 2006 and 2007. These inconsistencies could be due to limited data but certainly need further exploration to determine why these patterns exist and if they hold for counties of similar population throughout the U.S.

Another interesting trend is the large correlations between county populations 2005-2007 and all drugs over all years (with the exception of "other drugs" seizures in 2006) as well as for violent crime over the 3 years. Understandably a higher population has more violent crime, but the drug relationship to population could be explained by scenarios of more users or higher volumes of drugs are trafficked through higher population areas. The relationship between population and access to major transportation routes is likely part of the explanation; however, population is only moderately correlated (0.4 - 0.41) with the number of ports of entry. A deeper look is needed to determine if counties with more ports of entry have more substantial thoroughfares for transporting the drugs.

It is interesting to note that types of drugs seized increase together and increase with county populations. However, when divided into population groups, the relationship becomes weaker as population increases. Though studies on the effectiveness of law enforcement and presence of major shipping roads should be done to determine causation, the current data suggest that more resources be put in counties with greater populations to combat not only the drug and weapons problem but also increased instances of violence present with higher populations.

### *Weapons – Immigration*

Using murder rate as a proxy, the most direct correlation between apprehensions in 2006 and weapons in 2006 for all population groups is small (0.13). Among other population groups, however, the relationship varied; in Group 1 it was small (0.26); in 2 it was large (0.87); 3 it was negative and small (-0.17); and in 4, undetermined. A blanket statement cannot be made to the overall relationship between guns and immigration. This analysis suggests confirmation that while overall weapons and immigration are not tightly linked, in counties with 100,000-500,000, the relationship is different. Because these population counties are spread among states and other factors including law enforcement, policies, and major/ relatively major highway routes are unknown, it is impossible to link the issues in greater detail. This curious relationship suggests, but certainly does not prove, a weak link between weapons smuggling and illegal weapons.

### *Immigration – Drugs*

Although drugs and people both tend to move from the south into the U.S., there is little substantive relationship between the two. People who traffic drugs do not also tend to be those who traffic other people or immigrate to the United States themselves (Stratfor 2005).

It is first useful to note that contrary to our research, immigration and drugs are overall positively correlated, reflecting increases in immigration and drug seizures over the time period. It is impossible to say, however, if one causes, or even affects, the other; our research would suggest it does not.

In Groups 1, 3 and 4, marijuana seizures are positively correlated to apprehensions (large in Groups 1 and 3 and moderate in Group 4). No relationships can be determined for Group 2 because there is insufficient drug data for the counties (only Cameron county in Texas reported). Large correlations also exist between apprehensions and cocaine and total drug seizures (perfect 1 for Group 1 and 0.86 and 0.83 for cocaine seizures and total drug seizures for Group 3). In Group 4, however, there is a small negative correlation (-0.25) between cocaine seizures and apprehensions and a moderate positive correlation (0.33) between total drug seizures and apprehensions. This data suggests that marijuana has the greatest correlation with apprehensions; this could be because marijuana has, by far, the greatest seizures, a relatively large dose quantity or a greater demand. Variability is likely due to the number of counties reporting in each group. With further data it may be possible to extrapolate that increasing public safety personnel may help limit the numbers of illegal immigrants and total drugs in the country.

Although apprehensions are largely positively correlated with border length, drugs have a small to moderate correlation with border length (-0.01 to 0.19). Overall, ports of entry have a large positive correlation with different drugs across years, but have only a small correlation with illegal immigrant apprehensions. When comparing these without specific knowledge of the number or location of seizures, or aliens seized per bust, it seems to suggest that while the majority of drugs come in through ports, the majority of illegal immigrants enter, or are at least apprehended, outside of ports. An additional nuance not reflected is the existence and number of major highways, the volume of traffic that goes through them, and the dispersion of Customs and Border Patrol Agents across the counties studied. Data on these measures would help to produce

a more robust model that could better suggest the impact that CBP Agents have to support the placement of more agents or spur exploration of a new policy.

Overall, the data show that marijuana and immigrant apprehensions are on the rise though is inconclusive about the causal relationship between the two. While this may be due to policies aimed at increasing the effectiveness of law enforcement on the border, it also likely signals a rise in the quantities trafficked; the problem is far from solved.

### *Conclusion*

While examining the interplay of these issues is interesting, more and better quality data as well as additional information on policies and law enforcement personnel should be examined. Correlational data, however, reveals that marijuana seizures have the greatest correlation with apprehensions. Second, the weapons-drugs correlation is small only for the years we examined, and, as anticipated, there appears to be no correlation between weapons and immigration. Weapons smuggling may be best dealt with separately from immigration and drug trafficking, but all should be addressed with enhanced policy and law enforcement, particularly as the causal relationships are better understood.

### **Conclusion of Quantitative Findings**

There is a large correlation between illegal immigration and quality of life measures. Based on our correlations, cocaine, marijuana, and “other” drugs have substantial adverse impacts on quality of life. The exceptions were opiates and property value, which did not follow these trends. Correlations again suggest a substantial adverse relationship between murder rates and quality of life measures in counties with large populations. In counties with smaller population, the relationship was less significant. The exceptions were homeownership and high school graduation rate. Consistent with our research, drug and immigration seizures are somewhat correlated, particularly with marijuana. There is little correlation between weapons and drugs and none between weapons and immigration.

### **Concurrent Qualitative Approach**

The above data and analyses examine domestic indices affected by transnational crimes. The following qualitative approach augments the explanatory power of the primary analysis by placing it in the context of the global rise in transnational crime. This analysis allows Centra and its prospective clients to create integrated solutions to identified criminal threats.

Five seminal events contributed to the rise in transnational criminal activity in North America:

*Collapse of the Soviet Union:* The implosion of the widely corrupted government of the Soviet Union disrupted many longstanding relationships between government officials and criminal organizations. The dismantlement of the previously oppressive Soviet security apparatus allowed for the development of trafficking and fraud capabilities potentially available to more narrowly focused Central American drug cartels (Williams 2002, 70).

*Relative success of U.S. counternarcotics efforts in Colombia:* The intensity of U.S. efforts to combat narcotics production and trafficking by insurgencies in Colombia, combined with the completion of NAFTA, played a large role in shifting the locus of violence in the drug war from Colombia to the U.S.-Mexico border. This shift is detrimental to U.S. security and increases the real salience of the drug war in U.S. foreign policy (Malkin 2001, 102).

*Completion of the North American Free Trade Agreement:* The opening of the U.S.-Mexico border to free trade created substantial opportunities for Colombian cartels and Mexican intermediaries to move large volumes of narcotics undetected through Mexico (Dermota 1999, 15). As Mexican intermediaries consolidated their position in transshipment networks, the loci of money, power and violence in the American narcotics trade moved north (Dermota 1999, 18). The completion of NAFTA and its economic benefits to the United States create a conundrum for Mexican and American border agents: increasing the volume of licit trade inevitably creates opportunities for all forms of trafficking (Dermota 1999, 23).

*Electoral defeat of the Institutional Revolutionary Party:* In 1989, a new Mexican electoral code led to the ouster of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) by 2000. This upset reversed a seventy-one year trend of one-party rule in Mexico (Grayson 2007, 323). Dominant models of the political-criminal nexus suggest that this upset created significant dislocations in the relationships between PRI functionaries and major organized crime elements. These disruptions, and the disorder of the state security apparatus, created new opportunities for the expansion of organized crime within Mexico (Godson and Williams 2002, 317).

*Perceived weakness of the Gulf Cartel:* The arrest of Gulf kingpin Osiel Cárdenas in 2003 created the perception of a power vacuum in Gulf territories by the Juarez and Tijuana cartels. Attempts by these cartels to expand or retain their markets have escalated violence among cartels and the state. U.S.-made small arms fuel the conflict on all sides. The ability to purchase assault weapons at U.S. gun shows significantly strengthens the cartels (Weinberg 2008).

### *The Fluid Structure of the NAFTA Narcotics Trafficking Network*

The above developments significantly strengthen the position of organized criminal hierarchies with respect to state actors. Although hierarchies carry necessary advantages in the area of production, the true strength of these criminal organizations involve their diffusion of risk through diverse *networks* of loosely-connected *cutouts* with little or no knowledge of upstream production and distribution operations. These fluid networks allow traffickers to create an optimal balance among competing needs for economy<sup>2</sup>, secrecy<sup>3</sup> and redundancy.<sup>4</sup>

If crystalline hierarchies exist within fluid narcotics networks, they are most likely to exist at the top of the distribution stream, where narcotraffickers need persistent access to agricultural land

---

<sup>2</sup> **Economy** refers to the effective use of available organizational resources, especially with respect to expert human resources and scarce material capabilities. Economy refers to efforts taken to maximize the utility and protection of these assets

<sup>3</sup> **Secrecy** refers to the capability of human and physical assets to evade detection or capture.

<sup>4</sup> **Redundancy** refers to the capability of a criminal network as a whole to compensate for the loss in capacity suffered as a result of detection or seizure of assets by law enforcement agents.

and labor to achieve vertical integration (Godson and Williams 2002, 331). A narco-trafficker reaps three benefits from co-opting communities through social services:

- 1) A stable, independent supply of narcotics for distribution.
- 2) Remote, rural, underdeveloped communities inherently possess a high degree of secrecy, which contribute to accelerated innovation to counter the evolving enforcement tactics.
- 3) Co-optation of a community allows for the development of a trusted group of individuals who may migrate illegally to the United States to manage narcotics rings in the United States until their eventual discovery and capture (Godson and Williams 2002, 336).

Beyond these core communities, loose associations limit risk distributors by commoditizing and scaling risk among compensated cutouts (Dermota 1999, 20). Inelastic consumer demand also contributes to the scalability of distribution costs. These qualities make enforcement of limited utility in ever halting the drug trade entirely (Cottam and Marenin 2005, 9).

#### *The Migration-Narcotics Nexus Within NAFTA*

There is little evidence supporting increased criminality or violence rates among irregular migrants (Argent 2008, 14). However, several segments of U.S. citizens, immigrants and aliens play critical roles in the NAFTA narcotics trade that flows from Mexico to the United States:

*Irregular participants:* The pervasiveness of narcotics trafficking and heavy-handed tactics of enforcement personnel near the border often degrade the social stigmas of occasional participation in narco-trafficking (Campbell 2005, 326). These factors plus economic need motivate the limited participation of many in narcotics distribution. An individual may actively participate only for several days out of a given year. Collectively, these participants and their limited knowledge of upstream narcotics operations contribute significantly to the scalability of risk and the insulation of upstream traffickers (Campbell 2005, 327).

*Illegal immigrants subject to smuggler exploitation:* Increased U.S. border enforcement creates demand for sophisticated and expensive human smuggling services. Mexican citizens often lack the means to pay for these services. The narcotics trade allows illegal immigrants to pay for smugglers' services in kind by carrying narcotics into the United States. This arrangement represents a new commoditization of risk. Also, Mexican narcotics traffickers or their confederates may expand their operations to encompass alien smuggling to evade detection and prevent the seizure of narcotics (Godson and Williams 2002, 340).

*Co-opted alien distributors:* Kingpins may seek greater control of downstream distribution operations. They may use the bonds of trust within co-opted Mexican communities to meet this need. These aliens from co-opted communities enter the U.S. for the purpose of participating in downstream distribution operations. Many of these individuals cross the border with some expectation of eventual discovery, apprehension and imprisonment. This expectation insulates upstream narco-traffickers. Alternately, the visible wealth of successful distributors encourages others to migrate to the United States for narcotics distribution (Malkin 2001, 114). Participation

in these schemes will increase as narcotics agriculture and distribution become increasingly linked to economic survival and advancement (Malkin 2001, 116). The trade practices of U.S. corporations exacerbate these trends by marginalizing profits for licit agriculture. (Malkin 2001, 106).

*U.S. resident gang members:* The high visibility of U.S. gang members as final narcotics retailers belies their marginal profits and significance. Gang members generally distribute narcotics to meet basic needs of economic survival where licit opportunities are limited (Papachristos 2005, 49). The low profitability, low secrecy, low knowledge of upstream operations and high redundancy of street distributors of narcotics make poor strategic targets of narcotics interdiction efforts in the long term.

*Deported alien gang members:* Gang members in the United States often represent a young cohort of a marginalized immigrant population. Gang involvement generally represents an alternative form of social integration chosen as a result of social, economic and educational barriers. Within gangs, minor criminality in narcotics, fraud, assault, are the norms (Papachristos 2005, 50). For these crimes, U.S. immigration policy generally prescribes deportation to the Latin American country of their birth, where the gang member possesses few licit opportunities. Following deportation, these individuals generally return the U.S. illegally or participate in more significant Central American criminal organizations (Papachristos 2005, 52).

#### *The Narcotics-Firearm Nexus Within NAFTA*

Since the relative success of the U.S. antinarcotics campaign in Colombia and the completion of NAFTA, the loci of money, power and violence have moved northward. This violence has increased in proportion to narcotics profitability. However, wide availability and tolerance of firearms in the United States remains the main systemic force behind the availability of firearms to narcotraffickers. The expiration of the federal ban on assault weapons creates significant opportunities for Mexican narcotraffickers to acquire U.S.-manufactured assault weapons (Weinberg 2008). Congress currently allows states to establish documentation requirements for gun show purchases of assault weapons. As of April 2008, Texas, New Mexico and Arizona require no documentation of gun show sales of assault weapons (Weinberg 2008). The secrecy of gun show sales and proximity of the U.S. caused the import of U.S. firearms to supplant earlier transnational weapons flows from Eastern Europe (Williams 1998, 48).

These weapons retail on the Mexican black market for about \$1000 (Weinberg 2008).

Additionally, the growing arsenal of Mexican state agents threatens to further escalate the violence within the country (Weinberg 2008). Finally, U.S. corporations seeking to protect of their assets in Central America against criminals contribute to the proliferation of violence in the region by arming privately-sponsored militias, often furthering anti-state agendas (Weinberg 2008). The wide availability of illegal firearms in Mexico strongly suggests that the violence associated with narcotics trafficking will continue to escalate. This trend will stimulate the risk economies of narcotics trafficking and human smuggling (Williams 1998, 48).

Illicit sales of armaments at U.S. gun shows usually take one of three forms:



- 1) A licensed dealer allowed an undocumented purchase of a firearm by a person he knows to be prohibited from purchase (Weinberg 2008).
- 2) A licensed dealer intentionally fails to identify a purchaser as an out-of-state buyer, prohibited from purchasing a weapon
- 3) A person eligible to purchase an undocumented firearm is persuaded to purchase a firearm on behalf of end consumer prohibited from purchasing a firearm (Weinberg 2008).

## **Policy Implications**

There are a range of policy implications that derive from the conclusions of this report, based on both quantitative and qualitative analysis. Given the fact that these three issues (immigration, guns, and drugs) are broad and frequently overlapping topics, these findings offer a wide range of implications for policymakers, which include areas such as foreign policy, public health, law enforcement, and economics, among others. It is important to recognize that selecting a policy response first requires clearly defining the scope of the problem that is being addressed.

- 1) *Consider the quality of life implications of these issues:* Though our quantitative analyses failed to produce strong conclusions regarding the impact these issues have on a county's quality of life, there is at least some indication that there is a relationship. In developing policy responses to these issues, it will be important to be aware of how illegal immigration, for example, in certain counties may affect various quality of life variables in different ways -- fully understanding that the causal relationship is not definitive.
- 2) *Tighten U.S. firearm controls:* Holding buyers and sellers accountable for their transactions to reduce the availability of illegal firearms, while eliminating the most lethal firearms would help to stagnate the large flow of firearms into Mexico from the United States and eventually reduce the now ubiquitous violence associated with the highly lucrative trades of narcotics and illegal immigrant smuggling (Cottam and Marenin 2005, 18). This U.S. policy change would also induce a greater expenditure of Mexican national resources and political capital on narcotics interdictions. It is important to note that because Mexico views narcotics primarily as a public health issue, the expenditure of national resources upon enforcement per se is of low domestic salience (Cottam and Marenin 2005, 17).
- 3) *Implement a more favorable immigration policy toward Mexico:* U.S. allowance of a less regulated flow of Mexican migrant workers represents a major Mexican demand in exchange for greater cooperation in the U.S. fight against narcotics trafficking (Cottam and Marenin 2005, 19). Lowering immigration barriers would also decrease the escalating demand for coyote services and decrease social costs to U.S. communities whose immigrants are made averse to seasonal migration by stringent border controls. Reforms should include measures to allow Mexican migrants to establish and use bank accounts, rather than to carry large amounts of cash, which increases immigrant victimization to violent, financially motivated crime within American communities.

- 4) *Pressure Canada to tighten emigration controls to the United States:* Currently, Canada allows free emigration of persons across the U.S.-Canadian border, allowing those flying from Mexico to Canada to achieve easy undocumented entry into the United States. The United States should pressure Canada to regulate and document these emigrants as part of transnational cooperation within NAFTA (Cottam and Marenin 2005, 23).
- 5) *Pressure Mexico to tighten control on its southern border:* Mexico conducts a significant amount of trade with its southern neighbors and exercising additional security controls upon these borders would occur at the detriment of trade. However, the control of criminal markets within NAFTA requires strong control of all external borders. Therefore, increasing cooperation and decreasing border security among NAFTA participants requires increased securitization of external borders. This principle is especially applicable to Mexico's southern border as many regimes within Central and South American regions maintain policies conducive to organized crime and trafficking.
- 6) *Increase cooperation between U.S. and Mexican enforcement personnel:* U.S. and Mexican enforcement personnel are generally distrustful of each other. Rectifying these deficits through perception management would allow U.S. and Mexican enforcement personnel to use many best-practices currently practiced on the U.S.-Canadian border, such as the use of common radio frequencies and the sharing of sensitive intelligence as informational force multipliers (Cottam and Marenin 2005, 21-26).

### **Research Recommendations**

This analysis shows relationships between the issues of illegal immigration, drug smuggling, weapons trafficking, and quality of life. However, this research is far from comprehensive. With more complete data, further research could determine a causal relationship between these issues. Our research has not determined if these trends are transferable to other areas or time periods.

## References:

- Argenendt, Steffen. "Irregular Migration as an International Problem." Research Paper, German Institute for International and Security Affairs. <[http://www.swpberlin.org/common/get\\_document.php?asset\\_id=5121](http://www.swpberlin.org/common/get_document.php?asset_id=5121)>. Accessed: 14 April 2009.
- Campbell, Howard. 2005. "Drug Trafficking Stories: Everyday forms of Narco-folklore on the U.S.-Mexican Border." *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 16:5. 326-333.
- Castro Valverde, Carlos. *Migración nicaraguense en Costa Rica: población, empleo, y necesidades básicas insatisfechas*. December 5, 2002. Facultad Latinoamericana de ciencias sociales, Sede académica Costa Rica. [http://www.flacso.or.cr/fileadmin/documentos/FLACSO/Carlos\\_Castro.pdf](http://www.flacso.or.cr/fileadmin/documentos/FLACSO/Carlos_Castro.pdf) (accessed April 12, 2009)
- Cohen, Jacob. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2d ed. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cottam, Martha L. and Otwin Marenin. 2005. "The Management of Border Security in NAFTA: Imagery, Nationalism and the War on Drugs." *International Criminal Justice Review*. 15:1.
- Department of Homeland Security. (2007). *2007 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*. Office of Immigration Statistics, Department of Homeland Security. Washington, D.C. [http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/yearbook/2007/ois\\_2007\\_yearbook.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/yearbook/2007/ois_2007_yearbook.pdf)
- Department of Justice. 2008. *National Drug Threat Assessment 2009*. Accessed: 22 April 2009. <<http://www.usdoj.gov/ndic/pubs31/31379/index.htm>>.
- Dermota, Ken. 1999. "Snow Buisness: Drugs and the Spirit of Capitalism." *World Policy Journal*. 16:4. "Drugs, Weapons and Violence: The U.S.-Mexican Border's Hot Commodities." *STRATFOR*. February 10, 2006. [http://www.stratfor.com/drugs\\_weapons\\_and\\_violence\\_u\\_s\\_mexican\\_borders\\_hot\\_commodities](http://www.stratfor.com/drugs_weapons_and_violence_u_s_mexican_borders_hot_commodities) (accessed January 30, 2009).
- Federal Bureau of Investigations. 2005. *Uniform Crime Report*. September 2006. <[http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table\\_10\\_tx.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_10_tx.html)> Accessed April 5, 2009.
- Federal Bureau of Investigations. 2006. *Uniform Crime Report*. September 2007. <[http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table\\_10\\_tx.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_10_tx.html)> Accessed April 5, 2009.
- Federal Bureau of Investigations. 2007. *Uniform Crime Report*. September 2008. <[http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table\\_10\\_tx.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/data/table_10_tx.html)> Accessed April 5, 2009.
- Fotheringham, A. Stewart and Pasquale A. Pellegrini. 2002. "Modelling Spatial Choice: A Review and Synthesis in a Migration Context." *Progress in Human Geography*. 26:4. 487-510.
- Godson, Roy and Phil Williams. 2002. "Anticipating Organized and Transnational Crime." *Crime, Law and Social Change*. 37. 311-355.
- Grayson, George W. 2007. "Evolution of Mexico and Other Single Party States." *International Studies Review*. 9. 322-367.
- Katel, Peter. 2008. "Mexico's Drug War." *CQ Researcher Online*. 18(43): 1009-1032. <http://library.cqpress.com.ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/cqresearcher/cqresre2008121200> (accessed March 2, 2009).
- Malkin, Victoria. 2001. "Narcotrafficking, Migration, and Modernity in Rural Mexico." *Latin American Perspectives* 28:4. 101-128. "Mexican Cartels and the Fallout From Phoenix." *STRATFOR*. July 2, 2008. [http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/mexican\\_cartels\\_and\\_fallout\\_phoenix](http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/mexican_cartels_and_fallout_phoenix) (accessed February 12, 2009).
- Papachristos, Andrew V. 2005. "Gang World." *Foreign Policy*. 147. 48-56. *STRATFOR*. "Organized Crime in Mexico | *STRATFOR*." *STRATFOR*. March 11, 2008. [http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/organized\\_crime\\_mexico](http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/organized_crime_mexico) (accessed April 17, 2009).
- Stolzenberg, Lisa, and Stewart J. D'Alessio. 2000. "Gun Availability and Violent Crime: New Evidence for the National Incident-Based Reporting System." *Social Forces* 4: 1461-1482.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. 2008. "World Drug Report 2008." [http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data\\_and-analysis/WDR-2008.html](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data_and-analysis/WDR-2008.html). (accessed April 18, 2009).
- Weinberg, Bill. 2008. "Guns: The U.S. Threat to Mexican National Security." New York: North American Conference on Latin America. <<http://nacla.org/node/4493>>.
- Williams, Phil. 2002. "Transnational Criminal Networks." *Networks and Netwars: The Future of Terror, Crime and Militancy*. ed. John Arquella and David F. Ronfeldt. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation. 62-97.
- William, Phil. 1999. "Drugs and Guns." *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. January/February 1999.

# Christopher Davis Causey

225-610-5751

ccausey@bushschool.tamu.edu

**Education:**     **Bush School for Government & Public Service,  
Texas A & M University, College Station, TX**

Masters Candidate                             GPA: 3.7                             May 2009  
Masters Program in International Affairs  
National Security Track

**Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA**

B.S., Psychology, cum laude                 GPA: 3.74                             December 2006  
Major GPA: 3.8

Minors:  
Political Science  
Emergency Management (Disaster Science and Management)

**Experience:**     **Graduate Assistant for Research, Public Service Leadership Program.**

Bush School of Government and Public Service  
College Station, TX  
August 2008 – May 2009

**Staff Crisis Counselor, Baton Rouge Crisis Intervention Center**

Baton Rouge, LA  
May 2007 – August 2008

**Public Diplomacy Intern, U.S. Department of State.**

Astana, Kazakhstan  
February 2007 – April 2007

**Intern, East Baton Rouge Parish Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security.**

Baton Rouge, LA  
August 2006 – December 2006

**Volunteer Crisis Counselor, Baton Rouge Crisis Intervention Center.**

Baton Rouge, LA  
June 2006 – January 2007

**Contract Role Player, Scientific Applications International Corporation**

Anti-Terrorism Assistance Program, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Department of State  
Baton Rouge, LA  
June 2006 – October 2006

**Honors:**     **Robert and Judy Ley Allen Fellowship**

Bush School of Government and Public Service  
College Station, TX  
August 2007

# Jason Hahn

3802 Windridge Dr  
Bryan, TX 77802

817-228-0445  
jmhahn08@gmail.com

---

## Education

**Texas A&M University**, Bush School of Government & Public Service, College Station, TX  
Master of International Affairs, National Security Studies May 2009  
Dean's Leadership Certificate

**Texas A&M University**, College of Liberal Arts, College Station, TX  
Bachelor of the Arts, History and Political Science Aug 2007  
Certificate in European Union Politics

## Work History

**Bryan Independent School District**, Bryan, TX  
*Substitute Teacher* (Sept 2008-Present)

- Managed a classroom of 20-25 students

**Department of State, Houston Passport Agency**, Houston, TX  
*Fraud Prevention Intern* (June 2008-Aug 2008)

- Studied fraud prevention
- Assisted in passport application adjudication

**Texas A&M University Office of Honors Programs & Academic Scholarships**, College Station, TX  
*Student Worker* (Sep 2005 - Aug 2007)

- Recruited prospective students
- Advised students
- Served as the student representative at staff meetings

**Kroger Food Stores**, Grand Prairie, TX  
*Floor Supervisor/Customer Service* (July 2002 – Aug 2005)

- Managed front end operations and employees

**Southwest Sports Group**, Arlington, TX  
*Parking Lot Attendant* (Apr 2001 – Oct 2001)

## Language Skills

**Spanish**, Intermediate Low, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2008

## Clearances

Secret Level Clearance, Department of State April 2008

### **Education**

The Citadel, Charleston, SC December 20, 2001  
Bachelor of Arts in History,

The Basic School, Quantico, VA October 11, 2002  
Earned Military Occupational Specialty 8001

The Field Artillery Basic Officer Course, Ft. Sill, OK April 10, 2003  
Earned Military Occupational Specialty 0802

College of Liberal Arts, Texas A&M University May 15, 2007  
12 hours of graduate study in History, 3.25 GPA

The Bush School, Texas A&M University May 15, 2008  
15 hours of graduate study in International Affairs, 3.6 GPA

### **Experience**

Rifleman/squad leader, Ground Defense Security Force, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, January 1995 - February 1996.

Marine Security Guard at American embassies in Luxembourg, Copenhagen, and Bangkok, May 1996 - May 1998.

Artillery Officer with 3<sup>rd</sup> Battalion, 11<sup>th</sup> Marine Regiment, Twentynine Palms, CA, May 2003 - June 2006.

Officer in Charge, Regional Detention Facility, Camp Al Qaim, Iraq, March - October 2005.

Marine Officer Instructor, NROTC Unit, Texas A&M University, June 2006 - present.

### **Class Projects**

History 679-Comparative Border Studies, Professor: Dr. April Hatfield, Semester: fall 2006, Term Paper: *A Just and Lasting Peace: The Development of Just War Doctrine in Western Civilization*

History 645-Modern Military History, Professor: Dr. Brian Lynn, Semester: spring 2007, Term Paper: *The Rise of Small Wars*

Philosophy 662-Seminar in Value Theory (Atonement), Professor: Dr. Linda Radzik, Semester: spring 2007, Term Paper: *Truth vs. Justice: The Greensboro Truth and Reconciliation Commission*

Bush 689-Grand Strategy, Professor: Dr. Christopher Layne, Semester: spring 2008, Term Paper: *The Grand Strategy of Otto von Bismarck: Lessons for Navigating Tumultuous Times*

## EDUCATION

- Texas A&M University, Bush School of Government and Public Service**, College Station, TX  
Master of International Affairs May 2009  
Concentrations in International Economic Development and Diplomacy
- Texas A&M University, Mays Business School**, College Station, TX  
BBA Marketing. Psychology minor. *International Business Certificate* May 2006  
Magna cum laude

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- JB Knowledge Technologies, Inc.**, College Station, TX, and Salta, Argentina  
*Marketing Manager* May 2006-Feb 2008  
Developed marketing materials for a suite of 5 business software products.  
Set up and managed Search Engine Optimization for 5 companies and 2 client websites
- Texas A&M University, Study Abroad Programs Office**, College Station, TX  
*Public Relations Graduate Assistant* Feb 2008- present  
Coordinate marketing materials and public relations campaigns to encourage students to study abroad.  
Analyze and coordinate campus-wide publicity and events to maximize student participation
- The Norman Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture**, College Station, TX  
*Independent consultant* Aug- Dec 2008  
Independent study to analyze the effectiveness of a training program for economic development.  
Coordinated with American and Indonesian staff to determine objectives and results
- The Scowcroft Group**  
*Summer Associate* May 2008- Aug 2008  
Conducted internet-based international business research for partners and clients
- United States Department of State**, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea  
*Intern* Summer 2005  
Planned and executed 3-day speaking program at 6 venues for Peter Brookes (Heritage Foundation)  
Designed reference materials for new and visiting officers at post  
Wrote new housing policy for Embassy housing, approved by Ambassador

## LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES

- Foreign Language and Culture Society** (President, 2008-2009)  
Created International Student Mentor program and recruited student volunteers  
Recruited, interviewed, hired and organized 13 language discussion groups for 50+ students each semester  
Lead monthly general meetings and organize and promote cultural and language activities for students
- Graduate Student Council** (Representative, 2007-2008)  
Represented the interests of Bush School students to the A&M graduate community at monthly meetings
- Mays Business School Fellows Program** (Group XXIV Fellow)  
Selected as one of the top 50 business undergraduates to participate in an intensive professional development program designed to strengthen team-oriented leadership abilities

## HONORS

- Ryu/Heep Fellowship** recipient awarded 2-year full-tuition fellowship to attend the Bush School
- Mitte Circle of Excellence Award** – Awarded to a Mitte Scholar for commitment to community service and maintenance of above a 3.5 GPA

## INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

- |                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Indonesia        | One week development program evaluation field experience with the Borlaug Institute |
| Hong Kong        | Semester abroad Hong Kong University of Science and Technology                      |
| Argentina        | Two, 3-month international assignments with JB Knowledge Technologies               |
| Papua New Guinea | US Department of State internship at US Embassy in Port Moresby                     |
| Costa Rica       | Five-week study abroad and language immersion                                       |

# Stephen Meiners

8301 Cochrane Cove  
Austin, Texas 78757

512-680-3701  
meiners@tamu.edu

---

## Education

Texas A&M University, Bush School of Government and Public Service, College Station, Texas  
Master of International Affairs, National Security May 2009  
(expected)

University of Texas at Austin, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Austin, Texas  
Master of Arts, Spanish and Portuguese Linguistics, Sociolinguistics/Laboratory Phonology May 2006

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Faculdade de Letras, Belo Horizonte, Brazil  
Independent Study, Linguistics Field Work and Research May to July 2005

University of Northern Iowa, Department of Modern Languages, Cedar Falls, Iowa  
Bachelor of Arts, Spanish, Certificate in Portuguese Studies May 2002

## Experience

Stratfor, Office of Security and Counterterrorism, Austin, Texas September 2006 to present  
*Senior Tactical Analyst, Latin America*

- **Analysis and research:** Generated daily intelligence reports, by collecting and analyzing open-source and human intelligence regarding geopolitical and security-related issues.
- **Writing:** Wrote weekly multi-page intelligence analyses about Mexican drug trafficking organizations, criminal groups, and militant activities. Also regularly wrote security assessments and geopolitical analyses of other regions as required, resulting in the creation of high-quality intelligence products that serve the needs of clients.

United States Department of State, Office of Brazilian and Southern Cone Affairs, Washington, D.C. May 2008 to July 2008  
*Intern*

- **Analysis and writing:** Created documents for high-ranking State Department officials, by succinctly analyzing information from a variety of sources.
- **Organization:** Coordinated with various U.S. government agencies to organize a series of meetings and consultations for State Department officials.

GMAC Mortgage Company, Waterloo, Iowa September 2002 to June 2004  
*Bilingual Service Associate*

- **Negotiation:** Addressed client concerns in a customer-service role, satisfying customer needs while serving the interests of the company. Performed tasks with both Spanish- and English-speaking clients.

## Clearances, Leadership, and Honors

SECRET level security clearance, United States Department of State granted April 2008

University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas August 2005 to May 2007  
*Assistant Instructor, Teaching Assistant*

- **Leadership and teaching:** Served as the primary instructor in undergraduate language classes.

Broadreach Academic Treks, Raleigh, North Carolina May 2006 to August 2006  
*Study Abroad Trip Leader; Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Mexico*

- **Leadership:** Ensured students fulfilled trip requirements on study trips, while executing responsibility for their safety. Performed duties in remote areas and difficult conditions.

University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas August 2004 to May 2007

- **Research and oral communication:** Designed and conducted linguistics-related scientific research experiments. Presented research findings to colleagues at academic conferences.

Pre-emptive University Recruitment Fellowship, University of Texas at Austin 2004 to 2005 academic year  
Graduate Research Fellowship Program (Honorable Mention), National Science Foundation Fall 2005  
Liberal Arts Graduate Research Fellowship, University of Texas at Austin Spring 2006

## Languages

Spanish: "Superior" certification, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2008  
Portuguese: "Advanced Low" certification, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2008  
Modern Standard Arabic: elementary knowledge

*References available upon request.*



## **Brandon Clark Race**

1425 West Villa Maria Road

Bryan, TX 77801

Unit 901

(512) 771-3756

[racebc1@neo.tamu.edu](mailto:racebc1@neo.tamu.edu)

---

### **Education**

#### **The Bush School of Government and Public Service**

Masters in International Affairs, Expected August 2009

#### **Concordia University**, Austin, Texas

Masters in Education, Expected December 2009

#### **The Citadel**, Charleston, South Carolina

B.S. in Physics, Graduated Magna Cum Laude, May 2003

### **Work**

#### **Experience**

#### **The Citadel**, Charleston, South Carolina

*Research Assistant*, Summer 2001

Studied solar particle emissions from satellite data recorded over thirty years to look for periodicities in solar activity beyond known cycles.

#### **The University of Texas Department of Physics**, Austin, Texas

*Teaching Assistant*, Fall 2003

Taught four discussion sections weekly for an electricity and magnetism physics class taken by engineering students.

#### **House of Tutors**, Austin, Texas

*Tutor*, April 2004-March 2005

Tutored students in college and K-12 for math and physics classes.

#### **Boys and Girls Club**, Austin, Texas

*Tutor*, April 2004-March 2005

Helped tutor and mentor children from schools in East Austin after they finished school for the day.

#### **Governor's Office; Budget, Planning, and Policy Division**, Austin, Texas

*Intern*, January 2005-March 2005

Researched information relevant to upcoming legislation.

#### **AISD, St. Stephen's, and St. Andrew's**, Austin, Texas

*Substitute Teacher*, Fall 2005-Spring 2006

Instructed and supervised classes for absent teachers.

#### **Lanier High School**

*Permanent Substitute Teacher*, March 30, 2006-May 26, 2006

Assisted 2 teachers with their Geometry classes and taught 2 periods of Geometry