

Drug Trafficking in India, Mexico and USAH

Caitlyn Geraldine Lazaro¹, R. Thendralarasi²¹ *B.A.LL.B (Honours), Vels Institute Of Science Technology and Advances Studies*² *Assistant Professor, Vels Institute If Science Technology and Advanced Studies.*

Article Info

Article History:

Published: 26 April 2026

Publication Issue:

Volume 3, Issue 4
April-2026

Page Number:

2283-2291

Corresponding Author:

Caitlyn Geraldine Lazaro

Abstract:

Drug trafficking remains one of the most pervasive and financially powerful forms of transnational organised crime, generating annual revenues estimated between \$400–500 billion. This article presents a comparative analysis of drug trafficking across three jurisdictions — the United States, Mexico, and India — each occupying a distinct yet interconnected position in the global narcotics network. Drawing on doctrinal legal analysis, international conventions, judicial decisions, and socio-legal research, the study examines historical evolution, domestic and international legal frameworks, institutional corruption, and the socioeconomic consequences of drug trafficking. The article concludes that the dominant enforcement paradigm has failed across all three jurisdictions, and advocates for a rightsbased, public-health-oriented approach.

Keywords: Drug Trafficking, Comparative Law, USA, Mexico, India, Organised Crime, NDPS Act, Controlled Substances Act, Counter-Narcotics Policy, War on Drugs

1. Introduction

Drug trafficking constitutes one of the most formidable challenges confronting states, international organisations, and civil society in the twenty-first century. Broadly defined as the cultivation, manufacture, distribution, and sale of illicit narcotic substances across national and domestic markets, it generates revenues that make it one of the most lucrative criminal enterprises in human history. Its nexus with money laundering, human trafficking, arms smuggling, terrorism, and corruption renders it a multidimensional threat.

The three jurisdictions selected for comparative analysis — the United States, Mexico, and India — represent paradigmatic cases within the global drug trafficking system. The USA functions as the world's largest consumer market and a primary architect of global anti-drug policy. Mexico stands at the critical juncture of production, transit, and increasingly consumption, with powerful cartels exerting enormous influence over governmental structures. India, situated between the 'Golden Crescent' (Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan) and the 'Golden Triangle' (Myanmar, Laos, Thailand), serves as a major transit hub and emerging consumer market. Despite decades of international cooperation and billions spent on counter-narcotics efforts, drug trafficking continues to expand in scope, sophistication, and lethality.

2. Historical Evolution of Drug Trafficking

2.1 United States

The history of drug policy in the United States is inseparable from the country's histories of race, immigration, and moral reform. Early regulations targeted opium use by Chinese immigrants (San Francisco, 1875), and the

Harrison Narcotics Tax Act (1914) established the first federal framework. The Marijuana Tax Act (1937) extended control to cannabis, driven by anti-Mexican sentiment. President Nixon's 1971 declaration of the 'War on Drugs' and the Controlled

Substances Act of 1970 established the scheduling framework still in force today. The Reagan-era escalation dramatically increased enforcement expenditure and introduced mandatory minimum sentences, creating racial disparities — particularly the 100:1 crack-to-powder cocaine sentencing differential — that persist to the present. The twenty-first century has been dominated by the opioid epidemic, claiming over 500,000 lives, while the wave of state-level cannabis legalisation (over 23 states by 2023) has created profound tension with federal prohibition.

2.2 Mexico

Mexico's drug trafficking economy was shaped by its geography and proximity to the world's largest drug consumer. Opium cultivation in Sinaloa dates to the late nineteenth century. For decades, an informal accommodation between the ruling PRI party and organised traffickers maintained a degree of order. The transformation into the dominant transit corridor for Colombian cocaine occurred in the mid-1980s, as Mexican organisations evolved from junior partners into full participants in the cocaine trade. President Calderon's military offensive launched in 2006 succeeded in capturing cartel leaders but generated catastrophic violence — over 120,000 homicides between 2007 and 2012 — through the so-called 'hydra effect,' where eliminating leaders spawned more fragmented and violent successor organisations. Today, the Sinaloa Cartel and CJNG (Cartel Jalisco Nueva Generacion) dominate global trafficking, with drug-related violence claiming over 300,000 lives between 2006 and 2022.

2.3 India

India's engagement with narcotics spans millennia, with the British East India Company transforming traditional opium practices into a commercial enterprise generating approximately fifteen percent of colonial revenues by the mid-nineteenth century. Post-independence, India's geo-strategic position between the Golden Crescent and Golden Triangle emerged as a defining vulnerability, particularly following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979), which dramatically expanded opium output through the Golden Crescent. Punjab became severely affected, with heroin trafficking networks exploiting cross-border infrastructure shared with militant organisations — a nexus presaging 'narco-terrorism.' The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act (NDPS Act) of 1985 represented India's major statutory response, imposing stringent mandatory minimum sentences.

3. International Legal Framework

The international drug control architecture rests on three principal United Nations conventions. The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (1954) consolidated earlier treaties, introduced a four-schedule classification system, and required parties to limit drug use to medical and scientific purposes, mandating criminal penalties for trafficking. The 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances extended controls to synthetic drugs including amphetamines and hallucinogens. The 1988 Vienna Convention, the most operationally significant, created a comprehensive framework for dismantling trafficking organisations — requiring criminalisation of trafficking offences (Article

3), asset seizure and confiscation (Article 5), and mutual legal assistance (Article 7). The UN Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime (UNTOC, 2000) complements these instruments, while FATF standards address money laundering of drug revenues estimated at \$200–500 billion annually.

All three states are parties to these conventions, but implementation varies significantly. The USA broadly exceeds minimum requirements, though state-level cannabis legalisation raises questions about compliance with Article 4 of the 1961 Convention. Mexico's formal obligations are undermined by cartel corruption and territorial control. India's compliance is complicated by persistent diversion of pharmaceutical precursor chemicals — such as acetic anhydride used in heroin manufacture — despite active INCB cooperation.

4. Domestic Legal Frameworks:

4.1 United States — The Controlled Substances Act

The Controlled Substances Act (CSA) of 1970 establishes a five-schedule classification system.

Schedule I substances (heroin, cannabis, LSD) are deemed to have no accepted medical use; Schedule II substances (cocaine, methamphetamine, fentanyl) have high abuse potential but accepted medical uses. Mandatory minimum sentences introduced by the 1986 Anti-Drug Abuse Act — ten years for five kilograms of cocaine, twenty years for larger quantities — have been partially reformed by the Fair Sentencing Act (2010) and First Step Act (2018). The Supreme Court in *Gonzales v. Raich* (2005) affirmed federal authority under the Commerce Clause extends even to intrastate personal cannabis use. Civil asset forfeiture (21 U.S.C. § 881) permits seizure without criminal conviction, drawing sustained criticism. Drug courts — over 3,000 nationwide since 1989 — represent a structural innovation offering treatment as an alternative to incarceration, with documented effectiveness in reducing recidivism.

4.2 Mexico — Federal Narcotics Legislation

Mexico's drug control rests on the General Health Law (LGS) and the Federal Criminal Code (CPF), with trafficking penalties of ten to twenty-five years' imprisonment, aggravated where organised crime or public officials are involved. The Federal Organised Crime Law (LFCDO, 1996) permits extended pre-trial detention of up to eighty days — criticised by human rights bodies. A landmark development came in 2015, when the Supreme Court held that the absolute prohibition of cannabis for personal adult recreational use unconstitutionally restricted rights to free development of personality, establishing a jurisprudential trend consolidated by 2018 though legislation has lagged.

4.3 India — The NDPS Act 1985

India's primary instrument is the NDPS Act of 1985, prohibiting the production, manufacture, possession, sale, and transport of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances except for medical or scientific purposes. Offences are classified by quantity: 'commercial quantity' offences carry mandatory minimums of ten to twenty years with fines not less than one lakh rupees. Section 37 creates a presumption against bail in commercial quantity cases, upheld by the Supreme Court though cautioned against mechanical application. Section 50 — governing personal search conditions — has generated extensive Supreme Court jurisprudence balancing enforcement effectiveness against procedural fairness. The Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA, 2002) provides a parallel track of financial enforcement, and COFEPOSA (1974) permits preventive detention of suspected traffickers for up to one year.

5. Drug Trafficking, Corruption, and State Institutions

Corruption represents perhaps the most structurally entrenched challenge across all three jurisdictions, though its depth and character differ markedly. In Mexico, cartel penetration of law enforcement, judicial, and political institutions has been a defining feature of public life for four decades. The murder of DEA Agent Enrique Camarena (1985) — involving members of the Federal Security Directorate — symbolises this depth. The 2014 Ayotzinapa disappearance of 43 students, implicating local police, military personnel, and government officials with the Guerreros Unidos organisation, exposed the systemic nature of complicity. The cartel ultimatum of 'plata o plomo' (silver or lead) renders corruption coercive, not merely venal. The 2019 arrest of former Security Secretary Genaro Garcia Luna for accepting cartel bribes illustrates corruption reaching the highest levels. The Merida Initiative (\$3 billion in US assistance) produced mixed results.

In the United States, corruption is more episodic but present, particularly among Customs and Border Protection officers in border regions. Asset forfeiture laws create perverse incentives — effectively rewarding agencies for prioritising high-value seizures — while the militarisation of drug enforcement through the 1033 Programme has increased officer-involved shootings with little evidence of improved effectiveness. In India, the Punjab drug crisis exemplifies alleged political-criminal nexus, with Special Task Force reports alleging connections between trafficking networks and political figures across party lines. In northeastern states, insurgent organisations and security forces operating under the AFSPA have been implicated in trafficking complicity. The structural conclusion across all three jurisdictions is that prohibition's enormous financial incentives create corruption pressures no purely anti-corruption strategy can fully neutralise.

6. Socio-Economic and Public Health Consequences

The economic costs of drug trafficking are profound and unevenly distributed. In the United States, the National Drug Intelligence Center estimated costs exceeding \$193 billion annually — encompassing \$11 billion in healthcare, \$120 billion in productivity losses, and \$61 billion in criminal justice expenditure, likely underestimating current fentanyl-era costs. In Mexico, drug-related violence alone is estimated to cost fifteen to seventeen percent of GDP annually, suppressing investment and driving capital flight. In Punjab, India, studies document drug addiction as a major driver of family disintegration, school dropout, and agricultural productivity decline.

The public health toll is severe. The US opioid epidemic — moving in three waves from prescription opioids, to heroin, to illicitly manufactured fentanyl — claimed over 80,000 lives in 2021 alone, exceeding total Vietnam War combat deaths. Evidence-based interventions (medication-assisted treatment, needle exchange, naloxone, supervised consumption sites) demonstrably reduce mortality but face political resistance rooted in the criminalisation paradigm. In India, needle-sharing among heroin users in Punjab and the northeast has driven elevated HIV and hepatitis C rates, identified by NACO as a significant transmission driver. Mexico's public health infrastructure is chronically underfunded, leaving rural and indigenous communities with virtually no treatment access.

Drug trafficking and drug enforcement both disproportionately burden marginalised communities. In the United States, Black Americans are arrested for drug offences at three to four times the rate of white Americans despite similar use rates across racial groups — a disparity characterised by scholars as systemic racial subordination. In Mexico, indigenous and rural communities in opium-producing regions face a coercive choice between cartel enforcement and livelihood destruction through aerial eradication. In India, scheduled castes, tribal communities, and migrant workers are over-represented in trafficking prosecutions. Women and youth are

particularly vulnerable, drawn into trafficking through poverty, coercion, or the absence of legitimate economic alternatives. In Mexico, the number of women imprisoned for trafficking offences has increased dramatically, predominantly drawn from economically marginalised populations.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

Six interconnected findings emerge from this comparative analysis. First, drug market structures in all three countries are deeply historically conditioned — by colonial opium commerce, Cold War geopolitics, and racial politics of prohibition — requiring strategies that address root causes rather than symptoms. Second, the international drug control architecture, rooted in the midtwentiethcentury prohibition consensus, is increasingly misaligned with empirical evidence and evolving human rights standards. Third, the enforcement paradigm — criminal prohibition, mandatory incarceration, militarised interdiction — has failed demonstrably across all three jurisdictions, sustained by bureaucratic interests and political economy rather than evidence. Fourth, institutional vulnerability differs across a gradient from Mexico's pervasive structural corruption, through India's uneven multi-agency framework, to the US's subtler distortions — but all share the structural reality that prohibition's financial incentives cannot be neutralised by enforcement alone. Fifth, the costs of both drug trafficking and its prohibition are inequitably distributed, falling disproportionately on racial minorities, indigenous peoples, and marginalised communities. Sixth, evidence-based public health approaches demonstrably outperform enforcement approaches in reducing drug-related harm at lower social cost.

Recommendations include: at the international level, accelerating review of controlled substance scheduling and developing authoritative guidance on the compatibility of regulated drug markets with treaty obligations; for the United States, eliminating mandatory minimums for possession offences, resolving the federal-state cannabis contradiction, rebalancing the drug control budget toward treatment (at least 50%), and reforming civil asset forfeiture to require criminal conviction; for Mexico, prioritising comprehensive criminal justice and police institutional reform over military force, piloting regulated cannabis and poppy markets, and repealing arraigo detention; for India, substantially increasing NCB funding and developing integrated inter-agency coordination, reviewing Section 37 bail restrictions for proportionality, dramatically expanding opioid substitution therapy in Punjab and the northeast, and strengthening precursor chemical controls. Across all three, the study advocates a fundamental recalibration from a paradigm centred on punishment and interdiction toward one grounded in public health, human rights, social justice, and evidencebased governance.

References

International Conventions

1. Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 520 UNTS 151 (1961), as amended by the 1972 Protocol
2. Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1019 UNTS 175 (Vienna, 1971)
3. UN Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 1582 UNTS 95 (Vienna, 1988)
4. UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, 2225 UNTS 209 (Palermo, 2000)
5. UN Convention Against Corruption, 2349 UNTS 41 (Merida, 2003)

US Legislation

1. Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act, Pub. L. 91-513 (1970)
2. Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99-570
3. Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, Pub. L. 100-690
4. Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968
 - a. Fair Sentencing Act of 2010, Pub. L. 111-220
5. First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. 115-391

US Cases

1. Gonzales v. Raich, 545 U.S. 1 (2005)
2. United States v. Booker, 543 U.S. 220 (2005)
3. Kimbrough v. United States, 552 U.S. 85 (2007)

Mexican Legislation

1. Constitucion Politica de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos (as amended to 2023)
2. Codigo Penal Federal, DOF, 14 August 1931 (as amended)
3. Ley General de Salud, DOF, 7 February 1984 (as amended)
4. Ley Federal Contra la Delincuencia Organizada, DOF, 7 November 1996 (as amended)
5. Ley Federal de Extincion de Dominio, DOF, 29 May 2009 (as amended 2019)
6. SCJN, Amparo en Revision 237/2014 (4 November 2015)

Indian Legislation

1. Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Act 61 of 1985), as amended 1988, 2001, 2014
2. Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (Act 15 of 2003)
3. Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974
4. Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act, 1958 (Act 28 of 1958)

Indian Cases

1. State of Punjab v. Balbir Singh, (1994) 3 SCC 299
2. Union of India v. Bal Mukund Dass, (2014) 11 SCC 340
3. Toofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu, (2021) 4 SCC 1
4. Haradhan Saha v. State of West Bengal, AIR 1974 SC 2154

Books

1. Alexander, Michelle, *The New Jim Crow* (New York: The New Press, 2010)
2. Astorga, Luis, *Seguridad, traficantes y militares* (Mexico City: Tusquets, 2007)
3. Astorga, Luis and Shirk, David, in Olson et al. (eds), *Shared Responsibility* (Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center, 2010)
4. Baggins, David Sadofsky, *Drug Hate and the Corruption of American Justice* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998)
5. Bewley-Taylor, Dave, *International Drug Control: Consensus Fractured* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
6. Boister, Neil, *Transnational Criminal Law*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018)
7. Courtwright, David T., *Dark Paradise* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001)
8. Courtwright, David T., *Forces of Habit* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001)
9. Escohotado, Antonio, *A Brief History of Drugs* (Rochester, VT: Park Street Press, 1999)
10. Gilman, Nils et al. (eds), *Deviant Globalization* (New York: Continuum, 2011)
11. Grillo, Ioan, *El Narco* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2011)
12. Grillo, Ioan, *Gangster Warlords* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2016)
13. Hari, Johann, *Chasing the Scream* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015)
14. Hernandez, Anabel, *Narcoland* (London: Verso, 2013)
15. Kilmer, Beau et al., *Marijuana Legalization*, 2nd edn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020)
16. Lubin, Alex, *Never-Ending War* (Berkeley: UC Press, 2021)
17. Maril, Robert Lee, *The Fence* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2011)
18. Martin, James, *Drugs on the Dark Net* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)
19. McAllister, William B., *Drug Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Routledge, 2000)
20. McCoy, Alfred W., *The Politics of Heroin*, rev. edn (Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2003)
21. Musto, David F., *The American Disease*, 3rd edn (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999)
22. Nadelmann, Ethan, *Cops Across Borders* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993)

23. Paoli, Letizia (ed), *The Oxford Handbook of Organized Crime* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)
24. Raghavan, R.K., *Policing a Democracy* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1999)
 - a. Reuter, Peter (ed), *Draining Development?* (Washington DC: World Bank, 2012)
25. Reuter, Peter and MacCoun, Robert, *Drug War Heresies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
26. Richards, John F., "The Opium Industry in British India," *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, Vol. 39, Nos. 2–3 (2002)
27. Shelley, Louise, *Dark Commerce* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018)
28. Surie, Poonam, *Narco-Terrorism and the Challenge to Indian Security* (New Delhi: IDSA, 2004)
29. Tonry, Michael, *Malign Neglect* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995)
30. Vargas, Jorge A., *Mexican Law* (Eagan, MN: West, 1998)
31. Wainwright, Tom, *Narconomics* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2016)
32. Zaidi, S. Hussain, *Dongri to Dubai* (New Delhi: Roli Books, 2012)
33. Zweigert, Konrad and Kotz, Hein, *An Introduction to Comparative Law*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)

Journal Articles

1. Bewley-Taylor, Dave, "Challenging the UN Drug Control Conventions," *International Journal of Drug Policy*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (2003), pp. 171–179
2. Chemerinsky, Erwin, "Medical Marijuana, Federalism, and the Limits of Commerce Clause Jurisprudence," *Fordham Law Review*, Vol. 74 (2005), pp. 793–825
3. Collins, John, "Regulations, Coherence and International Drug Control," *Journal of Illicit Economies and Development*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (2019)
4. Decker, Scott H. and Chapman, Margaret T., "Drug Smugglers on Drug Smuggling," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (2006), pp. 109–143
5. Kilmer, Beau and Reuter, Peter, "Prime Numbers: Doped," *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 197 (2013), pp. 28–29
6. Kleiman, Mark, "Toward (More Nearly) Optimal Sentencing for Drug Dealers," *Criminology and Public Policy*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (2004), pp. 435–440
7. Martin Reyes, Hugo A., "The Mexican Supreme Court and Cannabis," *Mexican Law Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (2018), pp. 3–38
8. Nadelmann, Ethan, "Drug Prohibition in the United States," *Science*, Vol. 245, No. 4921
9. (1989), pp. 939–947
10. Rios, Viridiana, "How Government Coordination Controlled Organized Crime," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 59, No. 8 (2015), pp. 1433–1454
11. Room, Robin et al., "Cannabis Policy: Moving Beyond Stalemate," *Lancet*, Vol. 374, No. 9690 (2009), pp. 674–683

12. Stevens, Alex, “The Ethics and Effectiveness of Coerced Treatment of Drug Users,” *Criminal Justice Ethics*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (2012), pp. 69–93
13. Official Reports and Documents
14. CDC, *Drug Overdose Deaths in the United States, 1999–2021*, NCHS Data Brief No. 457 (Atlanta: CDC, 2022)
15. DEA, *2023 National Drug Threat Assessment* (Washington DC: US DOJ, 2023)
16. FATF, *Anti-money Laundering – Mexico: Mutual Evaluation Report* (Paris: FATF, 2018)
17. FATF, *India Mutual Evaluation Report* (Paris: FATF, 2010)
18. GIEI, *Informe Ayotzinapa II* (Washington DC: IACHR, 2016)
19. Global Commission on Drug Policy, *War on Drugs Report* (Geneva: GCDP, 2011)
20. INCB, *Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 2022* (Vienna: UNODC, 2023)
21. INCB, *Precursors and Chemicals Report 2022* (Vienna: UNODC, 2023)
22. Narcotics Control Bureau, *Annual Report 2022* (New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs, 2022)
23. National AIDS Control Organisation, *India HIV Estimations 2021* (New Delhi: NACO, 2022)
24. National Drug Intelligence Center, *National Drug Threat Assessment 2011* (Washington DC: NDIC, 2011)
25. Oregon Health Authority, *Measure 110 Implementation Report* (Salem: OHA, 2023)
26. UNODC, *World Drug Report 2022* (Vienna: UNODC, 2022)
27. UNODC, *World Drug Report 2021, Booklets 1–6* (Vienna: UNODC, 2021)
28. UNODC, *Legislative Guide for the Implementation of UNTOC* (Vienna: UNODC, 2004)
29. US-China Economic and Security Review Commission, *Fentanyl: China’s Deadly Export*
30. (Washington DC: USCC, 2019)