

Clinton's War on Drugs wins victories, despite congressional sabotage

by Joyce Fredman

During the past three years, the Clinton administration has conducted a quiet but persistent revolution in American anti-drug policy. President Clinton has taken a different approach than previous administrations, whose "war" was in large part characterized by rhetoric. In fact, the term "War on Drugs," coined by Lyndon LaRouche and *EIR*, was so abused and bandied about, that the Clinton team rejected the phrase altogether, despite the fact that they were actually conducting such a campaign, unlike their loud-mouthed predecessors.

These efforts have proceeded on four important fronts: 1) an unambiguous rejection of drug legalization; 2) support given to governments who are engaged in crackdowns on narco-terrorism; 3) a campaign against Hollywood and its glorification of drugs and the drug culture; 4) serious global moves to shut down the drug cartels at their nerve center, the money-laundering apparatus.

Most significant was the U.S. Justice Department's June 5, 1995 indictment in Miami of the entire leadership of Colombia's Cali Cartel and associated former U.S. lawyers, including Michael Abbell, who had served for 17 years in the Department of Justice. Four days later, Colombian and U.S. officials raided the Cali apartment of Gilberto Rodríguez Orejuela, arresting the cartel boss.

These policies culminated in the initiatives taken in October 1995, declaring the narco-terrorist networks a national security threat, and prioritizing the closing of 50 leading money-laundering centers internationally. A review of these activities, including the countermoves to sabotage the efforts, puts into a clear perspective who the real anti-drug warriors are, and who are the hypocrites.

No to drug legalization

Despite the pre-election forecasts of the media, and fervent expectations of the decriminalization crowd, Clinton and his cabinet officials have said it loud and often—*No* to legalization. Dr. Lee Brown, outgoing director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), has been the most vocal.

On May 21, 1994, a forum was held at the Harvard Law School on Crime, Drugs, Health, and Prohibition; it was heavily weighted toward decriminalization, and advertised itself thus: "The 1992 conference featured 16 workshops

highlighting the futility of drug prohibition. This conference will include a constructive dialogue from both points of view on the question: Would a public health approach, similar to [that of] European nations, be more effective than the existing criminal justice model?"

In the midst of this cultural pessimism, came a strong response. Dr. Brown gave the keynote address and made clear his purpose in attending:

"I am participating in this conference because it provides an excellent opportunity to clearly state this administration's stance on legalization. And that is as follows:

"Our number one goal is to reduce the number of drug users in America. Legalization is a formula for self-destruction, and this administration is unequivocally opposed to any 'reform' that is certain to increase drug use.

"As a former police officer who walked the beat and ran three major police departments, I have witnessed firsthand the pain, the despair, and the lawlessness that surround the drug trade. Those that argue in support of legalization as a solution to these problems are simply wrong. And it is my job, as director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the President's chief adviser on drug policy, to go wherever it is necessary, whenever it is necessary, and before whatever forum to state the truth: Drug use is a serious, multifaceted problem that adversely impacts this great nation in many and varied ways. . . .

"[There is a myth] that there is massive support for policy change by social thinkers, policy-level officials, and the public at large. This includes broad support for legalization, or the decriminalization of drug use.

"In fact, there is no massive support for legalization. A 1990 Gallup poll showed that 80% of the public thought that legalizing drugs was a bad idea. . . .

"Reflecting the views of the American public, there is no meaningful support within Congress for the legalization of illicit drugs.

"And in fact, policy-level officials who are directly responsible for the drug issue—*beginning with the President*—oppose legalization. I do, too. . . .

"Another . . . myth is that there are excellent foreign models to show that decriminalization works: The Netherlands and the U.K. are two.



Lee Brown, the outgoing director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, has been a strong spokesman against drug legalization, and against the efforts of congressional Republicans to dismantle anti-drug programs.

"This is another fantastic myth. One need only read the international press to realize the degree to which the Dutch have visited upon themselves misery from drug abuse, by enacting drug laws that go unenforced, and policies that encourage 'responsible' use rather than discourage any use at all. The Dutch are pleased to say they have remained mostly unscathed by drug use by their own citizens. They cannot say the same of the many thousands of foreign visitors who arrive to buy drugs, steal or panhandle to keep using them, and then ask the Dutch to treat them for addiction.

"And one need only recall the disastrous experience of Great Britain with the controlled distribution of heroin. In the years between 1959 and 1968—according to the 1981 *British Medical Journal*—the number of heroin addicts in the U.K. doubled every 16 months. The experiment was, of course, terminated. But addiction rates in the U.K. have not subsided.

"At the same time, no one mentions Italy, which permits heroin and other drugs to be used legally, and where the number of heroin addicts—some 350,000, by official estimates—and the level of HIV prevalence—an estimated 70%—are higher than those in any other country in Western Europe. I ask myself at times why those who advocate drug policy reform are so quiet about the Italian model. . . .

"In 1917, the renowned American journalist and social observer, H.L. Mencken, remarked: 'There is always an easy solution to every human problem—neat, plausible, and wrong.'

"To the overwhelming number of Americans, to the Clinton administration, to the American Congress, to American policymakers of this as well as prior administrations, to Americans involved with drug programs across the country, to Americans in drug-blighted communities across the country, legalization is exactly such a solution—neat, plausible, and wrong. Speaking for these Americans and for this administration, I can tell you that *it's just not going to happen*" (all emphasis in original).

Dr. Brown's voice is not alone. On Aug. 18, 1995, in the *Wall Street Journal*, U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala wrote an op-ed attacking drug legalization and refuting the attempts to portray marijuana as benign. "Given the facts, it is surprising that some people in Washington and elsewhere continue to bring up the issue of legalizing marijuana and other illicit drugs," she said. "That would be a huge mistake. First, marijuana is a problem in our country because it is harmful—not because it is illicit. Research continues to show that it damages short-term memory, distorts perception, impairs judgment and complex motor skills, alters the heart rate, can lead to severe anxiety, and can cause paranoia and lethargy. . . .

"Legalization of marijuana almost certainly would cause more young people to use—and become addicted to—marijuana, as well as other drugs. In part, that's because legalizing drugs takes away a significant deterrent against drug use. Moreover, for as long as we have monitored drug use, we have seen that whenever there is a decrease in the percentage of young people who perceive marijuana use as harmful, the percentage of users increases. Inevitably, legalization would suggest to young people that marijuana is not harmful—thereby knocking down a powerful barrier to use. . . . Indeed, reversing directions and legalizing marijuana could cause young people to dismiss warnings they have heard from government and the larger society about other illicit drugs like crack, cocaine, and heroin—an erosion of trust that must never be allowed to happen."

Meanwhile, the architects of the Conservative Revolution, such as Milton Friedman and William F. Buckley, Jr., continued their drumbeat for legalization, talking about what a failure criminalization has been. Drug Enforcement Administration Administrator Thomas Constantine characterized them as "false prophets" who undermine the nation's resolve. "This group of false prophets tell people that if we legalize drugs the problem will go away. . . . I have a plan," he said. "Let those wealthy people who want to legalize drugs try it out on their own families, in their own wealthy neighborhoods. Let them do it in their rich schools. . . . That will end the push for drug legalization."

International efforts

Dr. Brown traveled extensively around the world, to give support to those governments who have made anti-drug policy a priority. Clinton made Dr. Brown's position as ONDCP

director a cabinet post, signaling both his trust in Brown and his prioritization of the drug fight.

In 1994, Brown was in Asia, and on Aug. 29, 1995, he gave a press conference on his just-concluded trip to South America, stressing his strong impression of the political will of the anti-drug forces in Ibero-America. He also emphasized taking an approach here based on respect for national sovereignty, a key ingredient in an effective war on drugs, and one that was decidedly missing during the Bush years.

Brown's trip included Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela, and Brazil (he did not go to Colombia because of what he referred to as their "internal problems"). Concerning his meeting with President Alberto Fujimori of Peru, Brown talked about the progress made in shutting down the airplanes between Peru and Colombia, which serve as a shipment route for cocaine base. "For the first six months of this year," he said, "the number of drug flights from Peru to Colombia is down 30% over the same period last year. The quantity of cocaine shipped is down 43% over the same period last year. . . . Estimates of cocaine base awaiting buyers and transportation run as high as 30 metric tons. And, finally, reported transportation costs for air shipments from Peru to Colombia have gone up as much as five times. So we are seeing the results of an effective strategy, developed some time ago, now paying benefits for us."

Brown also met with President Sánchez de Lozada of Bolivia, and President Rafael Caldera of Venezuela, as well as justice ministers and top narcotics enforcement officials in all the countries he visited.

Perhaps most significant were his comments on Venezuela. Brown praised the efforts of the Caldera government, while implicitly impugning the regime of Carlos Andrés Pérez, Caldera's Bush-tainted predecessor as President.

Said Brown of his Venezuela trip, "What we saw was not only the political will, but the actual eradication of the coca and the poppy in that mountain range, and that's a very difficult thing to do. There are no roads going up there. . . . They are doing a good job in addressing the problem.

"They, too, are also concerned about the consumption problem. Venezuela has also developed *for the first time* a national drug control strategy. In our country, for example, we have a strategy that . . . must be presented to the Congress each year. Venezuela has developed for the first time their strategy" (emphasis added).

Brown made clear that he is not blind to the difficulties that lie ahead, such as the spreading of opium poppy plants throughout the area (South America is now responsible for 30% of the heroin entering the United States), and the shifting of transshipment routes into such areas as Brazil's western Amazon, which is not currently covered by radar.

But, he stressed, "for the first time . . . we have the right combination of political will and enforcement success. We now have an opportunity to further disrupt the supply of drugs to the U.S. . . . and we must begin now to beef up our

capacity to stop transit by river and land, as well as to increase enforcement resources against new trafficker routes. While this is daunting, it is what we need to do because of the success we are having in blocking the main arteries of the supply routes controlled by the Cali Cartel."

Campaign against Hollywood

On Oct. 19, 1995, Brown addressed the Entertainment Industries Council of 150 "creative community" executives from television, music, and movies. He rejected any notion of partisan politics in the anti-drug effort. "In recent months, one of my predecessors, Bill Bennett, and Majority Leader Bob Dole have spoken out about the media's impact on our cultural climate. Their comments about the excessive violence, drugs, and depraved imagery in some popular music and films echoed the concerns that President Clinton has voiced on many occasions. Let's be clear that this is not a Republican or Democratic issue. It is an American crisis. It is a bipartisan concern that is of paramount importance to all Americans."

He went on to discuss the role the mass media and entertainment industry play in shaping children's perceptions. "The influence of all of these negative images is particularly relevant to the use of drugs, because every recent study has documented that drug use among adolescents is on the rise. There is no mistaking that America's children are at risk. . . . Just recently, a rock album was released that glorifies the smoking of marijuana and advocates legalization. 'Hempilation,' the title of the record album, is a celebration of pot smoking, featuring 17 performing groups including the Black Crowes. Just a look at the titles of some of the songs on the album is enough to make one sick. There are songs included such as 'Champagne and Reefer,' 'Who's Got the Herb?' 'I Wanna Get High,' 'I Like Marijuana,' and 'Legalize It.'

"I would ask the producers and performers of this project: How irresponsible can one be? Marijuana is dangerous, harmful, and illegal. Those who call for the legalization of marijuana or who advocate its use are wrong, wrong, wrong. I don't care if it's a high-minded policy institute or a record company, they are wrong, they are wrong."

The other side mobilizes

One would expect the so-called law and order types to rally to these initiatives. Not so. During the first week of August 1995, when the Colombian government of Cali Cartel-linked President Ernesto Samper Pizano was being assaulted by corruption scandals, the U.S. war on drugs, energized by the June 5 Miami indictments against the Cali Cartel, could have used some backup. Instead, the Conservative Revolution Republicans in the U.S. Congress launched an assault on every anti-drug effort being undertaken by the Clinton administration, including a call for dismantling the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy.

On July 27, the Senate Appropriations Treasury, Postal

Service, General Government Subcommittee approved a proposal to abolish the job of White House drug policy adviser, a position created by the Congress seven years before to coordinate efforts in this area, and one that President Clinton saw as crucial to the anti-drug fight.

ONDCP Director Brown responded: "In the name of cost savings and efficiency, they would generate the far higher cost and inefficiency of individual agencies' gunning for control on their own—exactly the problem ONDCP was created to solve in the first place."

President Clinton announced that he would veto the bill if this proposal, part of a \$23 billion appropriations bill that would finance the Treasury Department, White House, and small agencies for fiscal year 1996, which began on Oct. 1, 1995, passed both houses of Congress. The President said that any removal of funds would "seriously undermine the nation's battle against drug abuse and drug-related crime." He also said that shutting down the office "would severely curtail my ability to sustain a coordinated strategy among some 50 federal agencies involved in drug control. Just when this coordinated effort is showing sustained success, the subcommittee is proposing we go back to the days when the nation did not have coordinated drug-control strategy." He added that Director Brown is doing "an extraordinary job."

Sen. Richard Shelby (R-Ala.), the chairman of the committee that proposed this fiasco, blustered: "If this administration will not facilitate and prosecute the drug war, then Congress is forced to do it for them. I believe my subcommittee will go to the mat on this issue." He claimed that if the administration "had worked as hard at making this position effective as it has at trying to save this office, then the committee would likely be looking to *increase* rather than reduce funding."

How likely? The actions of these legislators speak louder than their words. Look at their July 1995 activities:

- The House Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations Subcommittee voted to cut by 60% the only school-based federally funded drug prevention program, the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act, cutting it from \$500 million to \$200 million. The program serves 94% of the country's school districts and 39 million students.

- On July 19, the House Appropriations Committee voted to remove all money for the President's community policing program that has already put 16,351 new police officers on the streets. The appropriations bill puts all funds into a \$1.9 billion block grant with no guarantee that the money will go to hiring more police. The Commerce, Justice, State, and Federal Judiciary Appropriations bill eliminates funds for the drug court program, which requires drug-using offenders to get treatment or go to prison.

- On July 20, the House voted to cut the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program. This, in light of the fact that the Miami HIDTA joint task force agencies ran the investiga-

tion that led to the indictments of Cali drug cartel lawyers (including former senior Justice Department prosecutor Michael Abbell) and arrests of cartel leaders in Colombia. The Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations bill also includes cuts in the Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center, a program that provides new counter-drug technology for U.S. law enforcement.

- On July 18, the House Appropriations Committee blue-penciled the Housing and Urban Development drug elimination grants program designed to fight drug-related crime in public housing projects.

- On July 20, the House Appropriations Committee slashed the budget for Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services which provides substance abuse treatment, prevention, and mental health services for tens of thousands of pregnant women, as well as other high-risk groups. The Labor-HHS-Education bill cut \$371 million from the \$1.4 billion requested, one-third of the overall \$1.1 billion in cuts to the Health and Human Services Department.

- On July 10, the House voted to cut, from \$213 million down to \$113 million, the International Drug Law Enforcement Bureau at the State Department. The ONDCP assessment is that this will "have a devastating effect on our efforts to combat international drug-trafficking efforts, and sends the wrong message to the countries we urge to fight drug production and trafficking."

Gingrich: legalization or death penalty

Never one to miss a chance at the microphone, House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), during July's Republican National Committee policy forum, called for a national referendum on legalization. He, too, claims to be an anti-drug warrior. He says, let the American people choose between legalization and the death penalty. Lee Brown called this "the ultimate in extremism and defeatism," and noted that "drug abuse is an American crisis, not a partisan political opportunity. It does not help kids or serve them well, when our leaders play partisan politics with an issue that goes to the heart of everything we hold dear."

Despite the GOP attacks, Brown continued on the anti-drug offensive. In July, he issued a statement calling on the entertainment business and the Madison Avenue ad agencies to stop glamorizing the drug culture in their product promotions. He also attacked the idea of holding up professional athletes who use drugs as role models for youth, citing the case of professional baseball player Daryl Strawberry, who has repeatedly gotten into trouble for drug abuse, yet was recently hired by the New York Yankees.

Brown cited recent statistics showing that marijuana-related emergency room visits have nearly doubled in the last five years and are now recorded nearly as often as cocaine. "These numbers rebut the notion that marijuana is a benign drug."

Brown continued: "Perhaps there is some nervousness about our recent efforts to take on major sports leaders for sending a terrible message to youth by condoning repeated drug abuse. Or maybe there is a reaction to our taking on industry officials. . . . Right now, as we speak, HIDTA joint task forces, which my office funds, are working on additional cases like the Cali drug cartel indictments successfully arranged by the Miami HIDTA agencies. Our office worked closely with the President in his decision to decertify Colombia from aid and loans if they do not cooperate on drug control. As a result of the President's action, we have seen three of the top five Cali Cartel leaders arrested over the past few weeks. . . . Right now, we are in the process of designating additional federal-state-local partnerships across the country in order to focus anti-drug efforts where they can be most productive."

He reiterated his intent to continue fighting any initiatives by any group for the legalization of marijuana. He also cited a recent national survey showing that adolescents aged 12 to 17 view drugs as the most serious problem they face—"more than sex, violence, or their parents." The survey says that more than 80% of 10th and 12th graders said marijuana is easy to get; 54% said that cocaine or heroin were also accessible.

Yet, as recently as July, William F. Buckley, Jr., a leading figure in Mont Pelerin Society circles, wrote in his *National Review* that the war on drugs has been lost, and the United States should legalize all drugs. Gingrich called for a national referendum posing draconian police-state measures, including an increased use of the death penalty, as the only alternative to outright legalization.

The efforts of this gaggle of Adam Smith clones to paint President Clinton and drug adviser Brown as the "softies" on drugs, backfired. It was, after all, under the direction of George Bush that a character as unsavory as Oliver North employed both the Medellín and Cali cartels as "assets," "piggy banks" in his secret wars. That stands in stark contrast to the directives Bill Clinton signed in October.

Executive orders against money laundering

In a series of unprecedented moves, President Clinton made clear that "a national security threat to the United States" exists, in the form of narco-terrorism, and that, therefore, continuing extraordinary measures will be taken to combat what this administration sees as the increasing danger of a "nexus among terrorists, narcotics traffickers, and other international criminals."

The act of identifying an international force behind narcotics trafficking, and taking the appropriate actions to dismantle the associated financial networks, was a step long awaited by the American people. Unlike past administrations, Clinton came through on this issue. On Oct. 22, the President signed Executive Order 12978. The order states that "significant foreign narcotics traffickers . . . constitute

an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States."

The Order goes on to restrict various business transactions with specific companies and individuals who are associated with said traffickers. "To attack the danger of international organized crime, the President has ordered five specific initiatives designed to deny the criminals their ability to launder their illicit profits, shut down so-called 'legitimate' front companies financed and controlled by the world's largest drug cartel, enhance U.S. legislation to put the criminals

In reply to Gingrich, Lee Brown noted that "drug abuse is an American crisis, not a partisan political opportunity. It does not help kids or serve them well, when our leaders play partisan politics with an issue that goes to the heart of everything we hold dear."

in jail, increase training and assistance to the world's law enforcement agencies, and promote greater international cooperation in the fight."

Key to this initiative is the fact that it takes aim at money laundering, an aspect of organized crime which was all but ignored by previous administrations. "Criminal enterprises are moving vast sums of ill-gotten gains through the international financial system with absolute impunity," said Clinton in his speech to the United Nations on Oct. 22. "We must not allow them to wash the blood of profits from the sale of drugs, from terror, or organized crimes."

But this was not the first time this administration has targeted dirty-money operations. In fact, it has become an increasing priority of law enforcement over the past two years. On June 5, the indictment handed down by federal prosecutors in Miami targeted not only Colombian drug kingpins, but their lawyers as well, including three former Justice Department officials. This attack on the Cali Cartel's operations had money-laundering as one of its major components. And Michael Abbell, one of the lawyers indicted, had formerly, in his days at the Justice Department, been a top aide to Deputy Assistant Attorney General Mark Richard in the DOJ's Criminal Division.

On Dec. 16, 1994, international, federal, state, and local law enforcement officials disclosed Operation Dinero, a multi-agency investigation into the financial web of drug trafficking. The bust netted nine tons of cocaine, plus \$52 million in cash and assets. Most important, it established new

priorities in drug investigations. "It is the first time a U.S. government agency has operated a financial institution for the purpose of targeting the financial networks of international drug organizations," said DEA Administrator Constantine. "In effect, Dinero put us squarely in the middle of the high-tech world of banking and the sophisticated electronic movement of money."

In 1985, a strategy for fighting an effective War on Drugs was outlined by Lyndon LaRouche. It included three critical points: identifying narco-terrorism, money laundering, and the international narcotics business as a multinational operation. All three of these points have been a constant theme in President Clinton's effort.

In a press conference on Oct. 30, Robert Gelbard, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, elaborated the President's moves. "The problem of money-laundering . . . is a dramatic and still increasing problem. . . . The President has announced that he has instructed the secretaries of Treasury and State and the Attorney General to identify and notify nations which are the most egregious in facilitating criminal money-laundering of all kinds. . . . We would hope that they would enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements to conform to international standards. . . ."

"The President did say that if these nations do not enter into such agreements and implement them after an appropriate amount of time, the secretary of the Treasury, after consulting with the secretary of State and the Attorney General, will recommend to the President whether economic sanctions should be applied. There is a range of possibilities involved in this, but they could include, among other possible sanctions . . . prohibiting the use of electronic funds transfers and dollar-clearing mechanisms to financial institutions in the subject country. We understand fully that these could be and would be, if implemented, very dramatic measures, but we feel that it is a measure of the seriousness of the problem and the dire state to which the money-laundering problem has risen, that it is important to try to find ways to solve this problem and develop cooperative mechanisms around the world to prevent this problem from spreading any further."

Money laundering is now estimated at \$1.3 trillion a year, up \$300 billion from last year. "Criminal enterprises are moving vast sums of ill-gotten gains through the international financial system with absolute impunity. We must not allow them to wash the blood of profits from the sale of drugs from terror or organized crimes. . . . Nations should bring their banks and financial systems into conformity with the international anti-money-laundering standards. . . . And if they refuse, we will consider appropriate actions."

The actions referred to were stated in the White House Summary sheet. "Much of the problem . . . stems from the corrosive effect on markets and governments of their large illicit funds—blood money gained from their criminal acts. While we must continue vigorously to disrupt the enter-

prises which produce these funds, we will now greatly increase our efforts in going after their money and other assets directly."

In his speech to the United Nations, Gelbard specified, "The President announced that he has instructed the secretaries of the Treasury and State and the Attorney General to identify and notify the nations which are most egregious in facilitating criminal money laundering that they should enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements to conform to international standards. . . . If these nations do not enter into such agreements and implement laws against money laundering, the secretary of the Treasury, after consulting with the secretary of State and the Attorney General, will recommend to the President whether economic sanctions should be applied."

Within two weeks of this announcement, Arnaud de Borchgrave, former editor of the *Washington Times*, reported that the President had also signed a Presidential Decision Directive, that once again notes a national security threat posed by narcotics trafficking, illegal immigration, money laundering, smuggling of nuclear and chemical weapons material, assassinations, and bribery of government officials, and orders government agencies to "use creatively and aggressively all legal means to combat international organized crime." The directive was said to be addressed to the vice president; the secretaries of state, defense, and the Treasury, the attorney general; the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations; the directors of the CIA, FBI, Office of Management and Budget, Office of National Drug Control Policy, and Drug Enforcement Administration; and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In a press conference held in New York, Gelbard was questioned about the targets of this directive. He emphasized the importance of financial misdealings, and reiterated that only countries that engaged in this kind of activity would receive any reprobation.

"At this point," he said, "we're looking at a range of countries in which we see a tremendous amount of activity related to money laundering and other kinds of financial crimes, as I say, due to their unwillingness or inability so far to implement the measures." Included in the memo are negotiations "to close down about 50 money-laundering centers in the world," most of them "tiny sovereign nations and members of the United Nations." Asked who are the most egregious offenders, Gelbard refused to answer. "What we want to do right now is, now that we've put these countries on warning, we want to go to them quickly, which we expect to do within the next week or so, and approach them stressing the need for them to undertake these measures rapidly or face obvious consequences." Giving out more details than that, Gelbard noted, would jeopardize the operation.

It is long overdue that America has a President and an administration that consider narco-terrorism and money laundering a security threat.