

eliminates regular, productive work; strains or eliminates meaningful relationships; and militates against having family relationships.

Clinical surveillance, manifested mainly through frequent urine testing, gives those monitoring the clinical clients information about the clients' health, use of other drugs, and assurances that they are actually using the methadone. The assurance is important in preventing pharmaceutical-grade methadone from being diverted from the clinical setting and getting into the street market drug stream. When that occurs, it could mean that the client has returned to heroin use or that he or she may need a smaller dosage of methadone. That notwithstanding, testing reveals that the greatest drug problem for in-program MMT clientele is alcohol, as large numbers apparently self-medicate with that drug.

Additionally, monitoring has revealed that most clients need 80 to 120 milligrams per deciliter to relieve craving and to repress withdrawal symptoms from recurring for 24 to 36 hours. At that preferred dosage, it also blocks the effects of heroin and the concomitant euphoria and emotional impairment that occur under heroin intoxication. In some cases, however, heavy heroin users or those who are used to stronger strains of heroin may require a heavier methadone regimen, while others who are used to weaker heroin dosages could require less. A common complaint from clients is that the general dosage level of methadone is too weak to work effectively.

While MMT is generally seen as successful, it continues to be attacked by more traditional combatants of drug abuse and some within the recovery field as sending the wrong message about drugs. Their general point is that one should not substitute one addictive drug for another and that the addict should learn to live without drugs altogether. Moreover, buprenorphine, another synthetic opioid, is presently making inroads as a substitute drug for heroin users. For reasons too complex for elaboration in the present context, it is becoming the dominant mode of substitution therapy in Europe and is becoming more common in the United States.

*Francis Frederick Hawley*

*See also* Drug Testing; Drug Therapy

## Further Readings

- Dole, V. P. "A Medical Treatment for Diacetylmorphine (Heroin) Addiction: A Clinical Trial With Methadone Hydrochloride." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, v.193/8 (1965).
- Faupel Charles E., et al. *The Sociology of American Drug Use*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Joseph, Herman, et al. "Methadone Maintenance Treatment (MMT): A Review of Historical and Clinical Issues." *Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine*, v.67/5–6 (2000).
- Levinthal, Charles F. *Drugs, Society, and Criminal Justice*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall, 2012.
- Lyman, Michael D. *Drugs in Society*. New York, NY: Anderson, 2014.
- Mosher, Clayton J. and Scott M. Akins. *Drugs and Drug Policy: The Control of Consciousness Alteration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2014.

## MEXICO

Surveillance, security, and privacy in Mexico need to be understood both within the context of the ongoing war on drugs and the need to lower crime rates in big cities such as Mexico City, Guadalajara, and Monterrey. Moreover, as security along the U.S.-Mexico border has become a pressing issue for U.S. foreign policy, it is also important to perceive surveillance in Mexico as a phenomenon that is deeply connected to U.S.-Mexico relations. The future of U.S.-Mexico relations is tied to the need of securing the border, combating drug trafficking, and lowering the levels of violence in Mexico.

While bilateral cooperation in terms of security and surveillance has meant the modernization of Mexico's law enforcement agencies, it has also reinforced the presence of the United States in Mexican affairs. For example, the U.S. Congress, via the Merida Initiative—a bilateral partnership that began in the fiscal year 2008—has appropriated around \$2.3 billion to jointly fight organized crime and associated violence in Mexico. The initiative has funded the purchase of X-ray scanners, air mobility for Mexican police forces through the delivery of specialized aircraft and training for pilots and technicians, and the delivery of 400 canines trained for the detection of explosives,

drugs, and ammunition. Moreover, this program has provided funding for the development of a cross-border communication system that enables Mexican and U.S. authorities to share valuable information at a faster pace.

Although the Merida Initiative was conceived within the context of fighting organized crime, it has also had a large impact on the daily lives of Mexicans, particularly on privacy matters. For instance, as the war on drugs rages on, Mexicans have become accustomed to seeing the Mexican armed forces in the streets. Furthermore, as the Merida Initiative has transformed the perception of how to battle against organized crime, local police departments across the country have been largely militarized. The war on drugs and the need to achieve security and stability in the country have also led to a larger number of surveillance measures, such as road checkpoints in all major federal routes and the use of X-ray machines for the scanning of vehicles and people.

Surveillance efforts to lower crime rates in Mexico have shown mixed results. The biggest issues have been in the area of privacy. For instance, in 2012 and 2014, the Mexican Congress approved a legislation that demands telecommunications companies to store up to 24 months of their clients' information on a daily basis. Information gathered by telephone, cell phone, and Internet providers can contain users' locations, websites being visited, details of payments made over the phone or the Internet, and a wide array of personal information. This legislation also allows Mexican authorities to request the information gathered on clients without any warrant or review by a judge. While these new measures have been championed by the federal government as modern tools for combating organized crime more effectively, it is important to note that the lack of checks and balances in the application of this legislation could ultimately mean a threat to privacy rights.

While federal legislation allowing the collection and release of private information seems to mimic the powers granted by the USA PATRIOT Act to the U.S. federal authorities, it is important to consider the phenomenon of security and surveillance in Mexico as one that does not only involve the Mexican federal government or the U.S. foreign policy. Local and state governments have also

shown a growing interest in acquiring surveillance equipment. The logic underlying the need to acquire new surveillance technologies—such as intelligent cameras that can track the license plates of a vehicle—is that they will enable the authorities to lower crime rates and to provide better services to the citizenry. Local governments in major cities in Mexico, such as Guadalajara, Puebla, and Monterrey, have implemented the use of cameras in busy areas to reduce crime and to speed up police response. These cameras are monitored by the police on a 24-hour basis.

The case that may better illustrate recent improvements in security and surveillance in Mexico is the one of its capital city. As one of the largest metropolitan areas of the world, and with 8.5 million tourists flooding the city streets every year, the local government of Mexico City has decided to implement a program named *Ciudad Segura* (safe city). Mimicking law enforcement programs in cities such as Chicago, New York, and Jerusalem, the specific goals of *Ciudad Segura* are to lower crime rates, increase law enforcement presence, create stronger networks between the citizenry and government authorities, and improve emergency response. The program's main focus is the supervision of almost 14,500 cameras that are scattered throughout the city and are monitored from five different command centers. Law enforcement agencies in Mexico City also make use of unmanned aerial vehicles to monitor protests and traffic jams. While Mexico City's local government claims that the *Ciudad Segura* program has lowered crime rates as well as police response time substantially, it is difficult to determine whether these results are directly related to the use of surveillance cameras or whether they have to do with other factors.

It is also important to understand this program within the context of an increasing global trend that favors the use of surveillance tools to support law enforcement efforts. This new reality represents an opportunity for Mexican and foreign corporations, who now see their participation in the provision of security as a business that promises high returns. For example, the case of the *Ciudad Segura* program brings to light how Telmex (the largest data and communications provider in Mexico) and Thales (a French security, defense, and aerospace corporation) have partnered to

install the surveillance cameras currently operating in Mexico City. In addition to the cameras, Telmex and Thales have provided the technology and infrastructure for the construction of five command centers, as well as of two mobile command units and 250 intelligence positions. The cost of the first phase of this program was \$35.6 million for the provision of more than 8,000 surveillance cameras. Telmex and Thales were selected again as providers to increase the number of cameras in the city to nearly 14,500. For the two private companies, this represented additional substantial revenues.

The modernization of federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies has essentially been geared toward technological developments for improving security, such as the acquisition of better weaponry and surveillance systems. Notwithstanding such actions, the relationship between these institutions and the Mexican citizenry has not visibly improved. This can be illustrated by the recent atrocities and human rights abuses committed by Mexico's security forces in Apatzingán, Tanhuato, Tlatlaya, and Ayotzinapa, which have severely eroded citizens' trust in Mexico's authorities.

Finally, it is difficult to assess whether recent surveillance and security measures implemented in Mexico have had positive effects. While confidence in law enforcement officials continues to be low, and accusations of extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, and torture by such actors have not been infrequent, it is true that crime rates have lowered in certain parts of the country. However, it remains difficult to find a clear correlation between the use of security and surveillance measures and a decrease in the levels of crime and violence.

*Guadalupe Correa-Cabrera and  
Carlos Daniel Gutierrez-Mannix*

*See also* Closed-Circuit Television; Municipal Surveillance; Privacy; United States; War on Drugs

### Further Readings

Pallito, Robert and Josiah Heyman. "Theorizing Cross-Border Mobility: Surveillance, Security and Identity." *Surveillance & Society*, v.5/3 (2008).

RAND Corporation. "Security in México: Implications for U.S. Policy Options." [http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND\\_MG876.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG876.pdf) (Accessed December 2015).

Reuters. "Mexico Ramps up Surveillance to Fight Crime, But Controls Lax." <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-mexico-surveillance-idUSKCN0S61WY20151012> (Accessed December 2015).

Selke, Clare and Flinnea Cristin. "U.S.-Mexican Security Cooperation: The Mérida Initiative and Beyond." *Congressional Research Service*, 7-5700. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41349.pdf> (Accessed December 2015).

Thales. "Mexico City, the World's Most Ambitious Urban Security Programme." <https://www.thalesgroup.com/en/worldwide/security/case-study/mexico-city-worlds-most-ambitious-urban-security-programme> (Accessed December 2015).

U.S. Department of State. "Merida Initiative." <http://www.state.gov/j/inl/merida/index.htm> (Accessed December 2015).

## MILITARY INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

World Wars I and II saw the establishment of the armaments industry as an economic powerhouse in the United States. Through each major subsequent international conflict since the world wars, the armed forces and the defense industries that supplied them have emerged as a priority in the United States' budgetary allocation. President Dwight D. Eisenhower observed this transformation and warned the American people about the implications of the emerging construct. In January 1961, President Eisenhower delivered his farewell address to the American people. It was during this speech that he coined the term *military industrial complex*. He used the term to describe the intimate relationship between the military establishment, the political structure, and the defense industry. Eisenhower cautioned that this relationship between an immense military establishment and a large arms industry would become the new American experience and that total influence—economic, political, and even spiritual—would be felt in every city, every state house, and every office of the federal government.

According to Eisenhower, although he recognized the need for this development, the American