

Fractured Underworld: The Logic of Fragmentation in Organized Crime

Marco Alcocer^{*†} Lucía Hesles Toscana[‡]

March 30, 2025

Abstract

Criminal organizations (COs) often fragment, leading to the emergence of new independent COs. This article examines the factors influencing defection and their impact on subsequent fragmentation patterns. We argue that potential defectors strategically weigh economic viability and their probability of surviving retaliation from the CO they betray, considerations which shape who fragments, where, and when. Leveraging an original dataset covering major drug cartels in Mexico and the population of fragments from 2000 to 2018, we find that members at various ranks lead defections due to leadership turnover and internal disputes. Larger fragments sometimes operate near their originating cartel's stronghold, while smaller ones only fragment when they operate in distant areas to safeguard themselves from retaliation. Moreover, fragments operating near their originating cartel form military alliances with other cartels to survive retaliation. We also document key characteristics differentiating fragments from their originating cartels that suggest they may be more violent and predatory.

*We thank Hannah Baron, David Smilde, Guillermo Trejo, David Skarbek, Steve Levitsky, Alisha Holland, Jessica Zarkin, Kaitlyn Chriswell and participants of the speaker series at The Center for Inter-American Policy and Research (CIPR) at Tulane University, the 2024 Studies of Organized Crime and Politics MPSA Mini-Conference, and the Latin American Discussion Group (LADG) at Harvard University. We also thank Patrick Signoret, with whom Marco Alcocer began the data collection process, and the research assistance of Karina Velázquez Villatoro and Isaac Del Río Castro.

[†]Academy Scholar, The Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies

[‡]ITAM

1 Introduction

In December of 2006, Mexico’s government began a crackdown against drug cartels and adopted a strategy of leadership decapitation—removing cartel leaders. Soon after, large drug cartels began fragmenting and giving rise to new cartels that reshaped the criminal landscape. Hundreds of thousands of homicides have occurred since the government crackdown began, and criminal fragmentation has become one key factor used to understand the increasing violence. Scholars have argued that fragmentation increasing the number of inter- and intra-cartel conflicts is a key mechanisms through which government leadership decapitation strategies increase violence (Ríos 2013; Phillips 2015; Trejo and Ley 2016; Atuesta and Ponce 2017; Atuesta and Pérez-Dávila 2018; Velasco 2023; Esberg 2025). Moreover, criminal fragmentation is not limited to Mexico, powerful criminal organizations (COs) have fragmented in Italy, Brazil, El Salvador, Guatemala, Ecuador, the US, Colombia, Mexico, and Japan, among others, and this fragmentation is frequently blamed for increases in violence.

Yet, while the violent consequences of leadership decapitation and the increasing number of cartels have received considerable attention, cartel fragmentation itself remains largely understudied. This project seeks to fill this clear gap in the literature by opening the “black box” of fragmentation and asking: what is the underlying logic of criminal fragmentation? That is, what prompts fragmentation and what role do government policies play? Who within these organizations leads the defection? What factors shape a defector’s decision to fragment and how do they affect the patterns of fragmentation?

To answer these questions, the article first provides a novel theoretical framework about the logic underlying criminal fragmentation and its observable implications. First, while the conventional wisdom is that government leadership decapitation strategies drive fragmentation and that fragmentation is led by leaders who lose leadership struggles, we believe broader factors that create moments of instability may lead potential defectors to consider fragmenting and that defectors need not be high-ranking members. Second, we argue that

when considering fragmenting, potential defectors must consider two key factors: profits and survival, which are fundamentally shaped by illicit markets, geography, and relations with other COs. In terms of profits, potential defectors need to have access to a source of income at the time of defection to convince followers, continue operating, and finance defenses against retaliation by the CO they betray. The lower the rank the potential defector, the more likely they only have access to more localized illicit markets compared to the larger CO they are splintering from. In terms of survival, potential defectors need to ask whether they will survive if they defect knowing they will face retaliation. Thus, the weaker they are relative to the CO they leave, the less likely they are to survive and thus less likely to fragment. We believe two key factors can counterbalance relative weakness: geographic distance and military alliances with other COs, which can allow weaker defectors to fragment that otherwise would not be able to survive fragmentation.

As illegal organizations, COs operate in secrecy, making data collection particularly challenging. Not surprisingly, a key limitation in current scholarship on COs, in general, is the lack of high-quality data on various aspects of these organizations. Systematic data on criminal fragmentation, more specifically, simply does not exist. We overcome existing data limitations by creating an original qualitative dataset on the nine major drug cartels operating in Mexico at the turn of the century and the population of their fragments between January 2000 and December 2018, and collecting key information for each, including: date of fragmentation, reason for fragmenting, position of the individual leading the splinter group, geographic strongholds, main illicit activities, formation of alliances when fragmenting, and leaders across time, among other variables.

First, we find four general types of fragmentation depending on who leads the defection: (1) high-level members, (2) mid-level members, (3) low-level members, and (4) cartel dissolution where high-level leadership is dissolved and mid- and/or low-level members form their own cartel(s) without a larger organization existing. Countering the prominent explanation in the literature, we find that only 15% of leadership turnovers prompt fragmentation, sug-

gesting cartels are very resilient. Looking at the reason for each fragmentation, we find that only 60% of fragmentations were prompted by leadership turnover, particularly government policies removing leaders. We find that the remaining 40% resulted from internal disputes. This speaks against the conventional knowledge that fragmentation in Mexico is uniquely caused by direct government actions against the leaders of these organizations.

Examining profits, we find that all fragments had control of specific markets at the moment of fragmentation, countering narratives of fragments seeking markets after fragmenting. When they defect, most fragments are involved in either a subset or completely different activities than their originating cartel, with the percentage being higher for smaller fragments, clearly indicating that most defectors are unable to directly compete against their originating cartel over entire illicit markets. This also suggests that the diversification of drug cartels that started in 2007 ([Alcocer 2022](#); [Herrera and Martinez-Alvarez 2022](#)) helped facilitate fragmentation.

Analyzing survival, the pattern is clear with respect to geography: the smaller the fragments, the further their strongholds are geographically from the cartel they betray, clearly suggesting self-selection based on geographic location. This suggests that the geographic expansion of drug cartels that started in 2007 ([Alcocer 2022](#)) facilitated fragmentation. Looking at alliances, only fragments whose strongholds are in the same state as the CO they defect from form military alliances to survive fragmentation, regardless of relative power, while no fragment with strongholds in states outside the state where their CO of origin has its stronghold creates these alliances. This suggests that contesting strongholds is a key factor explaining the formation of military alliances when fragmenting.

Finally, we discuss additional patterns that we uncover that have not been previously identified. First, the large historical cartels are the least prone to fragmentation. Second, while kingpin strategies are often touted as complete failures, we find that 17 cartels stopped operating as a direct result of government leadership decapitation. Third, fragmentation has led to the rise of COs led by militarized leaders. Fourth, we find that fragmentation has given

rise to cartels specializing in predatory crimes. Lastly, while our empirical analysis focuses on Mexico, we believe the theory is applicable to other contexts, so we provide three case studies from Ecuador, Japan, and the US to illustrate the plausible generalization of our theory.

This article advances the study of CO fragmentation in three key ways. First, it presents a novel theoretical framework to understand the fragmentation of COs, a topic that remains largely understudied despite its prevalence and importance. Second, it introduces a new dataset on COs that identifies the fragmentation of Mexico’s main drug cartels and all their fragments. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first data of its kind. Third, the results provide new insights and patterns that, due to data limitations, had not been previously uncovered or systematically analyzed. Through these contributions, we challenge the existing conventional wisdom that government decapitation strategies are solely responsible for fragmentation, even in a context like Mexico where an intense crackdown targeted cartel leaders. We also challenge existing accounts that fragmentation drove the activity diversification and geographic expansion of Mexican cartels by showing that diversification and expansion preceded fragmentation and instead facilitated it. More broadly, this study relates to the more developed literature on the fragmentation of rebel groups that analyze non-state actors with political or ideological aims in the context of civil conflicts (e.g., [Pearlman and Cunningham 2012](#); [Bakke et al. 2012](#); [Fjelde and Nilsson 2018](#); [Woldemariam 2018](#); [Perkoski 2019](#); [Braithwaite and Cunningham 2020](#); [Mahoney 2020](#); [Joo and Mukherjee 2021](#)). Our study complements this literature by exploring non-state actors that are criminal, economically motivated, do not depend on citizen support to the same degree, and do not seek state power.

2 A Theory of Cartel Fragmentation

COs are structured associations that engage in illicit activities for financial gain. As illegal actors, COs rely on informal systems of rules and mechanisms to control and regulate member behavior, which can be referred to as “internal criminal governance” (Lessing 2021). Internal criminal governance is akin to corporate governance, albeit without being able to rely on legitimate, state-based legal institutions to enforce contracts, adjudicate disputes, or protect property rights. Despite the absence of third-party enforcement, a growing body of literature finds that COs are very effective at creating a wide arrange of internal governance mechanisms to promote organizational cohesion (Lessing and Denyer Willis 2019; Lessing 2021; Pereda 2021, 2024; Piano 2017; Leeson and Skarbek 2010; Skarbek 2010; Skarbek and Wang 2015; Skarbek 2012, 2014, 2024), including specific “mechanisms to promote loyalty and discourage defection” (Kostelnik and Skarbek 2013, 101), which make them highly resilient to internal and external threats (Ayling 2009; Catanese et al. 2016; Agreste et al. 2016; Cavallaro et al. 2020; Berlusconi 2022; Pereda and Décary-Hetu 2024).

Scholars note that underlying many of these mechanisms is the threat of violence, with violators being punished harshly. This is perhaps especially true for defectors, as COs face deep losses if members fragment, for example, losing members, assets, territories, and profits. Thus, COs offer potential defectors protection by staying and violent punishment, if not death, for defecting. Moreover, using visible violence against defectors allows COs to credibly threaten other potential defectors and dissuade them from fragmenting (Kostelnik and Skarbek 2013).

Yet, even in the face of lethal threat, CO members sometimes choose to fragment and leave their CO along with a group of followers to form their own independent CO. This section presents a general framework to understand the logic of fragmentation, the role of government policies in sparking fragmentation, outlining the conditions which facilitate fragmentation, and delineating the observable patterns of fragmentation we should observe.

2.1 Who Fragments and When?

CO members may choose to defect for various reasons, with the literature proposing some motives. Looking at the formation and collapse of alliances between COs and between internal factions within COs, [Atuesta and Pérez-Dávila \(2018\)](#) theorize that breakdowns of alliances can occur due to betrayals, diverging interests, succession struggles, and broken alliances. Alternatively, looking at the transplantation of mafias (outposts created due to mafia members relocating), [Varese \(2020\)](#) theorizes that separation (a mafia outpost becoming fully independent, which we refer to as fragmentation) may result when the outpost resists deeply disliked actions from the “motherland” or when they are expelled by the originating mafia. While these cover some motivations, it is likely that multiple motivations exist for why defectors may consider fragmenting.

But *when* do these members choose to fragment? Under business as usual, there are likely few incentives to break the status quo and fragment. Moreover, under business as usual, the internal criminal governance mechanisms that promote cohesion and discourage defection likely serve their purpose. This is why existing studies emphasize the role of government policies, and in particular, leadership decapitation, in prompting fragmentation. Studies on the violent consequences of leadership decapitation emphasize that leadership removals can create power vacuums that allow potential defectors to fragment ([Ríos 2013](#); [Phillips 2015](#); [Trejo and Ley 2016](#); [Atuesta and Ponce 2017](#); [Atuesta and Pérez-Dávila 2018](#); [Velasco 2023](#)). This is likely especially true if leadership decapitation momentarily weakens the cohesion or capacity of the COs to punish violators. The emphasis on leadership decapitation policies is likely why the conventional wisdom in the literature, and especially in the Mexican case, is that the government’s kingpin strategy is solely responsible for fragmentation. Given the literature, we should therefore expect leadership turnover to act as key destabilizing moment that allows potential defectors to fragment.

However, while leadership turnover, particularly from government kingpin strategies, may be a main driver of fragmentation, anecdotal accounts from other countries suggest

that they are neither necessary or sufficient for fragmentation. We instead contend that, more generally, shocks, moments of uncertainty, or instances of intense internal disputes likely create windows of opportunities that potential defectors can exploit to fragment. We further contend that these moments are most likely to lead to fragmentation when there are internal disagreements and thus potential defectors *and* the windows of opportunities temporarily disrupt or weaken the internal criminal governance mechanisms designed to prevent defection.

Turning from *why* defect and *when* towards *who* defects, the literature tends to assume the those fragmenting are aspiring high-level leaders who break from their CO to lead their own organization. This follows (Kostelnik and Skarbak 2013), who argue that as CO members are promoted, they face stronger incentives to defect since they gain more knowledge and responsibilities that they can exploit against their bosses. It also follows Varese (2020), who argues that fragmentation is only possible when a faction becomes larger and more powerful than the CO they belong to. Indeed, CO leaders or high-ranking members can decide to fragment when disputes with other leaders fail to be resolved internally. However, we argue that high-ranking or very powerful members are not the only ones with incentives to fragment. Mid- and low-level members (e.g., regional or local leaders) that do not aspire to take over and cannot compete against the CO they belong to but do seek autonomy to lead their own smaller COs can also choose to fragment. This, in turn, has implications for the size of the fragment and its power relative to the CO it breaks from.

2.2 The Strategic Logic of Fragmentation

To understand the dilemma potential defectors face when considering fragmenting and how it shapes fragmentation patterns, we assume that CO members are rational actors that care fundamentally about two first order concerns that shape their behavior: profits and survival. That is, CO members are profit motivated economic actors who prefer to stay alive. Thus, we argue that potential defectors strategically consider two key questions that shape their




Figure 1: Theoretical framework: Decision tree highlighting the different courses of action, as well as their expected outcomes, for potential defectors considering fragmenting.

decision to fragment: (1) Will they be economically viable if they fragment? (2) Will they survive if they fragment? How potential defectors answer these questions, we argue, shape fragmentation and its patterns. Figure 1 outlines the logic of the argument presented in this section.

First, potential defectors need to have access to a source of income *prior to* or *at the time of* defection that they will continue to have access to after fragmentation. As profit-maximizing economic actors, unless they are facing credible lethal threats, potential defectors have no incentives to defect if they are not at least as well off when fragmenting, which requires access to illicit markets. Moreover, COs require illicit profits to operate, so defectors need to secure their source(s) of income when defecting in order to establish their autonomous CO. Most importantly, potential defectors need to convince potential followers that they will be at least as well off financially if they follow the defector. Promises of future riches without the leader of the defectors having a secure revenue stream are unlikely to be credible, and thus potential followers will choose not to defect. Additionally, foreseeing that the CO the defectors betray will most likely attack them and that criminal wars are very costly (financially and otherwise), defectors need to have a secure source of revenue to assure their

survival. Delays in acquiring revenue streams could be fatal. This further implies that potential defectors need to already be operating in territories where they control lucrative illicit markets that provide them with financial resources.

We further argue that the structure of illicit markets plays a central role in the patterns of fragmentation because they determine the financial viability of fragmenting. High-ranking defectors may be able to compete in illicit markets against their CO of origin upon fragmenting. Yet, depending on the illicit market, mid- and low-ranking defectors may not be able to compete with their CO of origin. For example, large drug trafficking organizations typically oversee drug production, transportation, and smuggling across borders, which mid- and low-ranking defectors may be unable to undertake or compete in. However, these defectors can either control more localized subsets of those activities (e.g., controlling drug production in a region) or engage in alternative illicit activities (e.g., extortion).

This contradicts some existing accounts suggesting that *after* defectors fragment, they then seek other sources of revenue because they cannot compete in the markets that the larger COs dominate. These accounts imply that fragmented groups break from their CO without a stable source of revenue and if they cannot compete in the market and place where their CO of origin operates, then they move in search of new economic opportunities. Here we argue the inverse, that is, that potential defectors need to have a source of income secured when fragmenting to make fragmentation viable and desirable.

Second, potential defectors need to ask whether they will survive if they defect from their CO. Potential defectors know that if they defect there is a high probability that they will face retaliation by the CO they break from. If there is a high likelihood that the CO they defect from will kill them for the betrayal, they will be unlikely to fragment. This implies that the relative strength of the fragment relative to the CO of origin is a key factor in understanding fragmentation because it should be such that the fragment has a probability of survival. This is consistent with [Varese \(2020\)](#), who argues that defectors must accumulate enough wealth and influence to not fear retaliation from the CO they leave. Various factors

likely influence the fragmenting CO's probability of surviving retaliation, among them being the number of members, coercive capacity, degree of government protection, and financial strength. This means potential defectors need to secure sufficient power *before* or *at the moment of* fragmentation to assure that they can defend themselves as an organization from rivals as soon as they break away. Without this, it is highly unlikely that they choose to fragment.

We further argue that there are two factors that can compensate for weak relative power vis-à-vis the originating CO that allow smaller defectors (mid- and low-ranking members) to fragment: Geography and alliances.

We argue that geography impacts how COs can project power and thus shape the relative power between two rivals. To make this argument, it is important to highlight a key dimension of the geographic presence of COs. In most cases, COs have a center of operations, or stronghold, from which they operate out of. This is typically where they have historically operated, where they have built the strongest ties with political, economic, and social actors, and thus where their leaders tend to live. However, COs also often operate in territories outside of their strongholds. Following the literature from civil and international conflict, we argue that geography is a key variable that can counterbalance relative power because projecting military power across geographic distance is difficult and costly. Therefore, for defectors that fragment, distance can make up for some organizational strength. In other words, if potential defectors operate far from the parent organization's stronghold, because projecting power across long distances is difficult, parent COs will only be able to attack defectors with a proportion of their full capabilities. Thus, geographic distance can make up for relative strength, meaning that smaller, less powerful defectors can fragment and survive if they operate far from their originating CO's stronghold *at the moment of fragmentation*. This argument differs from some existing accounts suggesting that fragments defect and then move as they seek other territories to operate. It also differs from [Varese \(2020\)](#) in two important ways. First, the author only looks at members in distant outposts,

where we examine potential defectors both close and far from their CO's stronghold. Second, the author argues that only outposts who become larger and more powerful than their CO of origin can defect, where we provide a more nuanced explanation for relative power and distance.

Moreover, while the literature has given much of its attention to understanding wars between COs, they also frequently create alliances ([Atuesta and Pérez-Dávila 2018](#); [Alcoer 2023](#)). We further argue that potential defectors can countervail an unbalanced power differential vis-à-vis the CO they defect from by creating military alliances with other COs. That is, fragments can overcome some power differentials and increase their probability of survival by strategically forming military alliances when they fragment, particularly when the fragment operates geographically close to the CO they fragment from. These alliances can take different forms, but most likely entail defectors receiving military support from a CO that is confronting or wants to confront the CO the defectors are betraying. This argument contrasts that of [Atuesta and Pérez-Dávila \(2018\)](#), who argue that alliances are “an altruistic measure” and that fragments “cannot survive without the creation of an alliance” (238-239). We see alliances stemming from fragmentation as instrumental and we do not claim alliances always form or are necessary for survival, but that they are strategically formed given geographic and relative power considerations.

2.3 Testable Implications

This theory yields some central predictions. The first set of predictions pertain to when we should observe fragmentation and who leads this fragmentation: (1) Fragmentation should occur when external or internal shocks temporarily weaken COs or create moments of uncertainty, and (2) fragmentation may be led by high-, mid-, and low-level CO members. The second set of predictions stem from the patterns we should observe when defectors fragment: (3) The smaller the fragments are relative to their CO of origin, the more likely it is that they are involved in more localized illicit activities than the larger COs they originate from,

either by controlling a subset of their originating CO's activities or by engaging in different illicit markets than their originating CO; (4) the smaller the fragments are relative to their CO of origin, the more likely they are to have strongholds which are far from the stronghold of their originating CO; and (5) the smaller the fragments are relative to their CO of origin, the more likely they are to form military alliances with other COs to counterbalance their weaker relative power vis-à-vis the originating CO, particularly when they operate close to their CO of origin.

3 Mexico's Criminal Landscape

To test the theory, the article turns to Mexico. Since the late 1980s, Mexico's criminal underworld was dominated by a handful of powerful COs, or cartels, that specialized in trafficking drugs to the United States and operated in regions key to the drug trade. Through the 1990s and early 2000s, these cartels began a series of deadly wars against each other. In response, the newly elected president Calderón declared war against drug trafficking in December of 2006. As part of a broader strategy to combat drug trafficking and drug cartels, the federal government adopted a strategy of leadership decapitation. Through this strategy, the government sought to weaken or dismantle powerful cartels. Instead, cartel fragmentation increased dramatically starting in 2010 and resulted in an ever increasing number of COs operating across the country. Not surprisingly, experts and scholars alike have attributed this fragmentation to the government policy of leadership decapitation ([Ríos 2013](#); [Phillips 2015](#); [Trejo and Ley 2016](#); [Atuesta and Ponce 2017](#); [Atuesta and Pérez-Dávila 2018](#); [Velasco 2023](#)), which has become the conventional wisdom.

Beyond the policy of leadership decapitation, research has shown that the government crackdown had two other consequences which we believe created conditions conducive for fragmentation. First, the crackdown prompted cartels to diversify their activities beyond drug trafficking and enter other illicit markets such as extorting local businesses, drug dealing

to local consumers, property theft, and stealing oil from pipelines, among others (Alcocer 2022; Herrera and Martinez-Alvarez 2022). Second, the crackdown pushed cartels to expand geographically to new territories as they entered new illicit markets (Alcocer 2022). Together, these transformations created new underlying conditions that we believe helped fuel the fragmentation of cartels in Mexico. Diversification and expansion gave mid- and low-level members access to new markets that were more local in nature than drug trafficking (means) in many territories far from the cartel’s strongholds (opportunity).

3.1 Data on Criminal Fragmentation

As illegal organizations, COs operate in secrecy, making data collection particularly challenging. Not surprisingly, a key limitation in current scholarship on COs generally, and fragmentation more specifically, is the lack of high-quality systematic data. Data including information on each CO, such as their origin, leaders, strongholds, alliances, and activities, does not exist. Simply identifying which organizations operate in Mexico is a major existing challenge. For example, Crisis Group report that between 2009 and 2019, 463 criminal groups operated in Mexico, which is more than double the number reported by reputable local media, *El Universal*, during the same period (Esberg 2021). Scholars at the CIDE Drug Policy Program (PPD) created a state-level cross-sectional data of cartel presence in Mexico for the year 2020, where they identify 150 organizations based on open sources (Atuesta and Pérez-Dávila 2021). The Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) counted 20 “cartels” and 76 “gangs” between 2018 and 2019 (Raleigh et al. 2023). The Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) finds 33 actors that could be classified as COs and 18 factions between 2004 and 2022 (Sundberg et al. 2012).¹ If the simple task of counting COs proves to be a contested challenge, undertaking more comprehensive analyses is practically unfeasible. Moreover, beyond their names and location, these sources do not include any additional information on the COs they identify.

¹Unlike other sources, UCDP does not state whether each actor they identify is a CO.

To overcome this existing limitation, we create a novel dataset of Mexico’s main drug cartels and their fragmentation between January 2000 and December 2018 through extensive qualitative research. The dataset first identifies Mexico’s main drug cartels at the turn of the century (Cártel del Milenio, Cártel de Juárez, Cártel de Tijuana, Cártel de Sinaloa, Cártel del Golfo, Los Cuinis, Cártel de Oaxaca, Cártel de Colima, and Cártel de Sonora),² and systematically tracks their fragmentation, documenting all splinter cartels that operated as *independent* COs. We define an independent CO as an organization that operates autonomously without answering to another CO, which entails them having their own leadership, structures, and illicit activities. We identify but do not track cells, factions, or armed wings that operate for or under a larger CO. Thus, even when there are internal disputes between factions of a CO, we continue to consider them as one group unless there is evidence of a definitive and permanent split.

To create this data, we conduct extensive qualitative research (see Appendix for details). First, we compiled all existing publicly available lists of cartels, including those mentioned previously (except the Crisis Group data since it is not publicly available), and investigate each group to determine whether they operated independently at any point within our time period. This entailed collecting detailed information for each name on these lists, including their leaders and relations to other COs. This provided us a preliminary list of cartels that possibly operated independently within our time period and qualitative information on the history and background of each cartel. With an initial map of fragmentation, we further investigated each cartel to identify any possible fragmentations that were missing. Once this data was finalized, we began systematically collecting key information on each CO, including: which cartel they fragmented from, the date of their fragmentation, the reason for their fragmentation, the individual that led their fragmentation, their primary illicit activities,

²While drug trafficking was dominated in the 1990s and early 2000s by these groups, it was very decentralized and many smaller networks existed (colloquially called “cartelitos”), for example, Los Numeros in Sonora, Los 30 in Michoacán, and Los Ardillos in Guerrero. There were also small but important COs that were not drug cartels, for example, Los Mazos, Cártel de Tepito, and Cártel de Tlahuac. These groups are excluded from the analysis.

the geographic location of their stronghold, leaders across time, whether each leader was captured or arrested, whether other organizations fragmented from them, and whether they ceased operating and when. To collect this information, we relied on hundreds of data sources, including dozens of US and Mexican government reports and documents, academic research, books by investigative journalists, reports by experts and private companies, and news articles, among others (see Appendix for list of sources). If conflicting or incomplete accounts were found, we documented each account, our coding decision, and an explanation for the coding.

Rather than the hundreds of COs other sources claim to operate in Mexico, we find that the country's nine main drug cartels gave rise to 54 fragments between January 2000 and December 2018.³ Figure 2 visualizes one aspect of the data, the temporal fragmentation of Mexico's main drug cartels (see Appendix for list of names and abbreviations). Our extensive qualitative research identified and resolved three key systematic issues present in existing lists that inflate the number of cartels in Mexico: (1) some cartels use or are referred to by different names and each is counted separately, (2) structures within cartels that have names but are not independent are counted as independent cartels, and (3) some cartels that ceased operating continue to be counted in later years (see Appendix for details and examples of these issues). If seeking to identify *independent* COs in Mexico, these issues have resulted in drastically inflated counts of cartels. These findings are consistent with Signoret et al. (2021), whose external data sources identified 290 cartels operating in Mexico between 2006 and 2016, but after conducting qualitative research found that many of those referred to the same cartel or to some faction within a cartel. After accounting for this, they concluded that only 38 unique autonomous cartels operated within this time period.

³This excludes hyper-localized fragments that we are unable to identify or observe and measure.




Figure 2: Temporal fragmentation of Mexico’s main drug cartels between 2006 and 2018. Initials correspond to individual cartels. Green solid arrows represent when they operate(d). Red dotted arrows represent fragmentation. Vertical dotted line represents the beginning of the government war against drug trafficking. Original data by authors.

3.2 Measuring Fragmentation

We use this qualitative data to measure the key concepts derived from the theoretical framework, thereby facilitating empirical testing. To examine the moment of fragmentation, we collect data on those leading defection, their relative strength, and the factors that prompted them to splinter.

To measure different types of fragmentation, we collect information on the defecting leader of each fragment. While Mexican COs vary in structure and how hierarchical and centralized they are, they generally include various levels of leadership and operational roles. We consider three types of defectors, high-, medium-, and low-ranking defectors. We classify individuals leading defection as high-ranking defectors if they are part of the central decision-making structure of the CO they fragment from, including leaders and those immediately around them, and leaders of powerful armed wings (*brazos armados*). We define mid-ranking defectors as those that hold intermediate positions within their COs, which we measure as

regional leaders (*jefes regionales*). Finally, low-ranking defectors operate under regional leaders, and include local leaders (*jefes de plaza*) and leaders of smaller enforcement units (*jefe de sicarios*).

To measure balance of power, or the relative strength or power of a fragment vis-à-vis its CO of origin, we would ideally observe various aspects of each CO, for example, the number of members, economic resources, coercive capacity, and degree of protection from the state, among others. However, this information is neither observable nor measurable. Instead, we use the rank of the individual defecting within the CO they defect from to approximate their relative size. Our categorization therefore includes three categories: (1) “Balanced” when a high-ranking member leads defection, (2) “Moderately uneven” when a mid-ranking member leads defection, and (3) “Significantly uneven” when a low-ranking member leads defection. While this measure is imperfect, we believe it stands on reasonable assumptions and is the best proxy for relative size given data collection challenges.

To investigate the moment of fragmentation, we collect data on leadership turnover and factors prompting fragmentation. Because the literature emphasizes the role of leadership turnover in fragmentation, especially those caused by government leadership decapitation policies, we create a list of all leaders across time for each cartel, along with the reason there was leadership turnover. Alternatively, we also collect information for the factors that prompted each fragmentation. We note that determining the precise motivations for each individual to fragment is difficult given that these are private decisions from individuals operating in the underworld. Rather than speculating *why* individuals leading defection decided to fragment, which is unfeasible for most fragments, we focus on identifying the factor that prompted fragmentation. Thus, for each instance of fragmentation, we collect information on the stated circumstance that precipitated fragmentation.

3.3 Measuring Fragmentation Patterns

To investigate the implications of the strategic logic underlying fragmentation, or the patterns of fragmentation, we collect data on illicit activities, geographic location of strongholds, and military alliances.

First, to measure whether and which activities fragments were involved in that allowed them to defect, we search for information on their *main* activities⁴ at the time of fragmentation. Most activities are self-contained, but we break down drug trafficking to its components given that it encompasses various activities. Specifically, for cartels involved in drug trafficking, we identify whether they were involved in specific components of the drug trade—drug production, transportation, or smuggling across the US border—or all. We also include drug dealing, or selling small amounts to local consumers, as a subset of drug trafficking.

To test whether geography shapes fragmentation, we identify the strongholds of each cartel at the moment of fragmentation. For larger COs this can entail an entire state, while for smaller COs this can be a region within a state, a few municipalities, or even a single city. We underscore that this measure should not be taken as a definite measure of exact boundaries, but rough geographic boundaries. From this information, we measure whether the strongholds of fragments overlap with those of the CO they defect from.

Finally, to test whether defectors strategically form alliances that allow them to fragment, we identify whether each fragment created an alliance at the time of fragmentation for the explicit purpose of fighting the CO they fragment from. Accordingly, this measure excludes pre-existing alliances, alliances formed after fragmenting that are not directly related to their defection, and alliances formed for reasons other than fighting the CO they defect from.

⁴Mexican cartels have diversified and are involved in a host of activities. Identifying them all is challenging, but most specialize in a few activities, which we focus on.

4 Research Design and Results

To examine the testable implications derived from the theory, we provide quantitative and qualitative evidence using data on all fragmentation cases. This approach follows the LNQA method (Goertz and Haggard 2023). LNQA seeks to test a proposed theory by using data on *all* relevant cases. Through this approach, we seek to establish regularities, not average treatment effects. In LNQA, the strength of the theory is “simply the percentage of cases conforming with the causal claim” (1221). Given that we collect data on all relevant cases, LNQA provides an appropriate guideline for us to establish regularities and seeing to what degree they conform with the predictions made by the theory.

First, we examine the set of predictions pertaining to when we should observe fragmentation and who leads this fragmentation. Here, we follow what Goertz and Haggard (2023) call “Y generalizations,” where we select units where the outcome is present, $Y = 1$, to investigate the factors leading to Y . In our case, we analyze cases where the outcome—fragmentation—is present to examine when fragmentation occurs and who leads fragmentation.

We then turn to the second set of predictions about the patterns we should observe when defectors fragment. In this second part, we are testing what Goertz and Haggard (2023) call “X generalizations,” where a cause, $X = 1$, is postulated to be followed by an outcome. In our case, we are testing whether a cause—fragmentation—is followed by an outcome—control of specific illicit activities, location of strongholds, and military alliances—depending on who fragments. The strength of our proposed explanation can then be estimated by the number of cases the conform with our expectations.

4.1 Types and Drivers of Fragmentation

We first examine who fragments and when. Generally speaking, we find four types of fragmentation. Drawing from Trejo and Ley (2020, 134-137) and their discussion about the organizational structure of Mexican drug cartels that took hold in the 1990s, Figure 3 shows

stylized examples of the four types of fragmentation we observe depending on who leads fragmentation—high-, mid-, or low-level members. We note that cartels vary in how hierarchical, cohesive, and centralized they are, with Figure 3 overrepresenting how structured and hierarchical they are. Nevertheless, it provides an analytically useful model to understand different types of fragmentation.




Figure 3: Stylized CO structure and types of fragmentation by leader of defection. Black structures denote CO of origin, red dotted line denote fragmentation, red nodes denote leadership vacuum, grey structures denote fragmenting COs.

Figure 4 shows the distribution of types of fragmentations categorizing each fragmentation on the relative size of the fragment vis-à-vis their CO of origin.⁵ Results show an

⁵This contrasts the approach of [Atuesta and Pérez-Dávila \(2018\)](#), who argue four types of fragmentation: “(i) loss of reputation; (ii) through heterogeneous factions; (iii) successions within the same organization; (iv) fragmentation through external forces.”




Figure 4: Number of fragments by type of fragmentation (left) and relative power of fragment vis-à-vis CO of origin or other fragments under dissolution (right).

important pattern: only about 25% of defections are led by high-level members. In other words, fragmentation is primarily driven by mid- and low-level leaders. Moreover, when then categorizing fragmentation types by the relative size of each fragment vis-à-vis their CO of origin or other fragments under dissolution, we see that only about 33% of fragments are of similar sizes than those who they compete with. This suggests most fragments need to seriously consider factors that protect them and allow them to survive.

Turning to the moment of fragmentation, we first examine whether leadership decapitation explains fragmentation as is assumed in existing literature, we collect data on every leader of every cartel across time along with information on what prompted leadership turnover, including whether they were arrested, killed by the government, killed by a rival cartel, killed by an internal rival (member of the same cartel), or some other reason. Panel (A) of Figure 5 shows the number of leadership turnovers by reason for turnover and whether it prompted fragmentation. The results are surprising: Only 15% of leadership turnovers resulted in fragmentation. These results highlight that fragmentation following leadership turnover is actually very rare and that government policies are neither necessary nor sufficient to explain fragmentation.

One the one hand, these results support existing literature highlighting the resiliency of and, (iv) broken alliances” (247). However, these authors consider the breakdown of alliances and coalitions as fragmentation.




Figure 5: Leadership turnover and whether it resulted in fragmentation (left) and reasons for each fragmentation (right).

COs. On the other hand, these results clearly demonstrate that existing research assuming that leadership removal leads to fragmentation or using leadership decapitation as proxies for fragmentation completely overestimate the effects of crackdowns on fragmentation. Moreover, existing research only looks at fragmentation through government crackdowns and thus only examines a subsample of actual fragmentation, leaving 40% of fragmentations unexplored and a clear gap in our understanding of fragmentation not related to leadership decapitation. Finally, reports on a significant number of arrests and killings of leaders by government forces claim that internal or external cartel rivals provided information to government agencies on the location of these leaders. If these allegations are true, they mean that many leadership decapitations are not external shocks but rather endogenous to inter and intra-cartel dynamics and cartel-government relations—bringing into question existing research taking leadership decapitations as exogenous shocks.

Beyond looking at leadership turnover, we analyze the moment of fragmentation for each cartel to identify the postulated reason behind each defection, with results shown in Panel (B) of Figure 5. We find that while the majority (60%) of fragmentation was prompted by government leadership decapitation policies, a considerable amount is due to other reasons, principally internal disputes. Of these internal disputes, we find that only two can be directly attributed to government actions. In other words, the conventional knowledge that

government kingpin strategies explain fragmentation in Mexico is not fully supported by the evidence.

Examining the cases where government leadership decapitation strategies were not directly responsible for fragmentation, we find a wide variety of circumstances prompting fragmentation. Due to the clandestine nature of COs, identifying the exact motives behind fragmentation is difficult. Nevertheless, we can identify the moment of fragmentation and the reasons reported for each defection. We find that key internal betrayals are responsible for five instances of fragmentation, the death of a leader by natural causes prompted one, intense moments of internal disagreements resulted in five, internal disagreements that do not initially appear as severe resulted in seven though we have less information on these, financial disagreements seem to have motivated two, the killing of a defector's brother by a CO allied with the CO they defect from resulted in one, and opportunism due to intense government pressure targeting CO leaders led to one.

4.2 Patterns of Fragmentation

We now turn to investigating the patterns of fragmentation. First, we examine the prediction that fragments will have control over illicit markets when they fragment. We then turn to investigating the predictions about fragments needing to secure survival and the role that geography and alliances play.

4.2.1 Securing Profits

One key implication of the theory is that fragments will have control over illicit markets when they fragment, with smaller fragments are more likely to be involved in more localized illicit activities. We examine this by looking at the main activities of each fragment when they fragment. We classify these activities in three categories relative to the main activities of the CO they fragment from: (1) fragments are involved in the same activities, (2) fragments are involved in a subset of the activities, and (3) fragments are involved in different activities.

To understand the second category, we note that the main cartels whose fragmentation we examine were specialized drug trafficking organizations in the early 2000s. Drug trafficking involves the production, transportation, and trafficking (into the US in our case) of illicit drugs. We consider these specific activities as subsets of drug trafficking. Thus, if a CO that specializes in drug trafficking sees defectors fragment, and that fragment specializes in drug production, we consider this a subset of the activities of the CO of origin.

Figure 6 shows the activities of fragments by the type of fragmentation. We find interesting patterns. First, evidence clearly suggests that fragments do control specific illicit markets when they fragment. Second, most fragments are involved in either a subset (47%) or different activities (17%) than their CO of origin. This indicates that in most instances, defectors choose not to or are unable to directly compete against their originating CO over entire illicit markets. Third, we see a clear pattern wherein smaller fragments are more likely to be involved in subsets or different activities than their originating CO. These other activities tend to be more local than drug trafficking, with some of the most prevalent being drug dealing to local consumers, extortion of local businesses, oil theft, theft, and kidnapping for ransom. These results highlight two key aspects of illicit markets in Mexico: (1) the extensiveness of drug trafficking and the localized nature of certain aspects of it allows defectors to fragment who control only aspects of the drug market, and (2) large drug cartels diversifying their activities during the 2000s facilitated fragmentation by giving mid- and low-level leaders access to alternative local illicit activities.

Moreover, by looking at the activities of fragments in relation to their CO of origin and the geography of their strongholds, we find that most most balanced fragments who share strongholds with their CO of origin are involved in the same activities. Controlling a subset of the illicit markets the originating CO controls is most likely when they do not share strongholds, and fragments operating in distinct illicit activities do not seem to be impacted by geographic distance. By including relative power, we discover that, with one exception, all fragments that are involved in the same activities as their originating CO and




Figure 6: Main activities of fragments relative to CO of origin at moment of fragmentation by balance of power (left) and location of stronghold (right).

operate in the same state are either large or medium fragments. Only one large fragment was involved in distinct illicit activities when they fragmented, showing that large fragments tend to compete with their CO of origin to some degree. And on the other hand, most small fragments are involved in a subset of illicit activities, but those that operate in the same or distinct activities operate in separate territories than their CO of origin.

4.2.2 Assuring Survival

A second key implication of the theory proposed is that fragments can increase their probability of survival by exploiting geography (potential defectors self-select considering relative power and geography) and strategically forming military alliances, particularly for smaller fragments.

To probe these expectations, Figure 7 shows the geographic location of fragment strongholds relative to their CO of origin by their relative power. The pattern is clear: the smaller the fragments, the further their strongholds are relative to the CO they betray. While about half of fragments with similar power share strongholds with their CO of origin, only about 20% of medium fragments do, and *no* small fragment do. This clearly suggests that geography plays a key role in the strategic self-selection into fragmentation, with low-level members discounting the possibility of fragmenting due to the inherent risk. This suggests that the ge-

ographic expansion of drug cartels that began in 2007 (Alcocer 2022) created conditions that facilitated fragmentation, as it created more regional and local bosses controlling territories beyond the stronghold of their cartel.

To further probe these survival incentives, Figure 7 shows different types of fragments by the geographic location of their strongholds and whether they formed alliances when they fragmented to fight their CO of origin. The results are stark. Only fragments whose strongholds are in the same state as the CO they defect from form military alliances to survive fragmentation. Specifically, 8 of the 10 large fragments that share strongholds with their CO of origin form military alliances when they fragment, while 4 of the 5 medium fragments do. That means 12 of the 15 (80% fragments who share a stronghold with their CO of origin form alliances to survive fragmentation. Moreover, 25% (4 of 16) of those in the same state but without overlapping strongholds also form alliances to fight their CO of origin when they fragment. No fragment with strongholds in states outside the state where their CO of origin has its stronghold creates these alliances. This provides very strong evidence that these military alliances are key when fragmenting near the CO of origin for both large and medium fragments.

Together, these results indicate that potential defectors strategically consider their size relative to the CO they seek to betray, and that this balance of power is clearly affected by geography and military alliances. In other words, geography and alliances make up for poor power differentials and allows mid- and low-level members to defect, while alliances also reinforce high- and mid-level defectors whose strongholds are in the same state as the CO they betray.

5 Further Findings

Beyond exploring the drivers and patterns of fragmentation, our data further reveals additional insights about cartel’s propensity to fragment, the limited success of government




Figure 7: Location of fragment stronghold by balance of power (left) and by alliances formed at moment of fragmentation (right).

leadership decapitation policies, the rise of new types of leaders and predatory cartels.

5.1 Propensity to Fragment

We find that fragmentation is largely driven by the fragmentation of fragments and their fragments. In other words, the nine large drug cartels that we begin tracking in January 2000 only see 14 fragmentations (5 high-level defectors, one mid-level defector, and 8 cartels that stem from the dissolution of the Cartel del Golfo). Not considering dissolution, that means we observe an average of 0.67 fragmentations per cartel between 2000 and 2018. In contrast, those 6 fragments saw 20 defectors fragment (17 low-, mid-, and high-level defectors and three cartels resulting from a dissolution), or an average of 3.33 per cartel. Finally, fragments of the fragments saw 13 defectors. This pattern suggests that large drug cartels are especially effective at enforcing cohesion and dissuading defection, possibly because they were the ones with the greatest coercive capacity and thus have the ability of credibly threatening potential defectors. It also suggests that “second generation” cartels, or those with one degree of separation from the historical cartels, were the most susceptible to fragmentation. It is likely that fragments of these fragments then see fewer average fragmentations as they become too small to fragment further, or at least, it becomes more difficult as they become more localized. Further research is necessary to explore this dynamic and other factors that may make some COs more prone to fragmentation.

5.2 Successful Dismantling

While we emphasize fragmentation, we also observe 23 instances of cartels either ceasing their operations or ceasing their operations as independent cartels after being absorbed by larger cartels. The successful dismantling of cartels was the government’s aims when pursuing leadership decapitation strategies, but has received virtually no scholarly attention due to its failure to accomplish this in the vast majority of cases. Nevertheless, our data shows that 18 cartels ceased operating and that 5 were integrated by larger cartels. Looking at

disbandment, we find that 17 stopped operating as a direct result of government leadership decapitation strategies (16 due to arrests of leaders and one due to a leader committing suicide prior to being arrested), while only one was due to an internal dispute between high-level members that each went their own way. This is evidence that, in some important cases, government leadership decapitation strategies were successful in disbanding COs—though this by no means outweighs their costs and negative implications. Looking at integration, we find that five cartels joined the ranks for other cartels, four from the decision of the leader to do so and one after being weakened following the arrest of their leader. Future research should investigate the factors that make a CO prone to disbandment given the arrest of their leader.

5.3 From Drug Lords to Warlords

First, fragmentation has led to the rise of COs led by militarized leaders. By militarized leaders, we mean individuals leading defections who commanded of armed wings (*jefe de sicarios* or *jefe de brazo armado*) within the CO they fragment from. Armed wings in Mexico are units typically equipped with tactical gear, vehicles, automatic and semi-automatic firearms, and in some cases even grenades, rocket launchers, and makeshift tanks. These are not street soldiers or low-level hitmen, these are individuals who led militarized units, lead defection, and become leaders of their own COs. We find that 19 of the 54 defecting leaders (35%) led armed wings before or at the moment of defection. Given their combat training and experience, this likely has significant repercussions on the violent behavior of COs led by these individuals.

5.4 From Drug Traffickers to Predatory Cartels

Finally, we find that fragmentation has given rise to cartels specializing in predatory crimes. Of the 54 COs that fragment, 18 have primary activities that are far more predatory towards citizens (e.g., extortion, theft, local drug dealing, kidnapping for ransom) than the

traditional activity of drug trafficking large amounts of drugs to the US. While the activity diversification of the large cartels meant these crimes were increasing, the rise of smaller cartels that specialize in predatory crimes has resulted in cartels that cannot fall back on drug trafficking, depend on predatory crimes, and can only grow by increasing their involvement in these predatory crimes. This likely has very significant consequences for the prevalence of these crimes and citizen security. To exemplify, the fragmentation of the Zetas in 2015 following the arrest of their leader resulted in:

Dozens of cells in all the states where [the Zetas] operated were left... without profits or income from drug trafficking to the United States. Now their only relationship with drugs was local drug dealing... The new [fragment] leaders tried to supplement their income with mass kidnappings, robberies and extortion.⁶ (Cedillo 2018, 184)

6 Discussion

We have argued that questions of profits and survival are key to understand fragmentation and that illicit markets, geography, and alliances shape patterns we observe. An important question for future research is whether this theory travels to other contexts. Although our empirical analysis focuses on Mexico, we believe the theory generalizes to other countries, contexts, and time periods. Thus, while better-known cases like the Primeiro Comando da Capital in Brazil and the Cali and Medellin Cartels in Colombia may support the theory in violent contexts where governments use militarized approaches to combat drug cartels, we provide three alternative examples to show the plausible generalization of the theory to other contexts.

In Ecuador, a drug cartel called Los Choneros emerged in the city of Chone in the late 1990s. Los Choneros subsequently grew and expanded to prisons and new territories,

⁶Translated by authors.

becoming one of the dominant COs in Ecuador. Following the assassination of their leader in 2020, various internal factions of different sizes broke ranks and became independent, including Los Lobos, Los Tiguerones, and Los Chone Killers (the last two were armed wings of Los Choneros). In this fragmentation, both geography and alliances were key. The fragments mentioned previously formed an alliance called “Nueva Generación” to combat Los Choneros. Geographically, Los Choneros had extensive operations in the western provinces of Manabí and Guayas, while Los Lobos initially operated out of the eastern province of Pastaza, Los Tiguerones operate out of the northwestern city of Esmeraldas, and Chone Killers have their stronghold in the city of Durán ([GK 2022](#); [Newton 2023](#); [Insight Crime 2023, 2022](#)).

In Japan, the Yamaguchi-gumi, the largest yakuza organization, saw a high-level member and other dissidents split in 2015 following financial and personal disputes and form the Kobe Yamaguchi-gumi. Geographically, the Yamaguchi-gumi are headquartered in Kobe City, while the first headquarter of Kobe Yamaguchi-gumi was in Awaji Island. Later, the Kobe Yamaguchi-gumi itself saw members defect due to internal disputes. First, in 2017 a high-level member splintered and created the Ninkyo Yamaguchi-gumi (renamed Kizuna-kai in 2020), with its headquarters in Amagasaki City. Second, in 2020, defectors led by a mid-level leader formed the Ikeda-gumi with its headquarter in Okayama City, while others, a faction known as Yamaken-gumi with headquarters in Kobe City also became independent but soon thereafter rejoined to the Yamaguchi-gumi ([National Police Agency 2024](#)).

Before becoming one of the largest gangs in the Northern Triangle of Central America, Barrio 18 began as 18th Street gang in Los Angeles, California. The Mexican-American Westside Clanton 14th Street gang is a a Sureño gang formed in the 1920s centered along Clanton Street (later renamed 14th Street). In the 1960s, some members that operated in a neighboring community along 18th Street attempted to form a click (internal faction) called Clanton 18th Street, which Clanton 14 core members rejected—allegedly because the click was not led by a Mexican-American. Members of this click decided to become independent

and adopt the name 18th Street. Following quick growth due to their open ethnic enrollment, US policy of deporting non-citizen gang members to their country of origin in the 1990s resulted in the exportation of 18th Street to Central America ([Alonso nd, 2023](#)).

These examples suggest that the theory may travel to other countries with different levels of state capacity, types of COs, policies towards COs, and time periods. Future research should more formally test the generalizability of the theory to refine the incentives outlined, uncover other factors that shape fragmentation patterns, and better outline scope conditions.

7 Conclusion

We examine the factors influencing defection and their impact on subsequent fragmentation patterns. We argue that potential defectors weigh economic viability and their probability of surviving retaliation from the CO they betray. Leveraging an original qualitative dataset covering major drug cartels in Mexico and all their fragments from 2000 to 2018, we find that members at various ranks initiate defections due to leadership turnover and internal disputes. Larger fragments sometimes operate near their originating cartel's stronghold, while smaller ones operate in distant areas which safeguards them from retaliation. Moreover, fragments operating near their originating cartel form strategic military alliances with other cartels to survive retaliation. We further finds that direct fragments of the historical drug cartels are the most prone to fragmentation, and that government leadership decapitation did result in 18 cartels ceasing their operations. Moreover, we find the rise of cartels led by militarized leaders, a reduction in both the average tenure and age of cartel leaders decreases, and the rise of cartels specializing in predatory crimes.

These results have important policy implications. Most notably, it provides more nuanced understanding of the consequences of government leadership decapitation strategies. On the one hand, these cannot be solely blamed for the fragmentation of Mexican cartels. Even more, something not currently recognized is that, in some cases, they actually do accomplish the

goal of dismantling COs. Yet, it is also very clear that the costs far outweigh the benefits. Understanding which COs are prone to disbandment given leadership decapitation would allow governments to only target those leaders without cutting Hydra's head. However, it must be recognized that the policy has clear drawbacks and, in many cases, may not be a desirable option when targeting COs. The results also show that a fragmentation in one territory can affect other territories, highlighting the need for better coordination between local, state, and federal security agencies. Similarly, that fragmentation can push COs towards more local, and even predatory, crimes, which governments should consider.

We also believe this article opens the door to future research on CO fragmentation by providing data and uncovering patterns that require further attention. For example, future research could look at additional factors related to COs that may shape the propensity of fragmentation and subsequent patterns, including their size, internal structure, leadership styles, social and familial ties, government relations, or factors that cause fragmentation beyond those highlighted here. Future research could also look at fragmentation in other countries to provide additional insights and help better understand the phenomenon. Finally, our results show that fragmentation creates variation that can be analyzed empirically and in a more nuanced manner, for example, by looking at whether fragments differ in their violent behavior based on their size, leader characteristics, geography, or illicit markets, among others.

References

- Agreste, Santa, Salvatore Catanese, Pasquale De Meo, Emilio Ferrara, and Giacomo Fiumara (2016). Network structure and resilience of mafia syndicates. *Information Sciences* 351, 30–47.
- Alcocer, Marco (2022). Drug wars, organized crime expansion, and state capture in mexico. Unpublished manuscript.
- Alcocer, Marco (2023). Mapping Criminal Organizations in Guanajuato. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/WJSGWW>.
- Alonso, Alex A. (2023, Feb). 18th street gang in los angeles county. <https://www.streetgangs.com/hispanic/18thstreet/>.
- Alonso, Alex A. (n.d.). Clanton 14th street – 1st hood westside.
- Atuesta, Laura H and Aldo F Ponce (2017). Meet the narco: increased competition among criminal organisations and the explosion of violence in mexico. *Global Crime* 18(4), 375–402.
- Atuesta, Laura H. and Yocelyn Samantha Pérez-Dávila (2018). Fragmentation and cooperation: the evolution of organized crime in mexico. *Trends in Organized Crime* 21(3), 235–261.
- Atuesta, Laura H. and Yocelyn Samantha Pérez-Dávila (2021). *Presencia de los grupos criminales y de las fuerzas de seguridad en el contexto de la pandemia por COVID-19*. CIDE PPD.
- Ayling, Julie (2009). Criminal organizations and resilience. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice* 37(4), 182–196.
- Bakke, Kristin M, Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham, and Lee JM Seymour (2012). A plague of initials: Fragmentation, cohesion, and infighting in civil wars. *Perspectives on Politics* 10(2), 265–283.
- Berlusconi, Giulia (2022). Come at the king, you best not miss: criminal network adaptation after law enforcement targeting of key players. *Global crime* 23(1), 44–64.
- Braithwaite, Jessica Maves and Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham (2020). When organizations rebel: introducing the foundations of rebel group emergence (forge) dataset. *International Studies Quarterly* 64(1), 183–193.
- Catanese, Salvatore, Pasquale De Meo, and Giacomo Fiumara (2016). Resilience in criminal networks. *Atti della Accademia Peloritana dei Pericolanti-Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali* 94(2), 1.

- Cavallaro, Lucia, Annamaria Ficara, Pasquale De Meo, Giacomo Fiumara, Salvatore Catanese, Ovidiu Bagdasar, Wei Song, and Antonio Liotta (2020). Disrupting resilient criminal networks through data analysis: The case of sicilian mafia. *Plos one* 15(8), e0236476.
- Cedillo, Juan Alberto (2018). *Las Guerras Ocultas del Narco*. Grijalbo.
- Esberg, Jane (2021, Jan). More than cartels: Counting mexico’s crime rings. <https://www.crisisgroup.org/latin-america-caribbean/mexico/more-cartels-counting-mexicos-crime-rings>.
- Esberg, Jane (2025). Criminal fragmentation in mexico. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 1–8.
- Fjelde, Hanne and Desiree Nilsson (2018). The rise of rebel contenders: Barriers to entry and fragmentation in civil wars. *Journal of Peace Research* 55(5), 551–565.
- GK (2022, Oct). ¿quiénes son los chone killers? <https://gk.city/2021/10/21/quienes-son-los-chone-killers/>.
- Goertz, Gary and Stephan Haggard (2023). Large-n qualitative analysis (Inqa): causal generalization in case study and multimethod research. *Perspectives on Politics* 21(4), 1221–1239.
- Herrera, Joel Salvador and Cesar B Martinez-Alvarez (2022). Diversifying violence: Mining, export-agriculture, and criminal governance in mexico. *World Development* 151, 105769.
- Insight Crime (2022, Nov). Lobos. <https://insightcrime.org/ecuador-organized-crime-news/lobos-ecuador/>.
- Insight Crime (2023, Sep). Choneros. <https://insightcrime.org/ecuador-organized-crime-news/los-choneros/>.
- Joo, Minnie M and Bumba Mukherjee (2021). Rebel command and control, time, and rebel group splits. *International Interactions* 47(2), 318–345.
- Kostelnik, James and David Skarbek (2013). The governance institutions of a drug trafficking organization. *Public Choice* 156, 95–103.
- Leeson, Peter T and David B Skarbek (2010). Criminal constitutions. *Global Crime* 11(3), 279–297.
- Lessing, Benjamin (2021). Conceptualizing criminal governance. *Perspectives on politics* 19(3), 854–873.
- Lessing, Benjamin and Graham Denyer Willis (2019). Legitimacy in criminal governance: Managing a drug empire from behind bars. *American Political Science Review* 113(2), 584–606.

- Mahoney, Charles W. (2020). Splinters and schisms: Rebel group fragmentation and the durability of insurgencies. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 32(2), 345–364.
- National Police Agency (2024, Mar). *Organized Crime Situation in 2023*. Tokyo, Japan: Organized Crime Department.
- Newton, Christopher (2023, Apr). Ecuador gang massacre highlights intensified fight for drug routes. <https://insightcrime.org/news/gang-massacres-nine-ecuador-fight-drug-routes-intensifies/>.
- Pearlman, Wendy and Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham (2012). Nonstate actors, fragmentation, and conflict processes. *Journal of conflict resolution* 56(1), 3–15.
- Pereda, Valentin (2021). Macabre ceremonies: How los zetas produces extreme violence to promote organizational cohesion. *Violence: An International Journal* 2(2), 278–296.
- Pereda, Valentin (2024). How organizational culture shapes criminal organizations’ street-level territorial control capabilities: a study of los zetas. *Crime, Law and Social Change* 81(1), 53–74.
- Pereda, Valentin and David Décary-Hetu (2024). Illegal market governance and organized crime groups’ resilience: A study of the sinaloa cartel. *The British Journal of Criminology* 64(2), 326–342.
- Perkoski, Evan (2019). Internal politics and the fragmentation of armed groups. *International Studies Quarterly* 63(4), 876–889.
- Phillips, Brian J. (2015). How does leadership decapitation affect violence? the case of drug trafficking organizations in mexico. *The Journal of Politics* 77(2), 324–336.
- Piano, Ennio E (2017). Free riders: the economics and organization of outlaw motorcycle gangs. *Public Choice* 171, 283–301.
- Raleigh, Clionadh, Roudabeh Kishi, and Andrew Linke (2023). Political instability patterns are obscured by conflict dataset scope conditions, sources, and coding choices. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 10(1), 1–17.
- Ríos, Viridiana (2013). Why did mexico become so violent? a self-reinforcing violent equilibrium caused by competition and enforcement. *Trends in organized crime* 16, 138–155.
- Signoret, Patrick, Marco Alcocer, Cecilia Farfan-Mendez, and Fernanda Sobrino (2021). Mapping Criminal Organizations in Mexico: State Panel 2007-2015. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/N0KGCZ>.
- Skarbek, David (2010). Putting the “con” into constitutions: the economics of prison gangs. *The Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 26(2), 183–211.
- Skarbek, David (2012). Prison gangs, norms, and organizations. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 82(1), 96–109.

- Skarbek, David (2014). *The social order of the underworld: How prison gangs govern the American penal system*. Oxford University Press.
- Skarbek, David (2024). The political economy of criminal governance. *Public Choice*, 1–24.
- Skarbek, David and Peng Wang (2015). Criminal rituals. *Global Crime* 16(4), 288–305.
- Sundberg, Ralph, Kristine Eck, and Joakim Kreutz (2012). Introducing the ucdp non-state conflict dataset. *Journal of peace research* 49(2), 351–362.
- Trejo, Guillermo and Sandra Ley (2016). Federalism, drugs, and violence. why intergovernmental partisan conflict stimulated inter-cartel violence in mexico. *Política y gobierno* 23(1), 11–56.
- Trejo, Guillermo and Sandra Ley (2020). *Votes, drugs, and violence: The political logic of criminal wars in Mexico*. Cambridge University Press.
- Varese, Federico (2020). How mafias migrate: transplantation, functional diversification, and separation. *Crime and Justice* 49(1), 289–337.
- Velasco, Oscar Contreras (2023). Unintended consequences of state action: how the kingpin strategy transformed the structure of violence in mexico’s organized crime. *Trends in organized crime*, 1–25.
- Woldemariam, Michael (2018). *Insurgent fragmentation in the Horn of Africa: Rebellion and its discontents*. Cambridge University Press.