

# **Electoral Aftermath Memoria**

## MEXICO'S ELECTORAL AFTERMATH AND POLITICAL FUTURE

Synthesis/Memoria of the Papers Presented at a Bi-National Conference Held at The University of Texas at Austin, Sept. 2-3, 1994.

Conference Organized by The Mexican Center of ILAS

Conference Sponsors:

The Ford Foundation, Mexico City

The Mexican Center of ILAS

With Additional Support from:

The College of Liberal Arts

The Institute of Latin American Studies

The Shell International Oil Company

The Copyright for this document is held by the Mexican Center of ILAS.

Downloading and redistribution are acceptable, but the neither the contents nor the text must be altered in any way. Referencing and accreditation should be as follows: Author's name, title of presentation, page nos., in Ward, P. M. et al., Synthesis/Memoria of the Bi-National Conference: Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future. September 2-3, 1994 (Austin: The Mexican Center of ILAS, University of Texas at Austin, 1994)

If you prefer an original hardcopy of this document, it is available from the Mexican Center at a nominal cost of \$5.00 per copy. Please make money checks and money orders (dollars only) to ILAS, and send your order to the Mexican Center, Institute of Latin American Studies, Sid Richardson Hall 1.310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. U.S.A

The Mexican Center of ILAS

Peter M. Ward, Director

Xochitl Medina Gonzalez, Conference Coordinator/Layout and Design

Dorothy Schepps, Editor/Administrative Assistant

# Introductory Remarks

Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Peter M. Ward  
The Mexican Center  
The University of Texas at Austin

The seeds of the conference upon which this Synthesis/Memoria is based were first sown in 1988. The drama that surrounded the presidential elections of that year, and the serious shortcomings relating to the computation and declaration of the results, left an indelible shadow hanging over the legitimacy of the incoming administration of President Carlos Salinas de Gortari, as well as over the electoral process in Mexico. From the moment that the Gobernacion secretary announced that the electoral computer system had "crashed", there was intense interest and speculation both at home and abroad. Yet these events were so unprecedented that no-one offered a neutral forum in which an informed public discussion might emerge led by researchers and by political analysts. My hope was that in 1994, this opportunity should not be missed by default: hence the Austin meeting organized by the Mexican Center at the University of Texas.

The 1988 elections were so marred by controversy that President Salinas was determined to revamp the system before the end of his period in office so that his successor, whomsoever that might be, would not take office with the same cloud of suspicion hanging over him. Much has happened in the electoral arena since that time. I use the term "happened" advisedly, since I was aware that many who were present at the conference would be uneasy about accepting that Mexico had advanced, or that democratic change and transition were already entrained. Significant among these events were: the passage of a new electoral procedures and institutions law (the COFIPE) in 1990 and the creation of a whole new apparatus to conduct elections, the Federal Electorate Institute (the IFE) and the Federal Tribunal; electoral reforms, including a major campaign for voter registration and a revision of the electoral register; the introduction of voter identity cards; limits on campaign spending; more equitable media access for the parties; and some attempt to lessen the apparent control of the electoral apparatus by the government or from being influenced by a single party -- I refer to the last minute restructuring of the General Council of the IFE.

In the political arena, too, since 1989 there have been many significant events: an increased plurality in Congress; an opening of the political space, which has led to a

sharp rise of opposition parties in government at both the state and local levels; greater freedom of the press and political reporting in the mass media; improved monitoring of the electoral process by civic organizations culminating in the emergence of many major NGOs acting as national observers in the elections. But we have also seen evidence of political repression, greater fiscal centralization and enhanced powers of the presidency, as well as the sometimes dubious overturn and setting aside of election results. Equally significantly, we have witnessed in 1994 the taking up of arms against the state in Chiapas, a growing social instability, and an increase in politically motivated violence and assassinations.

Thus, just as there was intense national and international interest and speculation surrounding the election of 1988, the 1994 elections promised to be an acid test of just how far electoral and political reform had come. The key questions became: were Zedillo and a weakened PRI capable of winning the election? Could an opposition party win the presidency for the first time ever, and if so, or if it came close, would the result be respected? Would there be post-electoral conflict, and if so, could it lead to overturning the results or, in the worst of cases, as some feared, to civil conflict? Were the last minute reforms and the newly founded and unproven electoral apparatus and institutions going to be able to withstand the test? How could credibility be achieved?

Of course, by the time of the conference (early September) we at least had preliminary answers to some of these questions. The voter turnout was impressively high by any standards. The elections themselves appeared to have been conducted reasonably cleanly, with little post-electoral conflict. While observer groups differed over the extent and significance of irregularities and fraud that might have taken place, few were prepared to condemn the elections outright. The declared results showed a convincing victory for the PRI by a large margin of 20 and 30 percent over the PAN and the PRD, respectively. Compared with the drama of 1988, our conference discussions threatened to be far less exciting. As Alan Knight suggested during the first session, it was, perhaps, one of those turning points in history in which history refused to turn.

In fact, as the following pages of this Conference Synthesis will attest, the fact that we were not treated to a more exciting result in no way diminished the significance of these elections. Perhaps even more than 1988, these elections represented a watershed for Mexico and for its progress towards achieving a successful democratic transition.

Specifically, the issues upon which our conference presenters were invited to lead discussion were:

- \* The regional strengths and weaknesses of the parties, and the strategies required of the principal opposition parties in order to consolidate their party base.

- \* The likely composition of Congress, and the extent to which the system of partial

proportional representation provided effective and equitable representation of the parties in government.

- \* The nature of the mandate that these elections gave to the respective government branches, and for the separation of PRI-Government.
- \* The conduct of the elections themselves, and the relative effectiveness of the electoral organs to mount a fair and transparent election.
- \* An identification of further electoral reforms that are required in order to strengthen the plurality and the democratic process. What further revisions are required of the electoral institutions in light of their performance on August 21?
- \* To evaluate whether any inroads were being made into the "cultura de la sospecha" and how might an emergent political consciousness be consolidated?
- \* The utility, accuracy, and the role that public opinion surveys play in relation to opinion polling.
- \* The behavior and conduct of the mass media during the election campaign, and its effect upon the result.
- \* The future of the respective political parties and the likelihood of internal reforms, particularly of the PRI.

Short (15 minute) presentations were invited from the distinguished group of Mexican academics and political analysts who had agreed to participate. Full papers were not solicited, but a written summary was required comprising the main points and arguments touched upon. Subsequently, these formed the basis of the Memoria which follows.

Presentations were complemented by two or three brief commentaries from leading U.S. and European specialists, before taking questions and discussion from the floor. A distillation of these commentaries and the ensuing debate was provided later by four rapporteurs, and these, too, are reproduced below. The final session deviated from this format, and gave pride of place to three senior representatives from the principal political parties who engaged in a conversation with Rolando Cordera and with members of the public about the future scenario facing their particular party. Of course, they had also had ample opportunity to intervene earlier in the proceedings, as had all of the other presenters and conference participants. These final comments, too, form part of the rapporteur's comments for the final session.

I believe that most of us left the conference having modified our views somewhat, and challenged some of our preconceptions. While there was no consensus about the extent to which fraud had intervened in the elections, there was, I think, an acceptance of the need to consider the unevenness of the playing field in terms of access to media, campaign resources, privileged access of the PRI to major government programs and so on, as constituting fraud of the electoral process. Attacks upon the principal electoral institution (the IFE) were relatively muted: and most participants, I believe, respected the strides that had been made in the jornada electoral, even though opinion varied greatly about the effectiveness and impartiality of the IFE.

A clear sense emerged that, while the PRI's margin of victory was large, it was not a landslide, given that half of the population did not vote for the PRI, and the fact that these were probably the most transparent test of the electorate's pulse in recent history. The regional political landscape appears to have shifted in several important respects, and there is an uncoupling and dealignment of the PRI voter, which has enlarged the pool of floating voters. Clear bipartismo now exists in many regions, but it is invariably two separate two-party systems (PAN-PRI; PRD-PRI) rather than a three way regional race.

There was heated debate over whether the result was a mandate for further change or whether it gave Zedillo a "blank check" to proceed unfettered. There was optimism about opinion polling and its performance; there was some pessimism about how far the media had come in its equitable treatment of the parties. Although as yet incipient, it was argued that in addition to the well known effects of structural conditions shaping the vote, conjunctural events (such as the debate) during the election campaign mattered, and influenced how the electorate voted. There was some unease about the system whereby the winning party remains effectively over-represented in Congress, and whether opposition parties would be adequately included in the work of congressional committees.

These points, and many others, are the subject of the following pages. Finally, one area of consensus was that Mexico needs a strong plurality, a strong opposition, and, especially, a strong left. The irony, and a fear that many of us shared, is that despite a strong plurality in Congress, the opposition may have been weakened by these particular elections.

## MEXICO'S ELECTORAL AFTERMATH AND POLITICAL FUTURE

Synthesis/Memoria of the Papers Presented at a Bi-National Conference Held at The University of Texas at Austin, Sept. 2-3, 1994.

Conference Organized by The Mexican Center of ILAS

Conference Sponsors:

The Ford Foundation, Mexico City

The Mexican Center of ILAS

With Additional Support from:

The College of Liberal Arts

The Institute of Latin American Studies

The Shell International Oil Company

The Copyright for this document is held by the Mexican Center of ILAS.

Downloading and redistribution are acceptable, but the neither the contents nor the text must be altered in any way. Referencing and accreditation should be as follows: Author's name, title of presentation, page nos., in Ward, P. M. et al., Synthesis/Memoria of the Bi-National Conference: Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future. September 2-3, 1994 (Austin: The Mexican Center of ILAS, University of Texas at Austin, 1994)

If you prefer an original hardcopy of this document, it is available from the Mexican Center at a nominal cost of \$5.00 per copy. Please make money checks and money orders (dollars only) to ILAS, and send your order to the Mexican Center, Institute of Latin American Studies, Sid Richardson Hall 1.310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. U.S.A

The Mexican Center of ILAS

Peter M. Ward, Director

Xochitl Medina Gonzalez, Conference Coordinator/Layout and Design

Dorothy Schepps, Editor/Administrative Assistant

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents

## [Introductory Remarks](#)

Peter Ward

[SESSION ONE](#): The New Electoral Landscape. Party Regional Strengths, the Composition of Congress 1994-1997, and the Asamblea de Representantes del D.F.

21 de agosto de 1994: Volver a pensar la transición  
Alberto Aziz Nassif

Spatial Patterns of the 1994 Vote  
Guadalupe Pacheco Mendez

El Congreso Mexicano después de la elección  
Alonso Lujambio

Las elecciones federales de 1994 en Baja California: El fin de la opción panista?  
Tonatiuh Guillen Lopez

What Happened to Multipartyism in Mexico City?  
Jaqueline Peschard

La Asamblea de Representantes del D.F. Resultados e implicaciones  
Arturo Sanchez Gutierrez

El contrapunto jalisciense  
Jorge Alonso

Elecciones del 21 de agosto en Oaxaca  
Moises Jaime Bailon

Comments to Session One (a)  
Alan Knight

Comments to Session One (b)

Joseph L. Klesner

Session One: Summary of the Discussion and Debate.

Gareth A. Jones

[SESSION TWO](#): The Reform of the COFIPE, the Conduct of the Elections, and the Performance of the Principal Electoral Organizations

1994: Saldos, riesgos y agenda

Luis Farias Mackey

Consideraciones preliminares del IFE sobre las elecciones del 21 de agosto en Mexico  
Mauricio Collado Martinez

Law and Order in the 1994 Mexican elections, or "Nothing Happened in the Most Peaceful Land of America."

Manuel Gonzalez Oropeza

Nada que festejar

Sergio Zermeno

Deficiencias en la legislacion electoral mexicana para garantizar el sufragio  
Silvia Gomez Tagle

Mas alla de los organos electorales

German Perez Fernandez del Castillo

Session Two: Summary of the Comments, Discussion and Debate

Shannan Mattiace

[SESSION THREE](#): Party Access to the Media during the Campaigns and the Role of Opinion Polls in the Mexican Elections: How Level Was the Playing Field?

Opinion Poll Tracking 1994: A Success Story

Miguel Basanez

Mitos y realidades de las encuestas electorales en el proceso de 1994

Ana Cristina Covarrubias

Voto por el PRI, nivel de escolaridad nacional y percepcion de la probabilidad de violencia politica

Rafael Jimenez Valdes

Un muro contra la democracia  
Raymundo Riva Palacio

The 1994 Mexican Presidential Elections Coverage by and Potential Impact of Mexican and U.S. Television  
Federico Subervi and Jaqui Chmielewsky

Session Three: Summary of the Comments, Discussion and Debate  
Steve Barracca

[SESSION FOUR](#): Mexico's Political Future. Democracy and the Balance of the August 21 Elections

Indicaciones para una lectura de las elecciones mexicanas de 1994  
Alan Arias Marin

Perspectivas de cambio politico despues de los comicios de 1994  
Jose Antonio Crespo

Rebirth of the Perfect Dictatorship?  
Denise Dresser

La democracia y las elecciones de 1994  
Luis Javier Garrido

Session Four: Summary of the Comments, Discussion and Debate  
Roger Frahm

Summary of Roundtable Discussion: Whither the Political Parties?  
Roger Frahm

## [BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION](#)

### MEXICO'S ELECTORAL AFTERMATH AND POLITICAL FUTURE

Synthesis/Memoria of the Papers Presented at a Bi-National Conference Held at The University of Texas at Austin, Sept. 2-3, 1994.

Conference Organized by The Mexican Center of ILAS

Conference Sponsors:

The Ford Foundation, Mexico City

The Mexican Center of ILAS

With Additional Support from:

The College of Liberal Arts

The Institute of Latin American Studies

The Shell International Oil Company

The Copyright for this document is held by the Mexican Center of ILAS.

Downloading and redistribution are acceptable, but the neither the contents nor the text must be altered in any way. Referencing and accreditation should be as follows: Author's name, title of presentation, page nos., in Ward, P. M. et al., Synthesis/Memoria of the Bi-National Conference: Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future. September 2-3, 1994 (Austin: The Mexican Center of ILAS, University of Texas at Austin, 1994)

If you prefer an original hardcopy of this document, it is available from the Mexican Center at a nominal cost of \$5.00 per copy. Please make money checks and money orders (dollars only) to ILAS, and send your order to the Mexican Center, Institute of Latin American Studies, Sid Richardson Hall 1.310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. U.S.A

The Mexican Center of ILAS

Peter M. Ward, Director

Xochitl Medina Gonzalez, Conference Coordinator/Layout and Design

Dorothy Schepps, Editor/Administrative Assistant

# Session One: The New Electoral Landscape

Session One:

The New Electoral Landscape: Party Regional Strengths, the Composition of Congress 1994-1997, and the Asamblea de Representantes

Chair: Peter Ward  
The Mexican Center  
The University of Texas at Austin

21 DE AGOSTO DE 1994: VOLVER A PENSAR LA TRANSICION

Alberto Aziz Nassif  
Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social  
CIESAS, Mexico City

1. El país que voto sensaciones y sorpresas. Los días posteriores al 21 de agosto han transcurrido con una serie de sensaciones extrañas, desde la incredulidad, la sorpresa, la decepción, el hartazgo, hasta la curiosidad por saber que fue lo que paso.

Es increíble que haya habido una afluencia de votantes del 77.7 por ciento y que el PRI tenga prácticamente un carro completo.

Resulta sorprendente que la oposición panista fuera derrotada en lo que se suponía que eran sus bastiones regionales como Chihuahua o Baja California. Hay decepción porque casi la mitad del país voto por una continuidad y no se atrevió ni siquiera a generar contrapesos en el poder legislativo. Resulta hartante ver que la calidad de la elección no logro despejar del todo las viejas prácticas fraudulentas. Habrá que analizar con cuidado las razones del voto para entender el país que realmente existe.

2. La logica de las reglas del juego: Durante anos la oposicion ha peleado por mejorar las reglas del juego electoral como una de las vias para llegar a una transicion democratica. En esa logica se movio el pais practicamente desde la reforma de 1977. Dos eran los objetivos basicos, lograr un sistema de partidos incluyente para hacer de la via electoral el camino del cambio politico, de la alternancia y de un aterrizaje a la puerta democratica; el otro, era un objetivo que se daria de forma simultanea, terminar con el regimen de partido de Estado. Durante el camino surgio un problema, las resistencias minoritarias del PRI a dejar el poder cuando la ciudadanía se lo quitaba en las urnas. Asi, se llegaron a edificar los axiomas electorales del fraude y la manipulacion. Hoy, casi 20 anos despues de la reforma del 1977, tenemos, en efecto, nuevas reglas del juego, pero seguimos con un regimen de partido de Estado.

El resultado del 21 de agosto junto dos efectos politicos de forma paradójica: el avance para tener mejores reglas del juego fue resultado del impulso que se logro con el levantamiento zapatista en Chiapas, sin embargo, el asesinato de Colosio y la incertidumbre frente al cambio, generaron que el impulso inicial de cambio quedara subordinado a un eje: la necesidad de restaurar el orden, conservacion, frente al peligro del caos. Fue insoportable la incertidumbre de un posible cambio. Tal vez eso no pueda explicarnos el triunfo del PRI, lo cual era un dato de casi todas las encuestas, sino la forma en que sucedio, es decir, un alto porcentaje, con una afluencia masiva historica, 77.7%.

3. La agenda pendiente: desmontar al partido de Estado: La agenda politica despues del 21 de agosto sigue pendiente: acotar el poder presidencial, separar al PRI del gobierno, limpiar el poder judicial, autonomia al poder legislativo, hacer un nuevo pacto entre la federacion y los estados, lograr una mejor distribucion del ingreso, en fin, todas esas promesas de campana. El resultado de la eleccion no resuelve los problemas pendientes de una reforma politica mas profunda. Descomponer la eleccion y sobre todo el voto del PRI, puede ayudar a detectar con claridad que es lo que tiene que cambiar, ya que el cambio en las reglas del juego no desactivaron al partido de Estado, destacaria al menos seis elementos: los amarres corporativos; el clientelismo de PRONASOL y PROCAMPO; la dinero casi sin limites que gasto el PRI en las campanas; la inutilidad de la fiscalia electoral; la complicidad de muchos medios de comunicacion que actuaron como parte del regimen; las inercias de una cultura politica priista que se pensaba como algo muy reducido en el pais.

4. Y la transicion? Veamos dos posibilidades de lectura del fenomeno: a) Si vinculamos el termometro de la transicion democratica a los resultados electorales del 21 de agosto, entonces la conclusion puede ser la siguiente: hay una restauracion del partido de Estado, en la cual hubo procedimientos mas limpios que en el pasado, pero no dejo de haber fraude; al mismo tiempo, se activo el sistema politico para apoyar la continuidad del regimen frente a un posible cambio. En esta opcion tenemos un retroceso. El partido de Estado es un obstaculo de largo plazo, y tendremos a ese PRI por mucho tiempo mas. b)

Si no lo vinculamos, entonces la conclusion puede ser otra: la restauracion del partido de Estado es momentanea, fue producto de las situaciones extraordinarias que vivio Mexico en 1994, y cuando las aguas regresen a su nivel, se podra reconocer de nuevo esa parte del pais que ya se encuentra mentalmente en un Mexico plural y que aspira llegar a un sistema democratico. El partido de Estado es una realidad vulnerable. Tal vez las dos sean opciones ciertas, tal vez no, lo cierto es que tenemos un pais dividido y una agenda politica de cambios por delante.

5. Novedades de la eleccion: 1) El voto contra la inestabilidad. 2) La construccion de la legalidad electoral fue un objetivo central. 3) El voto en contra del panismo en los estados que gobierna. 4) Como ponderar la calidad de esta eleccion? 5) Cual es el mandato o los mandatos del voto del 21 de agosto?

## SPATIAL PATTERNS OF THE 1994 VOTE

Guadalupe Pacheco Mendez

1. Hubo sorpresa por el porcentaje alcanzado por el candidato presidencial del PRI (50%), a pesar de las dificultades politicas (Chiapas, asesinato de Colosio). Esto muestra la existencia de un segmento del electorado que considera al PRI la mejor opcion, casi siempre vota por el y espera que la situacion personal y del pais mejore con Ernesto Zedillo.

2. El aumento de la tasa de participacion hasta 78%, no favorecio al PRI, que retrocedio 12 puntos respecto a 1991. Esto se debe a que perdio electores entre aquellos que percibieron una mala situacion economica y politica y los que dejaron de valorar como positiva la labor de Carlos Salinas.

3. La eleccion presidencial de 1994 es tan competitiva como la de 1988, pero su patron de distribucion es diferente. La presencia de los tres principales partidos se reparte menos heterogeneamente en el pais y, en el caso del PRI, este ya no registra las elevadisimas votaciones superiores al 70%.

4. El PAN se consolida y avanza ahi donde ya tenia un nucleo fuerte y gana zonas en las regiones aledanas a esos estados; su presencia es importante en el norte y en el centro-occidente. El PRD avanza en el pacifico-sur y gana nuevos espacios en la region del golfo y del sureste.

5. Los bastiones del PRI se reacomodan. Su votacion se consolida en los estados con

alternancia (Chihuahua, Baja California y Guanajuato). Retrocede poco en los estados donde hay una oposicion importante (DF, Mexico, Michoacan, San Luis Potosi, Yucatan). Tiene sus retrocesos mas fuertes es estados rurales (Chiapas, Veracruz, Tlaxcala, Oaxaca), asi como en Sonora, Nuevo Leon, Campeche y Quintana Roo.

6. Se desarrolla un sistema de tres partidos pero que se expresa en dos niveles diferentes: en la mitad norte del pais es un bipartidismo PRI-PAN y en la mitad sur es un bipartidismo PRI-PRD.

## EL CONGRESO MEXICANO DESPUES DE LA ELECCION

Alonso Lujambio

Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico, ITAM

La ponencia discute la dificultad de fortalecer al poder legislativo despues de las elecciones presidenciales de 1994. Cuatro variables han explicado la debilidad del Congreso postrevolucionario mexicano: un solo partido ha obtenido, hasta 1988, la mayoria clarificada y absoluta en ambas camaras: el lider de dicho partido es el presidente de la Republica en turno; el PRI siempre vota cohesiva y disciplinadamente; desde 1933, no se permite la reeleccion legislativa en periodos sucesivos.

La eleccion de 1994 solo modifica, y parcialmente, una de estas condiciones. El PRI no contara con la mayoria calificada en una de las camaras del Congreso (la de diputados), por lo tanto, no podra reformar la constitucion sin el apoyo de otra u otras bancadas parlamentarias.

La ponencia discute como fortalecer el Congreso mexicano frente al escenario antes descrito y concluye con dos propuestas. En primer lugar, resulta urgente permitir la reeleccion inmediata en el Congreso para posibilitar el surgimiento de congresistas profesionales y experimentados. La reeleccion en periodos no sucesivos no ha permitido el surgimiento de una verdadera carrera parlamentaria: solo 14% de los diputados priistas han sido reelectos por lo menos una vez entre 1933 (año en que se prohibió la reeleccion legislativa inmediata) y 1994. Solo el 13% de los legisladores panistas han hecho lo propio.

Por otro lado, el reparto de posiciones al interior del sistema de comisiones puede fortalecer las labores legislativas del Congreso.

Las experiencias recientes de Alejandro Encinas - perredista, presidente de la Comision

de Asentamientos Humanos - y de Fernano

Gomez Mont - panista presidente de la Comision de Justicia - pueden ser ejemplares de ahi, no del ejecutivo, salieron piezas de legislacion que el Congreso aprobo. La composicion politica de las Comisiones, dominadas por el PRI - partido que usualmente se sobrerrepresenta en las mas importantes - es un punto de la agenda de lo que puede cambiarse en el Congreso. Los apoyos del staff de las comisiones pueden, por ultimo, contribuir a generar un trabajo mas profesional en los espacios legislativos mexicanos, sobre todo el de las fuerzas de oposicion.

## LAS ELECCIONES FEDERALES DE 1994 EN BAJA CALIFORNIA: EL FIN DE LA OPCION PANISTA?

Tonatiuh Guillen Lopez

El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, COLEF

Como en la mayoria de las entidades del pais, en Baja California en las elecciones de 1994 el PRI gano todos los cargos en disputa: la eleccion presidencial, la formula de senadores y las seis diputaciones de mayoria relativa. En 1991 el PAN habia ganado la eleccion de senador y tres diputaciones. Considerando el escenario gubernamental de la entidad, con el gobierno del estado y tres ayuntamientos bajo administracion del PAN, asi como su virtual control del congreso local, los resultados de 1994 parecen sorprendidos. Sobre todo considerando la fuerza que a nivel nacional adquirio su candidato presidencial y que nominalmente debio reflejarse en mayor medida en Baja California. Pero el hecho es que el PAN perdio casi un tercio de la votacion promedio que habia obtenido en 1991 y 1992.

La explicacion de los resultados de 1994 puede referirse a dos planos: uno estructural y otro coyuntural. En el primero se localiza el factor de mayor relevancia: la progresiva erosion del voto panista derivado de la practica de gobierno a partir de 1989. En este deterioro se encuentran tanto las limitaciones inherentes de los gobiernos locales frente a las necesidades del desarrollo regional, como las acciones propias de las politicas gubernamentales que progresivamente han generado espacios de friccion con la sociedad local. Ha sido esta relacion entre sociedad civil y aparato publico el principal factor que explica el declive del voto panista a partir de 1989, presente en las elecciones federales de 1991 y en las locales de 1992. Las victorias electorales del PAN progresivamente se realizaron a costos mas altos y con diferencias minimas frente al PRI (menos del 2 por ciento). Como tendencia, el declive del voto panista en 1994 es consistente con la

progresiva erosion presente en 1991 y 1992.

En el plano coyuntural se encuentran dos factores que se adicionaron al escenario estructural. El primero es la candidatura presidencial de Ernesto Zedillo y su reclamo de ser oriundo de Mexicali; la conexión entre el simbolismo presidencial y la región ha generado como expectativa una mayor presencia de los recursos federales en la entidad. Este efecto es sensible sobre todo en Mexicali en donde se fortalece la votación por el PRI.

Por otro lado, el segundo factor relevante de coyuntura fue el incremento de la votación del PRD y, en menor escala, del PT y del PVEM. Considerando que en la entidad se configuró entre 1989 y 1992 una estructura bipartidista entre PAN y PRI, todo incremento de terceros partidos tiene un costo para alguno de estos. En este caso, quien perdió sustancialmente votos, de perfil "de oposición", fue el PAN. Votos previamente del PAN se dirigieron ahora tanto al PRI como a los partidos PRD, PT y PVEM.

Entre los problemas de discusión que motivan los resultados de 1994 se encuentran: a) la confirmación de la "volatilidad" del electorado bajacaliforniano, que ratifica su distancia con los partidos; b) la relación entre el retorno del PRI en el primer plano electoral y la democracia: no hay un cuestionamiento de la apertura sino una ratificación del control ciudadano sobre las elecciones; c) la relación entre los partidos y la democracia: de la misma manera que ninguno la encarna, tampoco ninguno es su antítesis; d) la consolidación de partidos de oposición desde gobiernos locales: los gobiernos locales como posiciones frágiles, tanto por limitaciones institucionales como por dificultades para definir políticas que les permita articularse de manera plural con la sociedad local (tienden a funcionar bajo la herencia autoritaria); e) la expectativa de un triunfo priista en las elecciones locales de 1995 (gobernador, congreso, ayuntamientos).

## WHAT HAPPENED TO MULTIPARTISM IN MEXICO CITY?

Jacqueline Peschard  
El Colegio de México, COLMEX

All through the contemporary history of elections in Mexico, and particularly after the political reform of 1977, the Federal District has distinguished itself by three main traits:

- 1) high turnout rates;
- 2) low voting rates for the ruling party (a range of 15 to 20 points below its national

percentage) and high voting rates for the opposition parties (more than 20 points below its national percentage);

3) competition in the context of a multiparty setting that scattered the electoral potential of the opposition, allowing the ruling party to monopolize the capital city representation in Congress.

There were many novelties in the 1994 elections that had an important impact upon the Federal District: the organization of the electoral process gained independence from the government; the mass media opened to the opposition parties; and wide supervision over the election carried out by national and foreign observers. However, the 1994 elections confirmed certain voting trends in the Federal District:

1) 82% of the people registered voted, as compared with the 77% at the national level. Actually, this was the second highest turnout in the country (only below that of Guanajuato). The "Capitalinos" showed their will to participate and to be politically efficient and demonstrated their confidence in the electoral arena as a means to solve political discrepancies.

2) Competition among the three main political parties in the federal District was stronger than that expressed at the national level, but the difference was not as deep as it used to be. Only 7 points separated the PRI voting rates at the national level from those in the capital city. From the evidence of the 1994 elections, it seems that Mexico is moving firmly towards a three-party system. Added up, the votes of the 6 small parties represented this time only 10.9% of the total capital city votes, while three years ago they represented 22%.

3) The proportionality gap is still very wide. That is why, with only 40.4% of the votes, the PRI could take 92% of the capital city representation in the Chamber of Deputies (37 seats out of 40). The plurality formula in the context of a three party system explains part of this phenomenon. Something similar happened with the Asamblea de Representantes del Distrito Federal, which is a body elected by a mixed method. Again, with 40.3% of the votes, the PRI won 57.5% of the total number of seats. This overrepresentation of the PRI was achieved without even having to resort to the "majority lock." This absence of electoral efficiency on the side of the opposition parties in the federal District will be a central issue in the current political reform agenda for the capital city.

LA ASAMBLEA DE REPRESENTATES DEL D.F.: RESULTADOS E IMPLICACIONES

Arturo Sanchez Gutierrez  
El Colegio de Mexico, COLMEX  
Instituto Mexicano de Estudios Politicos, IMEP

1. Los resultados electorales de 1994 implican que el PRI obtuvo, con la mitad de la votacion, la Presidencia de la Republica, el 75% de la Camara de Senadores, el 60% de la Camara de Diputados y el 57% de la ARDF.
2. Mientras que las estrategias de campana de los partidos fueron importantes para la eleccion presidencial, los candidatos a la ARDF no realizaron una campana que destacara o que influyera en los resultados electorales. No se realizaron debates entre candidatos a asambleista, como se hizo para otras elecciones.
3. El contexto electoral para la ARDF es peculiar en tres sentidos: (1) A pesar de tratarse de la tercera Asamblea que se elige, el marco juridico actual y la perspectiva de funciones y facultades de la ARDF es distinto al pasado; (2) Prevalece en la formula electoral de la ARDF la clausula de gobernabilidad que le garantiza al partido mayoritario obtener mas del 50% de los asientos con solo alcanzar el 30% de la votacion en el D.F.; y (3) Esta eleccion es importante para el D.F. ya que la Asamblea que resulto de ella realizara funciones de transito a la eleccion indirecta del Regente de la ciudad a partir de 1997, cuando el Presidente de la Republica seleccionara al Regente entre los miembros de la ARDF, los diputados y senadores del D.F.
4. La eleccion de 1994 contrasta con las anteriores en tres puntos: (1) En 1988, el contexto de fraude dificulto la integracion final de la Asamblea; (2) La eleccion de 1991 resulto en una victoria total del PRI; y (3) La eleccion de 1994 dejo solo a 5 partidos representados.
5. El D.F. seguira debatiendose en el futuro en un contexto de cambio institucional: entre la conformacion de una nueva entidad federativa y la creacion de un gobierno representativo propio de una ciudad; entre un aparato administrativo obsoleto (por delegaciones) y la creacion de nuevas instancias de consulta ciudadana (consejos ciudadanos); entre una Asamblea de 66 miembros y una mas grandes para ser mas eficiente ante la no reeleccion de sus miembros.
6. Los resultados electorales se expresan en la siguiente tabla:  
  
(Table available in publication only)
7. Conclusiones: La eleccion de 1994 fue contrastantemente limpia en relacion con otras

elecciones. Ese criterio se aplica para la eleccion de la ARDF. El PRI obtuvo la votacion mas baja de su historia y sin embargo obtuvo el llamado "carro completo." Existen aun muchos elementos para transitar a una eleccion ya no solo limpia, sino completamente democratica. En el D.F., a pesar de la importancia de la eleccion, el interes de la ciudadania sobre sus representates directos, fue mas un efecto del contexto electoral que de un interes por el desarrollo de las instituciones ciudadinas.

## EL CONTRAPUNTO JALISCIENSE

Jorge Alonso

Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropologia Social  
CIESAS , Mexico City

(Tabled paper not presented at the conference: summarized by Mexican Center staff).

Alonso argues strongly that the 1994 elections underscores the regional peculiarity and variation in Mexican voting patterns. It also sheds light on many of the weaknesses and irregularities of the Mexican electoral system.

Notwithstanding the state's attempt to make these elections the cleanest and most transparent ever, they still leave much to be desired. It is not yet possible to claim that elections are democratic in Mexico. He lists the weaknesses: manipulation and intimidation on election day; new forms of corporatism; large areas of the electoral process still heavily influenced by the state party; heavy media and powerful backers supporting the PRI; use of government programs in favor of PRI; shaving of electoral lists; multiple voting; ink that not indelible etc. These were not democratic elections nationally nor in Jalisco, he argues.

This notwithstanding the PAN did very well in Jalisco - winning the largest cities (including Guadalajara); dominating the PRI in 35 municipalities and by almost 10% overall, with a very high turnout (83%). The PAN won 9 of the 20 districts and is contesting two others and the senate race. In one or two districts (eg the 7th) only a few votes split the candidates and gave the PRI victory. It was here that allegations of fraud are important. In district 18, for example, the margin of PRI victory is much less than the number of annulled votes.

Compared with 1988 in Jalisco the PAN increased its percentage vote by 11% and almost tripled its vote in absolute numbers, whereas the PRD (Cardenista vote) dropped 20%.

On these results at least, the PAN has a good chance of winning the governorship of Jalisco, although unless the playing field is made more level, opposition alternancia may continue to be frustrated.

## ELECCIONES DEL 21 DE AGOSTO EN OAXACA

Moises Jaime Bailon

(Tabled paper not presented at the conference: summarized by Mexican Center staff).

In Oaxaca, as elsewhere, the participation was high -- 71.4% of those on the electoral list -- and this represented a 25% increase over the 1988 election participation rate.

Although the opposition has an important presence in the state, it remains a minority presence, with the PRI dominant historically.

In the 1994 elections the PRI took 50% of the total vote (a decline in relative terms of 13% over the 1988 results, but an absolute increase of 27%).

Cardenas won approximately the same proportion of the votes as in 1988 (circa 27%), but his absolute vote increased by 54%. While the PAN increased its vote 351% in absolute terms this was on relatively low base levels, and, with 13% of the vote overall, it remains the third force.

While other parties continued to exist, as elsewhere in the country, it seems that their demise is imminent.

In short, a three party system emerging in Oaxaca in which dominant party has barely half the votes. The democratic future lies with in the ability of these opposition parties to engage and participate in a dialogue with the government, and to enhance the extent to which civil society achieves greater control over local government.

## COMMENTS TO SESSION ONE (a)

Alan Knight  
St. Antony's College, Oxford

The character of the 1994 election--and the degree to which it confers legitimacy--is clearly crucial. Conversely, the impact of fraud must be considered. But "fraud" and "illegitimacy" may be defined in two distinct ways. First, there is outright fraud: ballot-

rigging, "alchemy", coercion. In the view of many ponentes, although fraud existed, it was not on such a scale as to affect the final outcome of the presidential election. Arturo Sanchez made the point that the final result in 1994 was almost identical to 1988 (i.e., it tied the lowest ever PRI presidential vote). However, it is one thing to get 49% (of valid votes) when people think you really only got, say, 35% and almost lost; another, when they think you got, say, 45% and clearly won. Even if this assumption underestimates the level of fraud--as some would argue--it is the public perception which matters. If most Mexicans believe that Zedillo won, that is what counts.

However, the second form of "fraud" (here the word is not entirely appropriate) involves the structural imbalances which favor the PRI: the incestuous political parentesco linking party and state, the--increasingly close and increasingly contentious--relationship linking the PRI and big business, especially the electronic media. I refer not so much to the political peccadilloes of Carlos Hank as the role of Televisa or the political pay-offs of Solidarity and other government programs which redound to the benefit of the PRI. Federico Estevez stressed the importance of "conjunctural" campaign decisions over such structural imbalances. Certainly if you drop the ball you are more likely to lose the game; but if the playing field isn't level either, the chances of losing are greatly enhanced. However, an important caveat should be made. The politics of the pork barrel (Estevez's phrase) are ubiquitous--witness US defense spending or European-road-building. Administrations will always use public resources with an eye to (re-)election (e.g., Recupero's recent fall from grace in Brazil). And incestuous relations with the media are also common: consider Silvio Berlusconi and Forza Italia. The Mexican case is probably more extreme than most, given the longevity of one-party rule at the national level. But critics--especially gung-ho champions of political liberalism--should recognize that free elections and pork-barrel politics are entirely compatible and they should not expect the--relative--of the PRI vote by district suggest, the party has proven successful at mobilizing votes to good electoral advantage: a strategy requiring careful long-term pork-barrel planning.

What of the longer term consequences? As Peter Ward mentioned at the outset, the result was not "exciting"; it certainly did not live up to the--sometimes apocalyptic--expectations that I read in the Spanish press in August. Was 1994--like 1848--one of those "turning points of history when history failed to turn". The significance of the 1994 result can, I think be seen in conjunctural or longer-term perspective. Conjuncturally, it reflects the economic stabilization--especially the conquest of inflation--which has occurred since 1988; and, perhaps, the perception that the PRI was best placed to maintain economic stability (an economic voto miedo, one might say). In terms of political conjuncture, it may have ended a cycle begun with the 1987 split within the PRI and the 1988 FDN

campaign. The PRD failed to repeat its challenge of six years previously; like previous partidos electoreros, such as Henriquez Guzman's FPPM (1952-4), it could not--or was not allowed to--capitalize on its initial electoral appeal. This raises the crucial question whether the PRD--now solidly represented in the Chamber of Deputies--can regroup and constitute itself as a coherent parliamentary left-of-center party; or whether internal schisms and external pressures will defeat this goal, encouraging the left--which, as Chiapas showed, does not want for legitimate grievances--to take an extraparliamentary route. It would probably be in the long-term interest of the PRI and of the system as a whole to encourage, rather than to obstruct, such a goal; in other words, to "domesticate" the PRD as it has the PAN.

As for the latter, its healthy vote can be interpreted in two ways. It could be another step on the road to power (in 2000?), in which respect PAN's appeal to young voters is significant. But it could also be a plateau. Significantly, the PAN performed poorly in states where it held power, such as Baja California (a retrospective compliment to the PRI's prescience in letting the PAN win the odd governorship). In addition, the PAN, having lost its distinctive appeal in terms of economic and social policy (NAFTA, privatization, the ejido, Church-State relations) may now be forfeiting its distinctive political appeal.

Finally, what of the long-term consequences for the PRI? For decades, pundits have predicted that socioeconomic "modernization" (urbanization, literacy, the growth of a middle class, etc.) would doom the PRI, by virtue of requiring a commensurate political "modernization", e.g., pluralism, internal party democracy, genuine alternancia. Some even believe 1994 bears this out. Rather, I think, the PRI has responded with characteristic flexibility: it has shifted ground, targeted voters, and, in key areas like the DF, has significantly recovered ground. But, as the previous discussion of "structural" biases suggests, this does not necessarily mean a thorough reform of the PRI, of presidentialism, or of the system as a whole. As in the past, the system has responded to socioeconomic change, but many of its basic features remain. If, as Zedillo now boldly promises, a separation of party and state is in the offing, then, perhaps, the might engine of patronage and co-optation will be dismantled. But I will believe that when I see it.

## COMMENTS TO SESSION ONE (b)

Joseph L. Klesner  
Kenyon College

Regionalism. The data we have been shown by Guadalupe Pacheco and Federico Estevez indicate that the regional strengths of the PAN and the PRD that we have seen develop in the last two elections have continued and become accentuated. This may mean that a regional alignment of voters is solidifying, with the PAN showing very significant strength in the North, in the Bajío, in the Center-West, and in the Federal District, and with the PRD finding its support in the Federal District, in the South and some parts of the Gulf region. The PAN's showings in Jalisco, Nuevo Leon, and Sonora are notable here. So is the PRD performance in Guerrero, Tabasco, Chiapas, Michoacan, Oaxaca and Veracruz.

Dealignment. Combined with this regionalization of the electorate, however, is an uncoupling of voters from the PRI and the creation of a pool of floating voters. The presentations of Federico Estevez and Tonatiuh Guiellen speak of volatility. I have recently been making the argument that dealignment characterizes the results of the past two federal elections. I agree with those who say that by-and-large the electorate has not realigned itself. I think this is demonstrated by the following indicators, among others. First, the PAN's best performances in the North and West came in states where it does not govern; the PRI did well in the states where the PAN holds the gubernatorial seat. This suggests that each is able to lure voters from those who voted for the other the last time, or, and this is possible given the high turnout, each is able to mobilize voters who did not vote in 1991 or not in the last state-level election. Second, the PRI reconquered Mexico City, and the PAN did much better there than in 1988. Former Cardenas voters went to each. My supposition is that in 1988 many chilangos cast their protest votes for Cardenas, but in 1994 those expressing dissent voted for PAN because Diego Fernandez was a more efficacious candidate, and yet others were casting a vote of support for the PRI for a job well done.

Guadalupe Pacheco's suggestion that we see a bipartismo, but two separate two-party systems, is very important. I'll return to this below. Is it possible that Mexico is bifurcating? Electorally, there are indications of a panista North, or at least a North willing to vote panista if the government does not respond to its demands, and a South in which the Left can make serious inroads.

I was also taken with Federico Estevez's argument that we henceforth have to explore campaign dynamics much more than structural factors. This, of course, is the logical conclusion when the electorate becomes more uncoupled, when voter volatility increases. This has significant consequences for Mexican democracy. On the one hand, if, as Estevez argues is necessary, a credible democratic opposition party emerges, the possibility of alternation in power becomes greater. This would satisfy those identified by Alberto Aziz who would not be satisfied to say that Mexico has transitioned to democracy unless there is alternation in power. Of course, to do this, the parties and candidates for lower office must present more independent campaigns, as Arturo Sanchez implies in his presentation.

On the other hand, as we have experienced in the U.S., campaigns that focus too much on dynamics sometimes focus too little on the important campaign events--debates, for instance--and too much on personalities and scandals. Perhaps the weight of issues in Mexican politics will help Mexico avoid this North American pitfall.

Control of the Congress and State-level Government. Perhaps the most surprising element in the elections was the PRI's resounding success in the elections for the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. Very importantly, this means the PRI will govern by itself for the next three years, at least so long as social peace is not breached. This is true at state levels, too, at least for those states not now governed by the opposition. In this respect, it is valuable to note that the Mexican electoral calendar tends to concentrate gubernatorial elections into the second half of a sexenio. In the near term, the gubernatorial elections will be in Jalisco, Morelos and Tabasco and in Baja California. In the latter, PAN control of the state government will be on the line. The Jalisco and Baja California races will likely be strongly contested by the PAN, but even if it were to succeed in both cases, the PAN would only increase the geographical area it governs by one state, albeit the large state of Jalisco, home to Guadalajara. Perhaps the PRD will strongly contest Tabasco and Morelos, but I would be reluctant to predict that it could win either. Here the capacity of the PRI to concentrate its resources on just a couple of elections is very critical. So, having a near *carro completo* in the Chamber, firm control of the Senate, and few state governments in threat, the Zedillo administration should be able to do what it will so long as its actions don't threaten social peace. The latter possibility is one we have not yet considered. There has been little post-elections unrest, but that does not mean that unrest won't develop later.

Two Mexicos? This brings me back, briefly, to Alberto Aziz's last point. It is possible that the social crisis in Mexico, expressed most vividly by Chiapas, is not resolvable electorally. Part of Mexico may refuse to grant legitimacy to a government which assumes power as a result of an election which the majority of Mexicans consider fair. That dissenting Mexico may have the capacity to force the majority to consider public policies the majority does not favor, or to which the majority is indifferent. That may be the price of social peace.

## SESSION ONE: SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

The New Electoral Landscape: Party Regional Strengths, the Composition of Congress 1994-1997, and the Asamblea de Representantes de DF

Gareth A. Jones  
University of Wales, Swansea

The papers presented in this session (and two further papers which were tabled) addressed the issue of Mexico's new electoral landscape. Four themes ran throughout the session: trends in electoral results 1988-1994 and 1991-1994; changes to the regional distribution of voting patterns; the changing profile of the electorate; and, the changing balance of explanation between structural, contextual (coyuntural) and more locally conferred factors. To take each in turn.

According to a number of speakers 1994 marks a strong resurgence of the PRI, reaffirming the party's dominant position at all levels of the polity and the legitimacy of its right to govern. This picture is supported by the PRI's performance in PAN strongholds and by its ability to draw a popular base out from under the PRD. A number of presenters argued, however, that a more justifiable comparison is with 1991 which reveals a decline in the PRI vote by approximately 12%. The seeds of the following day's debate on President-elect Ernesto Zedillo's mandate were sown at this stage. As Knight pointed out, in 1994, the question of legitimacy of the president is no longer related to the election outcome, but whether that outcome is perceived to be fair and accurate.

There was a broad consensus on the new regional pattern of voter behavior, at least as regards the PRI. In 1994 the PRI's vote displayed little regional variation compared to 1988. The PAN on the other hand confirmed its powerful position in the north, even if it fared badly in those states in which it governs. The PRD has become a more genuine opposition to the PRI in the south despite a decline in support in states in which it did best in 1988. It was left to commentators and the floor to interpret this outcome in terms of Mexico's transition toward a tripartite political system at the regional level. Speakers had noted, for example, how within the thesis of "two Mexicos" evidenced by the north-south pattern of opposition support, the PAN vote had doubled in the south and the PRD had done well in some northern states. Speakers on the DF eluded to tripartite and highly competitive elections, while the experience of Baja California and elsewhere appear to be characterized by a two-party battle for dominance. Among speakers, commentators and the floor the jury is clearly out.

The changing profile of the Mexican electorate was the most interesting topic of debate. The 1988 election was characterized by party switching from the PRI, a trend which seemed to have stopped this time round. In 1994, party switching and tactical voting, especially as evidenced by split tickets, were minimal. Commentators and floor pursued the question of the future realignment of undecided voters and party switchers. The former promiscuity of left wing voters has calmed, but some odd patterns emerge such as the loss of votes from the PAN to the PT in the north. The highly contentious view was forwarded that in 1994 the PRI had successfully convinced formerly undecided and new

voters, hence rise in voter turnout, albeit by negative politics (fear vote etc.). Although unsaid, party loyalty remains a key characteristic of the system.

Speakers, commentators and the floor differed most widely on the issue of explanation. For some the continuing inequality of the electoral and extra-political system were paramount. This group pointed to the fact that despite the new rules of the game the result in 1994 was virtually the same as 1988. The reform of the COFIPE, for example, while progressive in many aspects guaranteed the PRI a governable majority with only a minimum margin of victory. Others argued that campaign errors such as the disappearance of Fernandez de Cevallos and the television debate for Cardenas were more important. The nexus of local and national political scales was seen as an important conditioning factor, although with no great consistency. Thus, in Baja California the PAN may well have suffered due to its record of local government and the confidence of the electorate to vote as citizens, while the election in the DF for an Asamblea de Representantes was put down to party allegiance. It remained for both commentators to show the linkage between these points, particularly how the PRI has successfully repositioned itself to win competitive elections in a different, arguably more modern, political environment.

## MEXICO'S ELECTORAL AFTERMATH AND POLITICAL FUTURE

Synthesis/Memoria of the Papers Presented at a Bi-National Conference Held at The University of Texas at Austin, Sept. 2-3, 1994.

Conference Organized by The Mexican Center of ILAS

Conference Sponsors:

The Ford Foundation, Mexico City

The Mexican Center of ILAS

With Additional Support from:

The College of Liberal Arts

The Institute of Latin American Studies

The Shell International Oil Company

The Copyright for this document is held by the Mexican Center of ILAS.

Downloading and redistribution are acceptable, but the neither the contents nor the text must be altered in any way. Referencing and accreditation should be as follows: Author's name, title of presentation, page nos., in Ward, P. M. et al., Synthesis/Memoria of the Bi-National Conference: Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future. September 2-3, 1994 (Austin: The Mexican Center of ILAS, University of Texas at Austin, 1994)

If you prefer an original hardcopy of this document, it is available from the Mexican Center at a nominal cost of \$5.00 per copy. Please make money checks and money orders (dollars only) to ILAS, and send your order to the Mexican Center, Institute of Latin American Studies, Sid Richardson Hall 1.310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. U.S.A

The Mexican Center of ILAS

Peter M. Ward, Director

Xochitl Medina Gonzalez, Conference Coordinator/Layout and Design

Dorothy Schepps, Editor/Administrative Assistant

# Session Two: The Reform of the COFIPE

Session Two:

The Reform of the COFIPE, the Conduct of the Elections, and the Performance of the Principal Electoral Organizations

Chair: Sidney Weintraub  
LBJ School of Public Affairs  
The University of Texas at Austin

1994: SALDOS, RIESGOS Y AGENDA

Luis Farias Mackey

Saldos: En materia electoral, de 1989 a la fecha, en Mexico se han llevado a cabo 3 reformas constitucionales, 6 legales y 2 penales. En un fenomeno que es por esencia controvertido podemos estar de acuerdo en un punto: Mexico esta inmerso en un proceso de transicion democratica. Para algunos puristas el termino transicion no es el correcto, e pur si muove; para otros la transicion ha sido muy lenta y hay para quien se ha efectuado demasiado rapido. De cualquier manera y para todos: en 1994 el cambio politico se impuso por sus fueros y, sin duda, sera la principal tarea a atender por el proximo gobierno.

En solo 5 anos en Mexico se han levantado dos padrones electorales, uno desde cero con una tecnica censal y otro, con base en el primero, que consistio en fotocredencializar a 45.7 millones d unico en el mundo por el tiempo de su realizacion, su cobertura, su consistencia y, sobre todo, el control ejercido desde las etapas de planeacion por todos los partidos politicos.

Se crearon nuevos y modernos organismos encargados de la administracion y jurisdiccion

electoral, se inicio la profesionalizacion de la funcion electoral; la toma de decisiones en el organo encargado de organizar las elecciones se deposito practicamente en las manos de representantes de la ciudadania y se profundizo la tendencia a descentralizar la organizacion electoral. Existe un sistema de medios de impugnacion sumamente elaborado que dota a cada etapa de definitividad juridica y sujeta al proceso todo al principio de legalidad.

La integracion de las mesas directivas de casilla se lleva a cabo a traves de una doble insaculacion disenada por uno de los partidos de oposicion, que permite corroborar en casilla que el ciudadano realmente sea el designado por esa doble via. El padron esta a disposicion permanente de los partidos politicos; las Listas Nominales de Electores se exhibieron por un mes para su correccion ciudadana y partidista; los listados definitivos a usarse en las casillas se repartieron a los partidos con mas de un mes de antelacion.

En materia de sistemas de representacion se atempero la que puede alcanzar el partido que obtenga mayoria de votos en la Camara de Diputados; se abrio el Senado a las primeras minorias; desaparecio la ominosa clausula de gobernabilidad que solo sirvio para demostrar al sistema electoral mexicano ante propios y extranos; se suprimio la autocalificacion electoral, sujetandose el proceso de resultados a un Tribunal de pleno derecho. En el sistema de partidos se fortalecio la figura y el monto del financiamiento publico; se regulo por primera vez el financiamiento no publico de los partidos; se impuso un tope a los gastos de campana y se establecio la obligacion de rendir informes financieros anuales y de campana; se amplio el acceso de los partidos a los medios electronicos de comunicacion en los tiempos oficiales y se abrio la puerta para regular en definitiva un trato equitativo de los concesionarios de radio y television a partidos y campanas.

Se consagro y reglamento el derecho ciudadano de observador electoral, se creo la figura de visitante extranjero para efectos electorales, se instauró una fiscalia especial en materia electoral, se ampliaron los tipos delictivos y las penas correspondientes.

Los saldos se inclinan a lo positivo: 15 millones mas de votantes que en 1988; 77% de la Lista Nominal de Electores votaron; fue una eleccion blanca, sin violencia ni irregularidades graves; fue una eleccion vigilada: 652 mil representantes de partidos politicos, 6.7 representantes por casilla y 1.6 representantes por funcionario de mesa directiva. El 84% de las casillas contaron con dos o mas representantes de partido. 81 mil 600 observadores electorales vigilaron la eleccion; 775 visitantes extranjeros atestiguaron su realizacion y conocieron de sus modalidades; se realizaron 13 conteos rapidos o exit polls por organizaciones no gubernamentales

coincidiendo en terminos generales entre ellas y con los resultados oficiales. La mayoria de las encuestas de tendencias electorales previas a la eleccion coincidieron tambien con los resultados alcanzados.

Las tentaciones y riesgos: que el mexicano, tan proclive a la rumorologia, caiga en la retroalimentacion geometrica de susceptibilidades que termina por solo hacer de nuestros procesos electorales "una red llena de agujeros"; que el PRI lea en su votacion que el electorado le ha extendido un cheque en blanco para remontarse a estadios de autoritarismos excluyentes; que la lectura del PAN fortalezca su obsesion por el bipartidismo; que la izquierda se retraiga a etapas pre o antidemocraticas; que los Consejeros Ciudadanos, pretendiendo cumplir su funcion, candida o manosamente, reediten los Colegios Electorales en el seno del Consejo General.

La agenda: abrir a la pluralidad los medios de comunicacion liberando a los concesionarios de lo precario de su derecho de concesion; revisar topes de campana y computarizarlos desde que el candidato acepte la postulacion por cualquier organizacion; duracion de campanas; replantear el sistema de representacion del que se beneficia, por la representacion proporcional ideada para dar representacion a los partidos minoritarios, el partido con mayoria de votos para consolidar su mayoria; adecuar las legislaciones locales a los avances federales; resolver el problema de los partidos fantasmas; tipificar el delito de calumnia y difamacion electoral, para evitar que la denuncia penal sea usada como instrumento de propaganda y lucha politica cuando no exista en realidad delito que perseguir; llevar a cabo la redistribucion electoral que data de 1977; instrumentar la Cedula Nacional de Identidad evitando caer en el chantaje partidista de que se haga en dos o tres anos; revisar la figura de coaliciones y plantearse el problema de la gobernabilidad factica por sobre la legal y democratica.

Avanzar en la consolidacion de la autonomia de las autoridades electorales, considerando que la autonomia es un termino relativo, siempre se es autonomo para algo y de alguien, debiendo entonces concebir esta como un control mutuo y no como la ausencia de todo control. Por ultimo, y sobre todo, revisar el codigo de conductas y actitudes de los diversos actores politicos que, a veces, se antoja, poco corresponde a los avances y saldos electorales, pero principalmente a la madurez que la ciudadania ha mostrado en estas elecciones.

**CONSIDERACIONES PRELIMINARES DEL IFE SOBRE LAS ELECCIONES DEL**

21 DE AGOSTO EN MEXICO

Mauricio Collado Martinez  
Instituto Federal Electoral, IFE

(This summary was made from the author's full paper by Mexican Center staff.)

This presentation provided data on the preparations for the August 21 elections; the conduct of the elections themselves; the nature, timing and accuracy of the Programa de Resultados Electorales Preliminares (PREP); and anticipated following steps concerning ratification of the definitive results and resolution by the Federal Electoral Tribunal of those results which are being contested.

Significant elements in the preparation for the elections include a new voting register (padron) which includes 95% of Mexicans eligible to vote: voting cards (credencial); electoral authority vested in independent "citizen counselors" of the Consejo General; new rules governing the conduct and observation of the elections etc. These elections were the most closely monitored in Mexico's history. Although the problems encountered were light, the major difficulty arose over insufficient voting slips in the 687 casillas especiales (0.71% of the total). An unexpectedly large number of people sought to vote in these specially designated casillas, the total number of voting slips allowable at which was determined by previous agreement. The General Council had ordered that a full explanation be given to the public regarding the arrangements for these special casillas, and a commission of Citizen Counselors would also be studying the case.

The PREP functioned well, but it was decided by the General Council of IFE that no preliminary results would be released until 15% of the casillas had reported. Thus, it was not until 2.35 am that this threshold was met, and the PREP results were released at 3am on 22nd August giving preliminary results in the presidential elections of 47.14% PRI [50.18%]; 31.35% PAN [26.69%]; 15.49% PRD [17.08%] [results in brackets show the final definitive results of valid votes]. Before the PREP results were declared, several other independent bodies had provided "rapid count" results (from 10pm onwards). Forty-five hours after casillas closed, the PREP had declared information on the results of 87.05% of all casillas. The formal sessions of District Councils to compute the results began on August 24, while the calculation of the plurinominal results began on the 28th. For the first time, election results will be approved by the decentralized organs of the IFE, while those of the presidential elections will be approved by the incoming Congress in November, thereby ending the "self-approval" mechanism.

In the Senatorial elections the PRI won in all 32 entities and obtained 64 of the 96 seats available; the PAN obtained second place in 24 entities; and the PRD in 8. In the deputyship elections the PRI won 277 districts; the PAN 18; and the PRD 5. At the time the paper was presented the overall representation of the political parties in Congress had yet to be determined, taking account of the proportional representation seats.

Finally, the paper concluded with an account of the procedures whereby the Federal Electoral Tribunal would resolve appeals made to it. Also, that the Fiscal Especial appointed on July 17 would be pursuing offenses committed during the elections.

## LAW AND ORDER IN THE 1994 MEXICAN ELECTIONS, OR "NOTHING HAPPENED IN THE MOST PEACEFUL LAND OF AMERICA"

Manuel Gonzalez Oropeza  
Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, UNAM

(This summary was made from a full paper provided by the author by the Mexican Center staff.)

The election results fundamentally reflect the innate conservatism in Mexican society, and the fear of social unrest and economic deterioration in the event of major political change.

The financing of the election campaign raises several important issues. First the overall amount (US \$70 million) under 5 different heads established by the electoral code is excessive given Mexico's relative poverty. Second, the largest share goes to the PRI (approximately half of the total). Third, that an excessive amount goes to very small parties (\$3 million) in total disproportion to the vote they polled (i.e. it is lifesaver to keep them afloat). The big beneficiaries are the commercial and advertising companies who serviced the campaign.

Various issues arise on the conduct of the elections themselves. First, there remain irregularities (occasional lack of secrecy; lack of access to observe election boards; rumor mongering to create fear and anxiety; confusion about where to vote; the special polling stations; some "buying" of votes [especially in Chiapas and Guerrero] etc.) Second, the "expense" not accounted for in financial terms, of the vast mobilization of unpaid human resources who served on election day. Third, the length of time many people were obliged to queue in order to vote. Fourth, the continuing (implicit) pressure upon civil servants and corporate members to vote for the PRI. Fifth, the COFIPE makes party

coalitions difficult (especially in Senatorial races).

Finally Gonzalez Oropeza drew attention to an anomaly of the 1994 COFIPE reform whereby cases referred to the Electoral Tribunal and then appealed are considered in a Sala de Segunda Instancia, but which is presided over by the same president as considered the case in the first place. This person is, therefore, both judge and party. The issue of self-qualification has not yet been put to rest.

## NADA QUE FESTEJAR

Sergio Zermeno

Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, UNAM

(This summary was made by Mexican Center staff from a full paper provided by the author.)

PRI, 278; PAN, 17; PRD, 5. Los consejeros llamados ciudadanos y otros representantes partidista se apresuraron para abrazar al secretario de gobernacion la manana del 22 de agosto. Estos datos dificilmente pueden ser interpretados como un paso mas en nuestro transito hacia la democracia. Es inexacto asociar al peso de cada partido en el parlamento con la expresividad politica de una sociedad, pero no deja de ser cierto que la funcion central de los procesos electorales es la de fortalecer la institucionalidad politica y, visto asi, las recientes elecciones van justamente en el sentido contrario. Las voces que de acuerdo a los resultados electorales se quedaran calladas o en sordina dentro del espacio parlamentario son dos: la de la ciudadania propiamente dicha y la del "sotano social" que apenas atina a darse una identidad y que de todos modos ya se autodenominaba "los sin voz".

Ahora bien, un hecho es insalvable: el partido de Estado le gano tres a uno al partido social-popular. Sin embargo, por mas que se nos acuse de necios, de contradecir la evidencia del sufragio y la corriente de la opinion publica, todos sentimos la necesidad imperiosa de desentranar el resultado electoral; particularmente en lo concerniente al deproporcionado 50% del PRI, versus el 17% de PRD.

Ni al candidato panista se le escapo mencionarlo al darnos a conocer su prescriptado

retiro politico: "...el triunfo del PRI se dio en condiciones profundamente injustas e inequitativas". Y es que, en efecto, que hubiera pasado si al partido del Estado le aplicamos las mismas reglas del juego que aplico a sus adversarios?:

Ocioso seria repasar la larga lista de pequenas triquinuelas expresadas en porcentajes de votos a favor del PRI durante la propia jornada electoral hasta la composicion final de los votos en las urnas y, luego, a partir del conteo, las sumas y la locura cibernetica. Lo que importa subrayar ahora, es que mediante esta delincuencia electoral del Estado se desfiguro al mapa politico y social de los mexicanos. Mas precisamente, se busco y se esta logrando desaparecer la expresion organizada del Mexico social popular, atomizandolo al extremo de olvidar que existio como fuerza articulada. Empleando a fondo los medios de comunicacion y monetarios para grabarnos en la mente que a partir de hoy, viviremos un bipartidismo moderno PRI-PAN, junto a un pequeno promontorio alla, olvidado, pero intensamente financiado para su autodestruccion, que se llama izquierda.

Es esa la opcion ya mundialmente catalogada, que forma parte del paquete de la modernizacion globalizante: destruir, atomizar las identidades basicas en etnias, sindicatos, pueblos, corrientes politicas, etc. con la ayuda de la miseria y la incultura que el propio modelo genera. Pero no va a ser facil borrar la expresion politica organizada de los mexicanos que no caben en el TLC. Y es que ese 50% de compatriotas que forma el piso social-popular se extiende por toda la Republica (nada mas hay que ver la imagen urbana de las ciudades de la maquila), pero se concentra particularmente en los estados populosos y mestizos del sur (Guerrero, Chiapas, Oaxaca, Veracruz, Tabasco, Morelos), en donde el PRD supero, incluso en las condiciones electorales descritas, el 30% de la votacion, mientras que en los estados de la franja fronteriza no promedio ni el 10%. El PAN en contraste, en estos ultimos estados supero con facilidad el 30%.

En resumen, digamos que en el pais existen tres identidades sociopoliticas definidas:

(1) la del partido de Estado (la del Centro, en el doble sentido), mezcla contranatura de supermillonarios con tenientes del Estado, con cosmopolios ciberneticos, con cacicazgos de todo tipo sustentados por el vertice de mexicanos empobrecidos y de pobres muy pobres pronasolizados hasta la ignominia;

(2) la del partido de la ciudadania, urbano, norteno, farmer, consumidor, en busca del fortalecimiento de las instituciones liberal-democraticas, beneficiario tambien del voto del miedo, y con una dirigencia que tiende a aliarse al partido de Estado y una base que se aferra a lo social, a identificarse horizontalmente con los mexicanos; y tenemos en fin...

(3) al mas atacado, aunque mayoritario partido social popular, arraigado en ese urbano

pauperrimo que de alguna forma se organiza y no termina de estar irremediadamente "roto", que tiene arraigo en lo campesino, en lo etnico, en lo sureno; que atrae a la clase media ilustrada y a otros sectores de nuestra modernidad golpeados por la modernizacion salvaje (obreros, empresarios pequenos y medios no competitivos, burocratas inservibles, etc.).

La prueba de que esta ultima identidad sociopolitica de los mexicanos pretende ser desaparecida, es el resultado de las elecciones chiapanecas: el no permitir, ni siquiera en un estado en guerra, la mediacion de una fuerza opositora. Ello nos muestra que el nucleo duro del partido de Estado interpreto los resultados electorales como un cheque en blanco no solo para dismantelar la identidad social popular sino, lo que es peor, como un espaldarazo para llevar adelante el modelo neoliberal que en lo humano consiste en la perdida de los derechos laborales y la caida salarial, para ser competitivos en el mercado internacional; ademas de la desposesion de la tierra de sus actuales propietarios y la subsecuente concentracion agraria; la entrada de productos basicos frente a los que nuestra masa campesina no puede competir; el exodo masivo del campesinado indigena y mestizo hacia las grandes ciudades o su conversion en jornaleros miserables de la agro-industria y la agro-maquila; la destruccion de cuatro de cada cinco de nuestros empresarios pequenos y medianos en el agro, la industria y los servicios ante el embate de productos hechos en serie para un mercado mundial, etc. He ahi la suma de lo que las elecciones avalaron.

## DEFICIENCIAS EN LA LEGISLACION ELECTORAL MEXICANA PARA GARANTIZAR EL SURFRAGIO

Silvia Gomez Tagle

Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, UNAM

Alianza Civica

En este documento se analizan algunos de los requisitos minimos indispensables para garantizar el voto de los mexicanos. Estas reflexiones tienen fundamento los trabajos de Alianza Civica, sin embargo este no es un documento oficial de esa organizacion.

En los primeros seis meses de 1994 se han logrado avances significativos en la legislacion electoral, sin embargo quedaron pendientes muchos problemas que se habian criticado en la legislacion desde 1993 y que ahora no se tocaron. Ademas de que la "ciudadanizacion de IFE" y la reglamentacion de la observacion electoral, tuvieron

tambien repercusiones negativas, que se han comprobado en la observacion de Alianza Civica.

La evaluacion de la eleccion de Alianza Civica. El trabajo de observacion de mas de 400 ONG's que participaron en Alianza tuvo como sustento criterios estadisticos que permitieron gran precision en el resultado.

Los datos de la votacion que proporciono Alianza con base en informacion de las primeras 1758 casillas de la muestra estratificada fueron notablemente exactos y corroboran el resultado oficial propocionado por el IFE diez dias despues. Pero al mismo tiempo los observadores de Alianza realizaron una evaluacion de la calidad del proceso electoral, que con el mismo grado de exactitud permite afirmar que las elecciones del 21 de agosto no fueron limpias. Por ejemplo que el problema de presion a votantes y de voto inducido se presenta en zonas rurales y urbanas de bajos ingresos, donde el PRI obtuvo la mayor parte de sus votos.

El saldo de la eleccion de 21 de agosto. Hay problemas en la legislacion electoral mexicana que estaban pendientes desde 1993 y que no han sido resueltos:

- a) Acceso de todos los partidos a los medos de comunicacion (que no existan monopolios en los medios concesionados por el gobierno).
- b) Las formas de representacion proporcional de la Camara de Diputados y de Senadores (aproximarse a una representacion proporcional).
- c) El financiamiento a partidos (garantizar que no se utilicen recursos gubernamentales en las campanas).
- d) Las reglas para el registro de partidos, coaliciones o aliannzas de partidos (facilitar la organizacion ciudadana).
- e) Observadores ciudadanos (dar acceso a la informacion).
- f) El proceso contencioso electoral (recursos y procedimientos adecuados a los tiempos electorales).
- g) Derechos ciudadanos equitativos para todos los mexicanos, indigenas, campesinos y residentes en el extranjero.
- h) Una nueva geografia electoral que permita la participacion de las organizaciones ciudadanas en la lucha electoral (al no fragmentar artificialmente a las comunidades

sociales).

En conclusion el sistema politico mexicano debe sufrir todavia transformaciones importantes con el fin de que los diversos grupos sociales, en especial aquellos menos favorecidos por el proyecto economico neoliberal, puedan expresarse y encontrar formas de representacion por vias institucionales.

## MAS ALLA DE LOS ORGANOS ELECTORALES

German Perez Fernandez del Castillo

En la medida en que los comicios se tornaron un problema de magnitudes nacionales en Mexico se ha exigido, con justa razon, reformas electorales. Con excepcion de algunos asuntos entre ellos las condiciones de la competencia legisladores, partidos politicos, autoridades y sociedad han logrado construir un marco donde la transparencia y legalidad han cristalizado con razonable fortuna.

Las enormes irregularidades electorales del pasado han gravitado en los partidos politicos. No simplemente porque se inauguraba una nueva legislacion, iban a confiar en la imparcialidad del IFE. En las negociaciones y multiples reformas habidas hasta 1994, la legislacion, procedimientos y organos electorales han sido rodeados de candados que han intentado cerrar todas las puertas a las irregularidades; hoy parece que esos candados son tantos que resultan contraproducentes.

1. La ciudadanía. Sobran ejemplos de que la suspicacia de los partidos afecta los derechos ciudadanos. En el caso de las casillas especiales se contrapuntearon por un lado el derecho ciudadano al voto y, por otro, las garantías de limpieza pedidas por los partidos. Se optó por el segundo a costa del primero. Mas importante, es el gasto irracional en investigaciones, verificaciones, muestras, auditorias practicadas al padron, listados para confirmar lo que ya se sabia: la confiabilidad mas que aceptable de esos instrumentos electorales.

2. Los partidos politicos. Un pasado de irregularidades explica su suspicacia, pero las cosas han cambiado sustancialmente

y no se explican las innecesarias y gravosas revisiones a las actividades del IFE que han emprendido. Bastaría un poco de confianza en los órganos electorales para invertir los recursos que gastan en ello, en consolidar sus estructuras internas, estrechar sus lazos con el electorado y representarlo mejor en los poderes públicos.

3. El IFE. Por más esfuerzos que hace, el IFE continúa siendo el blanco de los ataques, injustos, como demuestran innumerables investigaciones. El IFE gasta también demasiado tiempo y recursos en explicar y demostrar que hace su trabajo conforme a la normatividad y que sus autoridades no son delincuentes electorales. Un partido político le exige, por ejemplo, copia certificada de cada una de las actas de las casillas del 21 de agosto. Son más de 300,000 copias certificadas. Tiene sentido después de que conocieron la misma información en las actas que recibieron en las casillas y en las pantallas de sus computadoras cuando se les dieron los resultados preliminares? Solo en la jornada electoral se solicitaron cuatro investigaciones y hasta donde se sabe, no se deduce de ellas irregularidad alguna por parte de la autoridad.

Los comicios pasados obligan a replantearse la existencia de los candados, a rehacer nuestra legislación para que los procesos electorales sean más eficientes y menos barrocos. La ONU hizo recomendaciones en ese sentido. De la búsqueda de limpieza electoral debe pararse a la sencillez y eficiencia electorales.

## SESSION TWO: SUMMARY OF THE COMMENTS, DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

The Reform of the COFIPE, the Conduct of the Elections, and the Performance of the Principal Electoral Organizations

Shannan Mattiace  
Government Department  
The University of Texas at Austin

Commentators:

Manual Barquin: Dr. Barquin began by emphasizing the fact that the PRD participated in the development of the most recent electoral reform in Mexico. He claimed that the PRD's participation signifies that the representatives of all parties now have a voice in the process.

He argued that the Mexican elections helped discredit two myths which have been widely held in Mexico: 1) that Mexico could not hold an election that could be held up to some high, abstract standard; and 2) that all of Mexico's problems will be resolved through the electoral process. He emphasized the fact that Mexico still faces multiple problems. Mexico as a country, he suggested, still suffers from many of the same problems that the dependency theorists pointed out years ago. Yet, he claimed, we have advanced. One of the main signs of that advance, he said, was the 77% voter turnout in the last election. He pointed out that even the Chiapan "rebels" believe in the importance of elections.

Dale Story: Dr. Story began by reiterating a point which has been made repeatedly at the conference: that there exist two very different Mexicos. One view of Mexico is quite optimistic, the other rather pessimistic. According to Dr. Story, both of these views are highly accurate. On the optimistic side, despite incidents of error and fraud he cannot claim that the recent Mexican elections were any less clean than many which occur in the United States. Dr. Story said that he found it difficult to be critical of Mexico on this point.

On the other hand, he argued that Mexico is not a democracy after the August 21 elections. Mexico is still, he claimed, a centralized state with a hegemonic party. According to Dr. Story, Mexico will be a democracy when a non-PRI candidate takes power on the national level.

Finally, he raised the point that we need to re-evaluate the proportional representation vs. majority rule debate. He suggested that if Mexico were to be truly competitive it would have to choose between two systems and would need two parties.

Joe Foweraker: Dr. Foweraker began by summarizing the discussion on the panel, dividing the arguments into those who believe that the elections were transparent and generally fair and those who believe that they were not transparent, but were problematic, surrounded by pressures, and taking place in structured environment that is grossly unequal. Advocates of the former argument would suggest, said Foweraker, that we are advancing towards a consolidated democracy and a more advanced political culture. Advocates of the latter argument, he claimed, would suggest that serious structured inequalities still exist in Mexico. They would point to the influence of PRI patronage within the system, unequal media access for political parties, and the disproportionate representation of the PRI party within the electoral system. These folks would say, he submitted, that the electoral system is embedded within a political system which is not so

democratic.

Foweraker argued that Mexico has a poor record in respecting citizenship (read civil) rights. He claimed that in Mexico there are democratic elections without democracy. What is presently happening, he argued, is that the PRI is promising democracy within reason. For the PRI, according to Foweraker, government must be rational. Since the PRI sees itself as the only rational actor within the system, it advises the Mexican people to "be reasonable".

This is not to say, Foweraker insisted, that the system has not changed. It has. The PRI today, he claimed, is not the same official party that it once was. Foweraker, however, would not characterize the current period as a democratic transition but rather as a modernization of authoritarianism. There is not popular consensus, he argued, but only an authoritarian consensus. What are the chances of success for authoritarian consensus in Mexico? Good, he said, in the short-term.

Discussion:

1) The first question was directed explicitly to Lic. Mauricio Collado (IFE). What are your plans for improving the system in the future? How will you improve the padron? How can you ensure that the staff in the casillas have sufficient power to stop voters from being pressured? How will you deal with technical problems such as the indelible ink? Were you aware that soldiers arrived early to vote in many casillas in order to use up the ballots? Does the IFE visit all casillas during election day or just the ones where foreign visitors will be present?

2) One observer from the audience suggested that the casillas need to be compacted. He also suggested further caps on campaign financing. Media access needs to be regulated, he insisted. Regulation of the activities that the government can perform before the election also needs to occur.

3) Another comment from an observer centered around the conditions within which the elections occurred. He argued that one cannot take the elections out of the non-democratic context in which they occurred. The problem is not the evolution of the Mexican political system, he insisted, it is a question of will. We cannot compare Mexico with the United States, he claimed.

4) One audience member mentioned that he had been an observer in the Paraguayan elections. He claimed that it is misleading to ask how much fraud there was in the election. We need to ask, he argued, if the government would have yielded power if it had lost. Would the PRI have yielded power? To the PRD? Or only to the PAN?

5) A final question was asked about the relationship between crisis and continuity in the Mexican electoral process. Do we need crises to continue the process, or can it be institutionalized?

Replies by the panel members to questions and comments from the audience:

Luis Farias Mackey made two brief comments concerning the importance of the PRD in the process of constructing a more democratic Mexico and concerning the ongoing process by the IFE to regularize the lista nominal.

Mauricio Collado emphasized the point that we are only at the beginning of the electoral process. There is much work to be done with the data and their interpretation. What characterizes a democracy, he claimed, is certainty about the rules of the game. He responded to the queries about order within the casillas, saying that those working in the casillas have the force of law on their side. In the event of problems, those working in the casillas can call upon fuerza publica. He noted that there were only 107 cases in which the names of deceased individuals appeared on the electoral lists. He also mentioned that there have been no problems with the indelible ink. On the question of the IFE visiting the casillas on the day of the elections, Collado said that it is not IFE's job to monitor the casillas. Finally, he said that the evidence is unclear as to whether the casillas should be compacted.

Manuel Gonzalez Oropeza recommended that instead of going to special casillas in case of problems that the problems be resolved in the casillas themselves.

Silvia Gomez Tagle argued that there are several layers of democracy. She insisted that the Alianza Civica certainly does not want to make the electoral reforms more complicated and expensive. She mentioned that the question on everyone's mind is "Who is behind the IFE"?

Sergio Zermeno reiterated his point about the importance of the PRD within the Mexican political system. The PRD, he argued, represents certain aspects of society that need to be represented. Cardenas has insisted that the PRD will not tolerate the conditions of inequality in which the party finds itself. Zermeno also noted that we need to confront the problem of Chiapas. There is a subterranean left beginning to emerge in Mexico. If we do not allow the left to institutionalize itself as a party, we will indeed have electoral authoritarianism. The PRD, he claimed, is vital for the institutionalization of the system.

German Perez Fernandez del Castillo raised a question about IFE's lack of legal enforcement power. The IFE does not, he insinuated, have any power to influence the behavior of a governor or government official. He seemed to think that the idea of compacting the casillas was fair. He made the point that there is not democracy without clean elections, yet there are not clean elections without democracy (vicious cycle). Finally, he commented on the fact that there is not a government in Europe which does not have control over their elections.

## MEXICO'S ELECTORAL AFTERMATH AND POLITICAL FUTURE

Synthesis/Memoria of the Papers Presented at a Bi-National Conference Held at The University of Texas at Austin, Sept. 2-3, 1994.

Conference Organized by The Mexican Center of ILAS

Conference Sponsors:

The Ford Foundation, Mexico City

The Mexican Center of ILAS

With Additional Support from:

The College of Liberal Arts

The Institute of Latin American Studies

The Shell International Oil Company

The Copyright for this document is held by the Mexican Center of ILAS.

Downloading and redistribution are acceptable, but the neither the contents nor the text must be altered in any way. Referencing and accreditation should be as follows: Author's name, title of presentation, page nos., in Ward, P. M. et al., Synthesis/Memoria of the Bi-National Conference: Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future. September 2-3, 1994 (Austin: The Mexican Center of ILAS, University of Texas at Austin, 1994)

If you prefer an original hardcopy of this document, it is available from the Mexican Center at a nominal cost of \$5.00 per copy. Please make money checks and money orders (dollars only) to ILAS, and send your order to the Mexican Center, Institute of Latin American Studies, Sid Richardson Hall 1.310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. U.S.A

The Mexican Center of ILAS

Peter M. Ward, Director

Xochitl Medina Gonzalez, Conference Coordinator/Layout and Design

Dorothy Schepps, Editor/Administrative Assistant

# Session Three: Party Access to the Media

Session Three:

Party Access to the Media During the Campaigns and the Role of Opinion Polls in the Mexican Elections: How Level Was the Playing Field?

Chair: Bryan Roberts  
Department of Sociology  
The University of Texas at Austin

## OPINION POLL TRACKING 1994: A SUCCESS STORY

Miguel Basanez  
Market Opinion Research International, MORI de Mexico.

[Nota del Editor: La ponencia de Miguel Basanez contiene 17 graficas que muestran el desarrollo de tendencias en el electorado mexicano, a partir de los sondeos de MORI de Mexico. Estas graficas y resultados de encuestas se pueden obtener escribiendo al Mexican Center. ]

Las conclusiones del Dr. Basanez son las siguientes:

1. Durante las elecciones de 1994, se logro la acreditacion de las encuesta (pre-electorales, de salida y conteo rapido).
2. Se han logrado avances significativos en la resolucion de debates tenicos: calle-casa, urna-oral, inicio-final, asignacion-eliminacion de indecisos, tamanos de muestra, escenarios de abstencion.
3. Se constata la importancia de hacer encuestas experimentales.

## MITOS Y REALIDADES DE LAS ENCUESTAS ELECTORALES EN EL PROCESO DE 1994

Ana Cristina Covarrubias  
Voz y Voto

(This summary was made from the full paper by Mexican Center staff.)

Voz y Voto, revista mensual de analisis politico, encargo a nuestro despacho Covarrubias y Asociados S el diseno e instrumentacion de tres encuestas de preferencias electorales que fueron publicadas en los numeros de junio, julio y agosto del presente ano. El diseno de una muestra representativa a nivel nacional fue preocupacion central del proyecto.

Lo que las encuestas de Voz y Voto consistentemente publicaron a partir del mes de junio fue lo siguiente: 1) Que el PRI ocupaba una posicion de liderazgo en la contienda. Esto, aun en los momentos inmediatos al debate, del cual el ganador incuestionable habia sido Diego Fernandez de Cevallos (Voz y Voto. No. 16. Jun-94 Pags 30 y 31). 2) Que el PAN era la segunda fuerza politica del pais y que esta posicion la habia logrado a partir del debate. 3) Que la distancia relativa entre PRI y PAN era grande, en proporcion de 2 a 1. 4) Que el PRD era la tercera fuerza y que su distancia con respecto a los contendientes que lo superaban, tambien era grande, aproximadamente 2 a 1 con respecto al PAN. 5) Que los otros partidos, salvo et PT con su candidata Cecilia Soto, no ozaban de la preferencia del electorado. 6) Que solo en las areas metropolitanas del pais (las relativas a las ciudades de Mexico, Guadalajara, Monterrey y Puebla, que corresponden al 27% de la poblacion nacional de acuerdo al ultimo censo nacional de poblacion) habia una competencia cerrada entre el PRI y el PAN. 7) Que en la ultima evaluacion se detecto un descenso del nivel de preferencias hacia al PAN, probablemente debido al descenso de la actividad de campana de Diego Fernandez de Cevallos y 8) Que habia un alto nivel de interes de la poblacion por estos comicios, lo que presagiaba un alto grado de participacion.

Los resultados de las encuestas de Voz y Voto fueron siempre coincidentes con los de otras encuestas, tambien de alcance nacional, publicadas por otros medios como el periodico Reforma y el semanario Etcetera, pero fueron aparentemente discrepantes de los resultados de la encuesta semanal realizada por MORI. En realidad no habia tal discrepancia, sencillamente lo que ocurría es que esta ultima encuesta no tenia cobertura nacional. A la coincidencia de resultados de todas las encuestas electorales publicadas en la semana del 8 a 12 de agosto, se sumo la encuesta, de alcance nacional, que publico MORI en el periodico Excelsior.

La confusion de la opinion publica nacional, que llego a trascender a los medios internacionales, se debio a la indebida generalizacion de resultados derivados de una encuesta realizada con una muestra de 316 casos levantados en cinco ciudades (Mexico, Guadalajara, Monterrey, Tijuana y Merida); muestra que de haber sido probabilística, en el mejor de los casos, representaba tan solo a 20.8% del electorado.

Fue hasta el momento de la publicación de los resultados oficiales que se derrumbaron todos los mitos y se evidenciaron las realidades en torno a las encuestas electorales en nuestro país.

Estos mitos tuvieron múltiples facetas que sintetizo básicamente en tres:

- 1) "Que los resultados de las encuestas dependen de quienes las pagan". En el último momento todas las encuestas llevadas a cabo con metodología y cobertura geográfica similares obtuvieron resultados similares, independientemente de cual era la fuente de financiamiento.
- 2) "Que la participación alta de la ciudadanía en los comicios, dañaba necesariamente al PRI". El hecho fue que con aproximadamente 80% de participación el PRI obtuvo la victoria lo cual ya se entreveía al analizar el perfil de los votantes, en la última encuesta de Voz y Voto.
- 3) "Que los mexicanos, más que nadie en el mundo, mienten y/o esconden sus preferencias partidarias, lo que da pie a la espiral del silencio". Aseveraciones que implican por una parte que las encuestas son inútiles en tanto que el respondiente no dice la verdad y por otra, que en México existe un clima político tal que los ciudadanos temen expresar libremente sus opiniones.

La experiencia vivida puso de manifiesto las realidades de las encuestas que en síntesis son:

1. La encuesta, que se lleva a cabo con rigor metodológico, es una herramienta útil y confiable para captar la realidad socio-política de un momento específico.
2. Cuando se repiten las mediciones, con una periodicidad determinada, y con igual metodología, se definen tendencias que ayudan al analista y al estratega político a explicar las posibles causas de los altibajos de determinados fenómenos y a construir hipótesis de predicción de resultados.
3. La encuesta es un instrumento que contribuye a la formación de una cultura democrática.

**VOTO POR EL PRI: NIVEL DE ESCOLARIDAD NACIONAL Y PERCEPCION DE LA PROBABILIDAD DE VIOLENCIA POLITICA**

Rafael Jimenez Valdes

## Reforma

Para explicar el apoyo que el PRI logro el 21 de agosto se estudian dos variables de la poblacion: la escolaridad y la percepcion de la probabilidad de que ocurriera violencia a causa de las elecciones.

Las encuestas de Reforma, asi como las de otro medios (incluidos los "exit-polls") revelan que hay una relacion directa entre el nivel de escolaridad de la poblacion y el voto partidista: a menor escolaridad mayor voto por el PRI.

De esta relacion deriva la intensa campana de publicidad para fomentar la participacion elector, ya que el PRI y el gobierno percibian la necesidad de que los electores menos favorecidos votaran.

Adicionalmente el fenomeno de percepcion del temor a la violencia afecto la intencion de voto. La hipotesis de que el temor de la poblacion ayudo al voto PRI debe matizarse. A tres semanas de la eleccion los que mayor probabilidad de violencia percibian eran los mas proclives a votar por la oposicion. En realidad el PRI tuvo exito entre los sectores sociales con menor escolaridad a quienes se les vendio el slogan que asociaba la imagen de que votar por Zedillo era "un voto por la paz". El voto por el PRI fue 64 por ciento entre la poblacion sin escolaridad, 58 por ciento entre los que solo cursaron hasta primaria solamente, 49 por ciento entre los que tienen hasta secundaria, 40 por ciento entre los que tienen preparatoria y 41 por ciento con universidad o mas. El PAN y PRD sumados logran 30 por ciento entre los que no tienen escolaridad, 41 por ciento entre los que tienen primaria solamente, 45 por ciento entre los que estudiaron hasta secundaria, 54 por ciento entre los que tienen preparatoria y 54 por ciento entre los que tienen universidad o mas. El pais en su conjunto no alcanza el promedio de primaria completa y algunos indices como analfabetismo ganan terreno en el pais. El efecto de la campana de medios electronicos que advertia contra la violencia fue notable en los sectores de menor escolaridad, que efectivamente votaron por el PRI y que consideraban que al hacerlo este partido garantizaba la paz.

De este analisis parece comprehensible que el PRI por primera vez en su historia basara su campana mas en el efecto de los medios electronicos, que en la organizacion de los electores a traves de la Secretaria de Accion Electoral.

El papel de las encuestas fue importante en esta eleccion. Ganaron credibilidad al servir como elemento predictivo y la comparacion con resultados (por primera vez confiables) puede ayudar a clarificar los debates sobre las

mismas. Además de la utilización estratégica de las encuestas por parte del gobierno y del PRI, los medios de comunicación, en especial los electrónicos las difundieron con intensidad, con la idea de resaltar el orden de preferencias de los partidos contendientes, en especial después del debate, lo que pudo contribuir a fijar los porcentajes de preferencias. Hasta antes de esta elección la difusión de encuestas se limitaba a los medios impresos, que en esta ocasión solo cuatro grupos distintos financiaron directamente encuestas, prefiriendo difundir boletines.

## UN MURO CONTRA LA DEMOCRACIA

Raymundo Riva Palacio  
Reforma

1. La campaña electoral del PRI fue fundamentalmente electrónica. El modelo diseñado se le planteó originalmente a Carlos Salinas de Gortari en 1988, e incluía dar espacios a Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas en la televisión para exhibirlo, pero nunca fue aprobado plenamente.

Pero para la campaña de Luis Donaldo Colosio/Ernesto Zedillo, el método, más sofisticado, se puso en práctica.

2. La televisión, de donde obtiene el 85 por ciento de los mexicanos su información, se había controlado tiempo antes de que el PRI hubiera elegido a su candidato. Por ejemplo, Rafael Resendiz, que era amigo y colaborador de Colosio en el PRI y SEDESOL, fue nombrado vicepresidente de Televisa encargado de los asuntos políticos. Y cuando Colosio fue nominado, entre los primeros que acudieron a felicitarlo a sus oficinas, fue Ricardo Salinas Pliego, a quien el gobierno le vendió los canales estatales de televisión.

3. La radio se convirtió en otro vehículo de comunicación, y Colosio/Zedillo invirtieron buen tiempo en entrevistas radiales controladas. Sus asesores de medios entraban a las cabinas de transmisión y filtraban las llamadas del público, eliminando aquellas que fueran críticas o negativas. No sucedió lo mismo con los candidatos de oposición, quienes no pidieron el mismo trato, pero tampoco se los ofrecieron.

4. De esta manera, la prensa electrónica jugó un papel crucial en modular e influir la tendencia del voto, al proveer imágenes parciales o manipuladas de los candidatos del PAN y del PRD, ayudando a enfatizar o minimizar temas o aspectos de la campaña y definir una atmósfera única en las campañas. Del 3 de enero al 19 de agosto, la Comisión Mexicana de Derechos Humanos y Alianza

Cívica, reportaron que la distribución del tiempo total para candidatos presidenciales y partidos de oposición en los dos principales noticieros de la televisión, fue dominada por el PRI y sus candidatos, con 20 horas 31 minutos del total, contra 9 horas 23 minutos de Diego Fernández de Cevallos y el PAN, y 10 horas de Cárdenas y el PRD.

5. Esto no incluyó una sofisticada campaña de propaganda y de inducción masiva a la correlación en la televisión, de que un voto por el PRI era un voto por el orden, la estabilidad y la paz, mientras que un voto contra el PRI era un voto por la incertidumbre, el desorden y la violencia.

6. La manipulación fue menos evidente en la radio, pero ahí la censura fue más brutal. El gobierno impuso una estrategia para controlar el flujo de información en la fuente de origen en más de mil estaciones de radio en todo el país.

7. Por lo que toca a la prensa escrita, la diferencia no fue muy significativa en la mayoría de periódicos y revistas. La cobertura del candidato del PRI fue demasiado extensa y amplia para que los otros candidatos pudieran realmente enfrentarlo. Durante los cinco primeros meses y medio de 1994, de 5 mil 75 páginas dedicadas a las campañas en 10 periódicos de la ciudad de México, el 38.28% de la información se dedicó al PRI, que también logró el 50% de las 898 informaciones publicadas en primera plana, y las dos terceras partes de las 4 mil 792 fotografías.

8. Estos volúmenes no comprenden la propaganda blanca, que también jugó un papel importante en la modulación del voto. Hubo periódicos que publicaron dos informaciones pagadas por el PRI contra una de los 8 partidos restantes. En otros casos, hasta el 89% de la publicidad pagada fue para el PRI, dejando el 11% para el resto de los partidos.

9. Al electorado no se le proporcionó información adecuada y suficiente para poder hacer una selección informada de su candidato.

10. El acceso a los medios y su comportamiento se está convirtiendo en un tema total e indispensable en la discusión política en México. Sin un cambio sustancial de ellos, no importará cuántos candados se pongan para tener elecciones transparentes, pues no podrán construir la legitimidad del proceso.

11. Para que México tenga elecciones legítimas, justas, balanceadas y realmente competidas, se requiere de una reforma a los medios. Pero la reforma a los medios no podrá darse con efectividad si no hay un cambio en la cultura política mexicana, para eliminar la relación financiera viciada gobierno-medios, el fin a privilegios y prebendas que compran impunidad para funcionarios del régimen, y la eliminación de la corrupción,

mediante la cual se construyen realidades virtuales.

13. Para esto, se requiere un vocacion democratica del regimen, y mientras no se den los primeros pasos y se consoliden las dos reformas en paralelo, la de los medios y la politica, las elecciones mexicanas podran ser tecnicamente legales, pero no podran ser legitimas.

## THE 1994 MEXICAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS COVERAGE BY AND POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MEXICAN AND U.S. TELEVISION

Federico Subervi and Jaqui Chmielewsky  
The University of Texas at Austin

The main objective of our project was to monitor, assess and report how the 1994 presidential elections in Mexico were covered and possibly affected by the mass media, in particular television, in both Mexico and the United States. To achieve this goal, we taped the main news programs of Televisa and TeleAzteca in Mexico, and Univision and Telemundo in the U.S. for ninety days prior to the election. To assess how the election results were presented to the audience, we also taped the newscasts during ten days after the election.

Our very preliminary findings of the two U.S. Spanish-language networks indicate that the number of stories about PRI's presidential candidate Zedillo were approximately the same as those about his counterpart Cardenas of the PRD, but there were fewer stories about Fernandez de Cevallos of the PAN. The largest number of stories, however, were dedicated to President Salinas and other Mexican government officials and entities in their support of the PRI and its candidate. Thus, the number of stories about Zedillo, combined with those about Salinas and the Government added up to about half of Univision's and Telemundo's coverage of the Mexican presidential elections during the last days of the campaign. Other candidates and parties received scant attention in the U.S. Spanish-language network news.

Subsequent analysis of our data, including the newscasts of the Mexican television stations, will provide more precise results, which should contribute to enhancing our understanding of the role of political communication in the Mexican presidential elections of 1994.

## SESSION THREE: SUMMARY OF THE COMMENTS, DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

### Party Access to the Media During the Campaigns and the Role of Opinion Polls in the Mexican Elections: How Level Was the Playing Field?

Steve Barracca  
Government Department  
The University of Texas at Austin

#### Commentators:

Roderic Camp: Roderic Camp followed the presentations by trying to place polling within the broader context of media-state relations and by raising some issues related to the utility and interpretation of opinion polls. To provide some comparative perspective Camp pointed out that, in most other societies, the press is not as independent of the state as it is in the United States. In light of this point, he suggested that the relatively "close" media-state relations in Mexico establish it as a more typical case among the nations of the world. As evidence of the Mexican government's significant influence over the media Camp stated that a number of major media outlets derive a substantial amount of their revenues from public finances. For example, in the case of Excelsior, one of the country's leading newspapers, he cited that the paper received 37% of its budget from the government.

To further illustrate the government's influence over the press Camp identified two forms of censorship that characterize the country's media environment. The first is state-initiated censorship. This refers to cases where government officials try to influence editorial practices through methods such as payments to journalists, the withholding of resources, and direct threats. Second, is the much more common practice of self-censorship where editors avoid publishing stories that are seen as threatening to the regime and writers avoid stories and analyses that would jeopardize their access to government contacts and side payments which supplement their incomes. Given these various forms of state influence over the media, Camp views the emergence of opinion polling in Mexico as a positive development, because it can provide an alternative channel for free public expression. However, Camp qualifies his optimism that polls will actually serve this function by pointing out that pollsters are also subject to censorship.

After providing a backdrop of media-state relations, Camp went on to raise the issue of the political utility and impact of polls. Camp suggested that one important way polls impact politics is by influencing candidates stances on the issues and affecting public policy choices. This issue was also touched on by Nancy Belden who argued that polling promotes democratic discourse because it gives candidates more of an incentive to take

issue stances and divulge more about their programs. None of the panelists had data which could shed light on whether or not this phenomenon was actually occurring in the Mexican case. As an explanation for the fact that all three major parties ran on platforms that were quite similar, one might speculate that the parties developed their platforms in response to public opinions as expressed in polling results.

Highlighting a second effect that polls have on the political process, Camp noted that polls influence the voters' perceptions of candidates. To what extent this phenomenon occurred in the presidential race was left open. In this regard, it would be interesting to see, for example, to what extent polls reporting the surge of Diego Fernandez following the presidential debate added to his popularity.

Finally, Camp noted that the most significant use of polls was to explain voting behavior. For this task it was noted that exit polls provide particularly useful information. The consistency of polling data presented by Basanez, Covarruvias, and Jimenez indicates that survey data in Mexico is providing more credible and reliable information about the voting behavior of various demographic groups. This sort of data will be important for researchers who are interested in explaining why Mexican voters vote the way they do. Camp concluded his comments by arguing that readers, television viewers, and journalists had to be educated in how to interpret polls.

Lawrence Graham: Lawrence Graham stressed that the emergence of more sophisticated and reliable polling in Mexico was a sign of the progress of the country's political transition. Graham argued that greater openness, or "transparency" in the economy was transferring over to the political arena. With this comment he seemed to be supporting the thesis that economic liberalization stimulates, or creates a need for political liberalization. Graham pointed out that polls are now being used in Mexico in the same way that they are used in the more established democracies of Western Europe and the U.S. Concurring with the members of the panel, he stated that polling in Mexico was becoming more reliable and that the expanded regional coverage of polling was an important development. In particular, he noted that the expanded regional use of polls had provided a better understanding of the political attitudes of the rural population. Additionally, Graham pointed out that the growth of opinion polling in Mexico was giving rise to the same sorts of debates that take place in the OECD nations. These debates center around questions of accuracy, interpretation, the utility of polls for candidates and parties, as well as their impact upon electoral behavior. Echoing the views of others on the panel, Graham cautioned that polls are an imperfect instrument of measure and that one has to exercise a great deal of care in interpreting their results.

In spite of the fact that the results of the August 1994 elections appeared to demonstrate that Mexico's system of one-party rule had not run out of steam, Graham argued that we should not underestimate the extent of political change in the country. First, he suggested that the increasing use of political

polls was an indicator of an emergent democratic culture in the Mexican political community. Second, Graham argued that the polling data was evidence of a democratic transition in progress. While he noted that this was a very slow transition, he offered two reasons for optimism about its ultimate course. First, he suggested that the clock could not be turned back, implying that popular political sentiments would not allow for a suppression of increased political openness and competition. Second, comparing the Mexican transition to transitions in other countries, Graham pointed out that all political openings that are "guided" from above tend to reach a limit where the regime loses its ability to control the outcomes of the political process.

Nancy Belden: Nancy Belden, a private pollster, focused her comments on the methodological problems associated with opinion polling as well as on its beneficial uses. She began by adding her assent to the panel consensus that opinion polling has made great strides in Mexico, particularly over the last six years. While sounding a generally optimistic note about these advances, Belden argued that pollsters in Mexico, like elsewhere, need to grapple with some key methodological difficulties. The first issue that Belden pointed to was the problem of "allocating undecideds". This refers to the decision pollsters must make of whether or not to include "undecideds" when reporting results. Belden noted that this is a big decision, because highly volatile voter preferences can lead to inaccurate polling results. She argued that doing exit polling was the best way to overcome this problem because with exit polls you knew that people had actually voted and you could get the most reliable information about who they voted for and why.

Belden also discussed the impact of environmental factors on the answers respondents gave. She pointed out that factors such as, whether the survey was conducted in the street or in the household, or whether the poll was conducted by secret ballot or through open questioning could influence how people responded to polls. Belden argued that pollsters needed to be conscious of the potential effects of environmental factors when designing surveys and interpreting their results. The final methodological problem Belden discussed was the difficulty of selecting a random sample when polling in the field. She noted that randomization was difficult when conducting door-to-door, or man-on-the-street interviews, because of the bias inherent in a particular neighborhood. She suggested that pollsters would be tempted to use quotas (getting a certain number of responses from a variety of neighborhoods) in order to overcome this problem, but the biases of the pollster, or his or her lack of familiarity with a locale could interfere with this effort. As Ana Covarruvias had noted, telephone surveys are a good method for obtaining a random sample, but the lack of telephone coverage in Mexico, especially in rural areas, ruled this out as a present option.

Belden concluded by arguing that polling could promote democracy by offering another channel through which citizens preferences could be articulated to political elites. She encouraged political parties to use polls as a

tool to get in tune with the pulse of the public. However, in order for people to take advantage of this new tool Belden, like Rod Camp, argued that voters and political leaders needed to be educated in how to interpret polls.

#### Discussion:

In the question and answer period following the commentaries several interesting issues were raised. As a possible explanation for why the polls showed more women voting for the PRI, Dr. Alan Knight, hypothesized that it might be related to the recent detente between the Mexican government and the Catholic church. In addition, in an effort to stimulate debate Dr. Knight tried to challenge the general consensus that the polls were accurate and the elections were generally clean. Offering a counter-hypothesis he asked whether it was not possible that the polls were inaccurate and that electoral fraud filled in to make the polls appear accurate.

Continuing this line a thought, Dr. Martin Needler suggested that someone ought to try an accurately measure how much fraud occurred. He complained that, thus far, all the talk of fraud was anecdotal and unsupported by hard numbers. Dr. Needler also raised the very interesting question of how the increased use of polling in Mexico would affect voters' political preferences. In particular, he was concerned that the growth industry of polling would bring about a homogenization of voter opinion, which would in turn, weaken the range of ideological and programmatic choices offered in the electoral arena. Dr. Needler suggested that the similarity of the PRI, PAN, and PRD platforms was evidence that this was already occurring.

A final issue that was raised by a number of people at the conference session was the question of who was paying for the polls. These questions reflected the general concern that polls funded by the various parties would have a partisan bias. Ana Covarruvias responded that the poll conducted by her organization, Voz y Voto, and the poll conducted by Rafael Jimenez's publication, Reforma, were financed by private, non-partisan funds. Miguel Basanez added that people should not be concerned that the government, or the parties fund opinion polls. He argued that the more polling information that was generated the better. Responding to the worry that these polls would be distorted for partisan purposes, Basanez argued that private polls would act as a check on the accuracy of polls financed by partisan money. He reasoned that if private and partisan polls differed greatly in their results analysts would have to account for these variations.

## MEXICO'S ELECTORAL AFTERMATH AND POLITICAL FUTURE

Synthesis/Memoria of the Papers Presented at a Bi-National Conference Held at The University of Texas at Austin, Sept. 2-3, 1994.

Conference Organized by The Mexican Center of ILAS

Conference Sponsors:

The Ford Foundation, Mexico City

The Mexican Center of ILAS

With Additional Support from:

The College of Liberal Arts

The Institute of Latin American Studies

The Shell International Oil Company

The Copyright for this document is held by the Mexican Center of ILAS.

Downloading and redistribution are acceptable, but the neither the contents nor the text must be altered in any way. Referencing and accreditation should be as follows: Author's name, title of presentation, page nos., in Ward, P. M. et al., Synthesis/Memoria of the Bi-National Conference: Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future. September 2-3, 1994 (Austin: The Mexican Center of ILAS, University of Texas at Austin, 1994)

If you prefer an original hardcopy of this document, it is available from the Mexican Center at a nominal cost of \$5.00 per copy. Please make money checks and money orders (dollars only) to ILAS, and send your order to the Mexican Center, Institute of Latin American Studies, Sid Richardson Hall 1.310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. U.S.A

The Mexican Center of ILAS

Peter M. Ward, Director

Xochitl Medina Gonzalez, Conference Coordinator/Layout and Design

Dorothy Schepps, Editor/Administrative Assistant

# Session Four: Mexico's Political Future

Session Four:

Mexico's Political Future: Democracy and the Balance of the August 21 Elections

Chair: Victoria Rodriguez  
LBJ School of Public Affairs  
The University of Texas at Austin

INDICACIONES PARA UNA LECTURA DE LAS ELECCIONES MEXICANAS DE 1994

Alan Arias Marin  
Fundacion Cambio XXI, Luis Donaldo Colosio

La intervencion tiene como proposito establecer, a partir de un ejercicio analitico, un conjunto de hipotesis de trabajo para construir una lectura racional del proceso politico y los resultados de las recientes elecciones mexicanas.

Las afirmaciones de fraude electoral, en todas sus versiones prejuiciadas y sin pruebas empiricas ("monumental", "cibernetico", "psicologico") o las insinuaciones sin rigor analitico de que algunas irregularidades configuran un proceso viciado, constituyen comportamientos politicos irresponsables, y ejercicios intelectuales y/o academicos deshonestos. Los valores politicos y morales, las simpatias e, incluso, los compromisos militantes no pueden desviar o inhibir el compromiso moral de los academicos e intelectuales para con las reglas de su oficio, la objetividad y la prueba de sus proposiciones.

En primer lugar, es conveniente rescatar las funciones sistemicas de los procesos electorales. Enfaticamente su funcion de integracion de los ciudadanos a la comunidad politica y al regimen; la funcion de asignacion de poder al grupo o partido triunfador del proceso electoral; asi como la funcion de control y juicio sobre el grupo gobernante.

Proponer una dicotomia entre un proceso electoral limpio y legal, por un lado, producido

y promovido por un sistema o regimen esencial y suficientemente democratico (lo que no excluye limitaciones, inequidades y aun rasgos autoritarios), pluralista, competitivo y con alternancia en los poderes, como es ya un hecho consolidado en Mexico. Un regimen autoritario no produciria elecciones limpias y, si fuera el caso, seria derrotado en un proceso electoral libre.

El panorama politico mexicano se caracteriza por un contundente triunfo del PRI, no obstante el espectacular crecimiento e implantacion del PAN a escala nacional. Por su parte, el PRD se ha constituido en una fuerza politica de gran significado para la democracia mexicana, tanto por su peso cuantitativo (17% de la votacion), cuanto por sus potencialidades de representacion social e intelectual.

En segundo lugar se enfatiza, a partir de hechos y elaboraciones cuantitativas, el significado politico de las elecciones mexicanas. Se destaca en particular las implicaciones de la alta tasa de votacion, el comportamiento de los electores de acuerdo con indicadores socioeconomicos y se plantea una lectura tendencial de la competencia interpartidista y sus perspectivas futuras.

Por ultimo, se delinea un mapa de las principales fuerzas politicas, sus tendencias mas probables y la serie de problemas que enfrenta la configuracion del renovado sistema mexicano de partidos.

El sistema de partidos podra ser consistentemente tripartidista (sobre todo en la Ciudad de Mexico y el Estado de Mexico), aunque regionalmente se configuran competencias bipartidistas siempre entre el PRI (de presencia nacional indisputable) con el PAN (Baja California, Chihuahua, Nuevo Leon y Jalisco) y el PRD (Michoacan, Chiapas y, en menor medida, Tabasco, Veracruz y Oaxaca).

Los grandes retos y responsabilidades de las tres principales fuerzas politicas consisten en su capacidad de autoreforma. Destacadamente en el PRI, su distancia del gobierno y sus procedimientos democraticos internos; en el PAN, la consolidacion y profundizacion de la estrategia gradualista, asi como una necesaria actualizacion ideologica; para el PRD evitar la division y las escisiones y adoptar con claridad una linea de oposicion leal consecuente, asi como su maduracion para llegar a ser un partido moderno de centro-izquierda.

El estudio, balance y analisis del proceso electoral mexicano debe situarse con perspectiva historica. El cambio de modo de legitimidad en Mexico es ya y debera seguir siendo legal y racional, donde el centro de gravedad sea elecciones libres, legales y limpias. Con el proceso electoral de agosto, la sociedad mexicana, los partidos, el gobierno y la opinion publica estan en condiciones de comenzar a hacer politica verdadera, a plantear y resolver los graves problemas sociales, microeconomicos, de

justicia y de reforma institucional que requiere una modernización con justicia.

## PERSPECTIVAS DE CAMBIO POLITICO DESPUES DE LOS COMICIOS DE 1994

Jose Antonio Crespo

Centro de Investigacion y Docencia Economica, CIDE

El proceso de transición política en México ha seguido un trayecto caprichoso de alzas y bajas. Su lentitud y dificultad pueden explicarse en buena parte a partir de las muy peculiares características institucionales y procedimentales del régimen priista, su alto grado de institucionalización, su carácter incluyente y su gran capacidad de adaptación a distintas circunstancias. Los sucesos políticos ocurridos desde enero de 1994 pusieron al régimen frente al mayor desafío que había enfrentado. Se abrió la posibilidad de un cambio cualitativo del régimen político, que incluía el paso a un sistema de partido dominante, en donde el PRI obtuviera un triunfo limpio pero con un poder más acotado por la oposición, o incluso la alternancia del poder por primera vez en la historia de México. Pero el proceso también generó la posibilidad de una ruptura institucional, dada la ausencia de un acuerdo sólido entre los partidos políticos, así como la mutua desconfianza.

El régimen priista supo una vez más manejar la situación, y aprovechar el clima de inquietud e incertidumbre generado por la guerrilla chiapaneca, la muerte del candidato oficial Luis Donaldo Colosio, y la estrategia intransigente de Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas. El número de votos para el PRI, conseguidos de manera tanto ilícita como lícita, han dado al régimen un nuevo margen de tiempo y maniobra que podría aprovechar para continuar con mayor holgura y tranquilidad el cambio democrático, pero también lo posibilitan para retrasar otra vez la reforma democrática. Ello en virtud de la aplastante victoria del partido oficial, que le permiten el control del Congreso, en el que tendrá el 60% de las diputaciones y cerca del 75% de las senadurías.

Es posible entender este resultado como una revitalización o restauración del régimen de partido hegemónico, pero las condiciones políticas y sociales que generaron este difícil e incierto período del proceso político mexicano no desaparecen del escenario. De no profundizarse la reforma, tanto social como política, podrían volver a surgir conflictos, probablemente más intensos y difíciles, quizás ya no manejables por el gobierno. En cambio, continuar con la democratización "desde arriba", permitiría abrir cauces para que las dificultades encuentren una vía de expresión y solución institucional. Se perdió pues la oportunidad de un cambio democrático más claro decisivo, fuese por vía de la alternancia o través de un triunfo del PRI pero con un resultado más equilibrado entre los contendientes.

Por otro lado, una nueva oportunidad se abrió al régimen para reformarse asimismo, de

manera que pueda capitalizar el cambio en provecho propio, en lugar de retrasarlo hasta que estalle otro conflicto mayor. Un resultado mas equilibrado hubiera orillado al nuevo gobierno priista a continuar la reforma. En cambio, su nueva aplastante mayoria le permitira hacer caso omiso de lo que ocurrio, como sucedio despues de 1988, a menos que tenga la suficiente sensibilidad politica para asimilar la experiencia de ese sexenio y, sobre todo, de lo ocurrido durante 1994.

## REBIRTH OF THE PERFECT DICTATORSHIP?

Denise Dresser

Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico, ITAM

Inter-American Dialogue

(This summary was made by Mexican Center staff from the author's full paper.)

Although not without some irregularities the August 21 elections were relatively clean, but they have restored the PRI to its hegemonic position in Mexican politics and government. Despite Chiapas, the impetus for change was forestalled. Dresser argues that this was due to a number of factors, inter alia: 1) the Colosio sympathy effect which did much to counterbalance public sympathy after Chiapas; 2) anxiety about the opposition alternative; 3) Salinista economic reforms and some expectancy that economic material benefits were within reach. In short Salinas won the Zedillo election victory. 4) Diego Fernandez de Cevallos' failure to capitalize and follow through from his overwhelming success in the debate (and particularly his mysterious "disappearance" from public view soon thereafter); 4) the failure of the PRD to mount an adequate challenge debilitated, as it was, by internal wranglings and conflict; 5) and importantly, the continuing symbiosis (subtle and blatant) that the PRI enjoys with the government. Notwithstanding the innovations in the electoral process which gave unprecedented credibility to these particular elections, the playing field remains far from level.

What are the implications of the PRI victory? Dresser argued that the margin of victory should not be interpreted as a mandate for Zedillo to use the enormous discretionary powers of the presidency available to him. The danger is that the PRI will be complacent in the scale of its victory, and that the forces of reform (already underway) will be stifled. Hegemonic powers, she argued, do not give or share power of their own accord, so who, now, will force the PRI to do so? Zedillo may renege (or be obliged to backtrack) from several of the promises made during the campaign -- to delink government from party; to distance himself from his powerful backers; and to modernize the party.

The opposition parties, too, face a crisis: the PAN because there is suspicion that it sought

to lose and because the results exposed its narrow bases of support; the PRD because it failed so badly to mount an effect challenge. Here questions of leadership abound, and the possibility that Camacho may play an important role in reconstructing the Mexican center-left.

The immediate problem hinges upon interpretation of whether Zedillo has a mandate. Dresser argued that he does not. Fifty percent of the electorate did not vote for him; he has not built a camarilla; there is no consensus. He may not need to include the left and right in his government, but he will need their support if he is to govern. Zedillo must push forward with the reform program and construct institutions that will preserve Mexico from recreating the dictatorship and allowed to forge a genuine democracy.

## LA DEMOCRACIA Y LAS ELECCIONES DE 1994

Luis Javier Garrido  
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, UNAM

(This summary was made by Mexican Center staff from an extended abstract.)

Garrido's presentation argues unequivocally that the whole of the electoral process leading up to the August 21 elections was systematically fraudulent. The outcome has a dual significance: continuity and rupture with the past. Continuity in the sense that time-worn traditions prevailed; rupture in the sense that the Partido del Estado, far from breaking down, is actually modernizing its structures and its anti-democratic practices.

The fraud was systemic and perpetrated by personnel of the PRI, public officials, and by government representatives (at all levels). It comprised many dimensions:

- a) The illicit use of public resources for partisan purposes
- b) The maintenance of a sub-system of (6) parties "paraestatales" to widen the appearance of a wide set of alternatives, when in fact there are only two independent options (PAN & PRD)
- c) The unconstitutionality of failing to provide citizens with free access to (undistorted) information; the vast disinformation campaign promoted by the PRI and its by its presidential candidate; and by the systematic vilification of Cardenas by presidential staff in Los Pinos since 1988

- d) The lack of an impartial authority in electoral matters and the pretense that the IFE was now under "citizen" control, whereas the 6 consejeros ciudadanos had limited authority, and their representation was negotiated by the three principal parties
- e) The propaganda promoted nationally and internationally that these elections would be clean and impartial, without adequately contextualizing their importance within a Mexican reality
- f) An electoral register widely reported to be as complete as humanly possible, yet in fact riddled with errors and which still failed to include 8 million citizens (17% of the voting public); included some 4.5 million with false or non-existent addresses, and numerous others whose data were suspicious. Furthermore, large numbers of voters had multiple voting cards. The external auditing was inadequate and actively involved the participation of the IFE -- the subject of audit
- g) Manipulation of the media in order to prepare the electorate for the desired and pre-ordained results
- h) On election day fraud was manifest and widely documented -- multiple voting, ballot box stuffing with additional PRI votes, intimidation, non-secret voting, "shaving" people's names from the list etc. This was especially the case in rural regions. In almost 50% of casillas there was no (non-PRI) party representative
- i) During the week following the elections the results were massaged, often in ways which lacked all credibility. In addition there were parallel (secret) computing centers in addition to those identified officially by the IFE. Much of this information will be denied to researchers wishing to corroborate the conduct of the elections.

In short, so many people were involved in so many different ways that one cannot even argue that this was the "perfect fraud"; it was actually very imperfect and messy.

These elections were, for many Mexicans, a plebiscite as to whether they wished to live in a legally-founded democratic regime, or under the PRI for another 6 years. It was not the people's "fear" that "won" the election for the PRI, but the government's "fear" that it would lose power.

Mexicans live in a system that is not "fincado en el Estado de Derecho", but continues to be a system characterized by:

- 1) The almost absolute centralization of power in the hands of the President
- 2) The absence of a decentralization and division of government based upon a separation

of powers and upon municipal autonomy

3) A "Partido del Estado" -- the PRI -- which undermines democratic life and "el Estado de Derecho", and which restricts, greatly, civil liberties

4) Citizenship without basic rights to elect governments

5) An almost total impunity for public officials who abuse the public interest for the private interest.

The future is highly uncertain. There is the danger that the PRI will set aside the demands for democracy and will continue to support policies which are authoritarian, albeit now presented as democratically legitimated. For the parties and for civil society the challenge continues to be how to modernize Mexico politically, and develop an "Estado de Derecho". The PAN must decide whether it is prepared to collaborate with an illegitimate government, and if so, it is in danger of losing respect for itself as a party and, perhaps, generating further breakaway factions from its ranks. The PRD will have to confront again a whole range of adverse conditions and will need to resist any temptation to negotiate future election results -- as the government would like it to do.

The greatest challenge, however, is for Mexican citizens to promote the move towards democracy through the means of the vote, and mobilization. The elections have generated a new and invigorated civil society capable of make democratic change and advancement a reality. That is why Garrido is not entirely pessimistic of the outcome of these elections and of the future.

## SESSION FOUR: SUMMARY OF THE COMMENTS, DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

### Mexico's Political Future: Democracy and the Balance of the August 21 Elections

Roger Frahm  
Government Department  
The University of Texas at Austin

#### Commentators:

Guillermo de la Pena: Dr. de la Pena's comments raised five concerns, each of which appears to question the overall legitimacy, not of the electoral outcome, narrowly speaking, but of the electoral and surrounding political process more broadly.

First, Dr. de la Pena took issue with Alan Arias electoral functions; i.e., that elections aim to integrate the population into the political system, that they link the right to govern strictly to the winners, and that then limit power by setting limits on office holders, hence assuring as well that minority groups are not excluded from power indefinitely. Dr. de la Pena's point was that many citizens do not feel represented in the ways that these electoral 'functions' suggest, since the conditions of the elections were less than equitable. In particular, Dr. de la Pena highlighted the inadequacy of information provided on and by the different parties and candidates. In this regard, the PAN was criticized for focusing on the middle class, the PRD on its narrow support base, instead of directing their respective efforts to a wider citizenship. Second, Dr. de la Pena registered a critique of the government, hence of the PRI, in his charge that the demands for representation of the indigenous population which arose with the Chiapas rebellion, has fallen on deaf ears. While, the government ceded to some material demands, it has essentially skirted the political demands.

Third, Dr. de la Pena raised the question of whether the opposition parties will pull back (retirarse) or not, this in the light of the PAN's 'error' of ongoing engagement with Salinas after the '88 elections. The opposition response, then, will be key to legitimizing the present electoral outcome. This ties in with a fourth point, namely the 'lack of' a mandate for Zedillo. Dr. de la Pena interprets the electoral results as admonishing Zedillo to continue forward with the 'transition,' given the narrow margin of victory, and the strong showing for the major opposition parties.

Finally, Dr. de la Pena raised the question that many people ask whether the glass is half empty or half full, and for analysts such as Luis Javier Garrido there is no cup! Although an extreme position to take, it is necessary for us all to take this viewpoint seriously.

#### Discussion:

Several important issues were raised from the floor. Some questioners asked Denise Dresser what she meant by the center-left option and were puzzled by her suggestions that the PAN wanted to lose the election (viz. Diego Fernandez's "disappearance"). Other points related to the question of fraud, and that sophistication of the electoral system meant that fraud need not be massive in order to be effective. The question of whether or not the PRI had a mandate also exercised several people's minds. Lic. Angel Gurria insisted that the mandate was clear-cut and noted that no-one questioned President Clinton's mandate even though he was elected with 43% of the vote on a much lower overall turnout. He also attacked Garrido for being highly misleading and selective in his facts, a point which Garrido vigorously defended by noting Gurria's own recent assertion that the PRI would rule for another 25 years.

IFE/ex-IFE members also took advantage of this opportunity to defend the IFE and the electoral outcome. One speaker recalled the IFE's 'maximum effort to find observers,' the looming 'technical problems' involved, and asked where are the 'fantasma' votes Garrido

speaks of? Another questioned the legitimacy of PRD-partisan Barbaran's claims that so many millions of voters were either shaved or substituted, while negating the huge difference between Zedillo and Cardenas. This particular speaker also slammed Riva Palacio for grounding his arguments in misrepresented documentation.

#### Panelist Responses:

In effect, Garrido defended his position across the board (returning to some of the points that he stressed earlier), arguing that his is not a pessimistic position, but a realistic assessment of the evidence, including the many doubts expressed about casilla observers (e.g., lacking impartiality/training).

Dresser returned to three points. First, she tied Camacho to the possibility of a viable center-left 'option' by stressing his capacity to 'reinvent himself' in the fashion of a grand PRI politico ('he has wasted only a limited number of his political lives thus far'), hence depicting the possible (likely?) reemergence of Camacho as a key player in reconstituting the center-left. Second, she argued that Zedillo's lack of a mandate, which she asserted earlier, cannot be compared to Clinton's 'mandate' given the lack of a level playing-field in Mexico. That is, Dresser sees the many 'structural' factors favoring the PRI as making comparisons with the US untenable. Finally, she revisits the 'carbon-copy' depiction (PAN taking from the PRI), granting that events can also be read as the PRI taking from the PAN. Whichever the case, she asserts that in fact PAN's backing down (witness Diego de Fernandez' post-debate 'disappearance') may well have been a wise strategic move, though the PAN has not said as much. Losing fits nicely into a gradualist strategy that sees the PAN as reluctant to put a PAN-president into office facing 28 PRI governors. Better to take a serious run at the presidency ('lanzarse') in the year 2000 or 2006, but why ask for more now?

Crespo asserted that we do not have to wait until the elections assail us with their transparency ('rechen de limpio'), but if the PRI won fairly, why does it continue to stain credibility with small scale fraud?

Arias put the icing on the cake with his accusation that the level of the dialogue had sunk below academic standards, firing brusquely at Garrido, who Arias asserted 'undercuts stability and legitimacy with unfound claims.' Instead, Arias points us back to the 'historical legitimacy' of the Mexican political system, and pointed to three legitimating axes for that political system: pluralismo, competencia, alternancia.

#### SUMMARY OF ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION: WHITHER THE POLITICAL PARTIES?

Panelists: Agustin Navarro (Partido Accion Nacional, PAN)  
Angel Gurria (Partido Revolucionario Institucional, PRI)  
Ricardo Pascoe (Partido de la Revolucion Democratica, PRD)

Chair: Rolando Cordera (Nexos)

Roger Frahm  
Government Department  
The University of Texas at Austin

In his opening comments, Rolando Cordera asserted that the conference participants have been 'dominated by doubt, systematically.' This led him to underline two themes: representation ('the parties must be capable of representation') and reform. For the PRI this boiled down to sorting out its competing tendencies, one for fast trade reform, the other for slow reform ('a lo largo'). For the PAN these themes raise issues of the substance and meaning of being a party of the loyal opposition, specifically when the PAN is also a party in power (partido de gobierno). And for the PRD, it must balance or prioritize its contending options, i.e., either full institutionalization or mobilization (counter-institutional?), while at the same time remaining a public party with more representatives in the national Congress than ever.

The panelists then had an opportunity to respond to Cordera's and to each other's comments, and these are folded into a single summary provided below and which also offered some response to questions from the floor.

These questions related to issues of separating party and state; the desirability of polls and debates becoming a part of the regular political scene in Mexico given the important role they had played throughout the elections; the future of the PRD; and interpretations drawn from the leanings of young voters (to the PAN). Panelists were also asked to identify those areas of the political and electoral system that they felt most needed changing. Had NAFTA been an important issue in the campaign?

Panelists' Remarks:

Angel Gurria: Gurria (PRI) returned to a defense of the vote/electoral process, which he asserted was won fairly. Furthermore, he reasserted that the results stand as a firm mandate for the PRI, and that this extends to its strong position in the Congress. Second, Gurria argued that governability was not really at issue, nor was civil violence. Instead, he asserted that the strong PRI showing in spite of the warnings that a high voter turnout would result in defeat has left the opposition caught off guard. Third, Gurria listed Zedillo's agenda: justice, economic equity, resolution of Chiapas conflict (responding to fellow panelists); and enumerated multiple Zedillo reform aims: an independent IFE and judiciary, state and municipal finance overhaul with the goal of municipal autonomy, and

opening up the candidate selection process of the PRI (seen as key to transforming the party and achieving transparency). Lastly, Gurria suggested that NAFTA was not a significant campaign issue.

Agustin Navarro: Navarro (PAN) in turn criticized the PRI for falling short of realizing a clean electoral process: 'it is time to end the use of qualifications' [by which I understand him calling for an electoral process 'without adjectives']. He called for additional improvements: an independent judiciary, and the separation of the state and the governing party. Picking up on the observation that the youth (students) support the PAN disproportionately, Navarro argued that the PRI finds it hard to reach these groups, though he added that there is also a 'cultural factor' at work in shaping who follows the PAN. Next, Navarro called for alternative formulas for dealing with poverty. And finally, he echoed the notion that the NAFTA was not a big election issue, but took the opportunity to chide the PRI for pursuing bi- or tri-lateral agreements that serve best in the short-term, instead of multi-national agreements the are preferable for the long-run.

Ricardo Pascoe: Pascoe (PRD) first expressed concern that while [the PRI] need justify the election [i.e., this much was to be expected], its partisans were overbearing in their attack on intellectuals ('this is the wrong direction'). Next he responded to the question: what started/what ended with the August 21st election. One, renovation of the need to end the party-of-the-state. Two, internal change of the PRI, which has nothing to do with the separation of government and state ('society cannot tolerate that these same processes continue in future elections, we must separate the conduct between the PRI and the government'). Three, we must reconstruct the elements of consensus (franjas de consenso) necessary to govern and move forward.

Finally, Pascoe responded to the question: regarding the PRD, its supporters, what will we do? how? He suggested that the aforementioned factors (extricating the PRI from the state, internal reform of the PRI, and reconstituting a national political consensus) can be separated in time/space, hence dealt with bit by bit. In the end, the PRD itself is a product of national politics, but through its mechanisms of internal discussion it can and will create 'a vital party that will win the next elections'.

## MEXICO'S ELECTORAL AFTERMATH AND POLITICAL FUTURE

Synthesis/Memoria of the Papers Presented at a Bi-National Conference Held at The University of Texas at Austin, Sept. 2-3, 1994.

Conference Organized by The Mexican Center of ILAS

Conference Sponsors:

The Ford Foundation, Mexico City

The Mexican Center of ILAS

With Additional Support from:

The College of Liberal Arts

The Institute of Latin American Studies

The Shell International Oil Company

The Copyright for this document is held by the Mexican Center of ILAS.

Downloading and redistribution are acceptable, but the neither the contents nor the text must be altered in any way. Referencing and accreditation should be as follows: Author's name, title of presentation, page nos., in Ward, P. M. et al., Synthesis/Memoria of the Bi-National Conference: Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future. September 2-3, 1994 (Austin: The Mexican Center of ILAS, University of Texas at Austin, 1994)

If you prefer an original hardcopy of this document, it is available from the Mexican Center at a nominal cost of \$5.00 per copy. Please make money checks and money orders (dollars only) to ILAS, and send your order to the Mexican Center, Institute of Latin American Studies, Sid Richardson Hall 1.310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. U.S.A

The Mexican Center of ILAS

Peter M. Ward, Director

Xochitl Medina Gonzalez, Conference Coordinator/Layout and Design

Dorothy Schepps, Editor/Administrative Assistant

# Biographical Information

## BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Program Participants for

Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future

A Bi-National Conference Organized by the Mexican Center of ILAS  
September 2-3, 1994

ALAN ARIAS MARIN: Licenciatura en filosofía en la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Estudios de Posgrado en Ciencias Políticas en la Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales de la UNAM y en la New School for Social Research de Nueva York. Profesor invitado en Universidades del extranjero (Universidad de París, Francia, Universidades de los Andes y la Nacional de Colombia) y en varias partes del interior de la República Mexicana. Ha sido asesor de Imevisión (1985) del Comité Ejecutivo Nacional del PRI (1988-1990), de la Fundación Mexicana Cambio XXI y del Instituto Nacional de Administración Pública (desde 1982). Ha sido agregado cultural de México en Colombia (1990-1992) y director de análisis de RTC (1992-1992). Actualmente es Profesor de la Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales y Director de Análisis y Proyectos Especiales de la Fundación Mexicana Cambio XXI - Luis Donaldo Colosio.

Entre sus artículos y ensayos destacan: "La Revolución de la Democracia", "Preliminares para una discusión de la Democracia en América Latina", "Proyecto Nacional y Democracia", "Protesta Estudiantil y Legitimación Estatal" y "La Evolución del Sistema Político Mexicano".

ALBERTO AZIZ NASSIF: Lic. in Communication Sciences at the Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Occidente (ITESCO); M.Sc. and Ph.D in Social Sciences at the Universidad Iberoamericana. He is Professor at FLACSO and at CIESAS (Mexico City). Author of several books on the Mexican State, Electoral Patterns, and Politics in Chihuahua. He publishes regularly in La Jornada.

MANUEL BARQUIN ALVAREZ: Lic. Facultad de Derecho, UNAM; Maestría en Derecho, Harvard; Maestría en Ciencia Política, Yale. Es Investigador Titular "C" del Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas de la UNAM desde 1988. Ha sido Profesor en varias universidades y fue Abogado general de la UNAM; Consejero Magistrado del IFE,

y actualmente es asesor del Secretario de Gobernacion. Entre sus libros destacan: La Regulacion del Trabajo en las Instituciones Autononmoas de Educacion Superior (1984); y Los Recursos y la Organizacion Judicial en Materia Civil (1977).

**DR. MIGUEL BASANEZ:** Dr. Basanez is a lawyer from National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). He holds an M.A. in Public Administration and did his doctorate in Political Science from the London School of Economics. He has authored three books and numerous articles on Mexican current affairs. His books include: La lucha por la hegemonia en Mexico, 1968-1980 (Siglo XXI, 1981, VII edition); El pulso de los sexenios: 20 anos de crisis en Mexico (Siglo XXI, 1990); and North American Convergence: Trade, Politics and Values, co-authored with Ronald Inglehard and Neil Nevitte (Princeton University Press and Siglo XXI, 1993).

Dr. Basanez has served for over 20 years in government. His most recent positions were in the President's Office and at the Secretary of Energy. Since 1990, Dr. Basanez has been the representative of WAPOR (World Association for Public Opinion Research) in Mexico, as well as professor of public opinion and Mexican politics at Mexico's Autonomous Institute of Technology (ITAM). Currently he is President of MORI de Mexico (Market and Opinion Research International) and is publisher of the monthly magazine Este Pais, which specializes in public opinion polls.

**NANCY BELDEN:** Ms Belden has polled in Mexico for financial Institutions, the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times and Univision. She has also done polls in Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia and the U.S. She is a partner in the polling firm of Belden and Russonello in Washington which works for the media, non-profit organizations, democratic candidates and others.

**RODERIC AI CAMP:** Ph.D., University of Arizona (1970). Professor Camp joined the Tulane University faculty in 1991 and has also served as visiting professor at the Colegio de Mexico, the Foreign Service Institute, and the University of Arizona. He was a research fellow at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars, Smithsonian Institutions (1983-84). Camp is a contributing editor to the Library of Congress Handbook of Latin American Studies, and to the World Book Encyclopedia. He was awarded a Howard Heinz Foundation fellowship for research on Mexico (1990-1991).

Camp's special interests include Mexican and Latin American politics, comparative elites, political recruitment and civil-military relations. The author of numerous articles and books on Mexico, his most recent publications include: Politics in Mexico (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); The Successor, a political thriller (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1993); Generals in the Palacio: The Military in Modern Mexico (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Entrepreneurs and Politics in

Twentieth Century Mexico (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); and *Memoirs of a Mexican Politician* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988).

**MAURICIO COLLADO MARTINEZ.** Realizo sus estudios en la Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales de la Universidad Autonoma de Tamaulipas. Profesor de las materias "Introduccion al estudio de Derecho" y "Teoria General del Estado" en la misma Institucion donde curso sus estudios, en 1979 y 1980. Ha expuesto temas sobre Historia Politica de Mexico, Sistema Politico Mexicano, Desarrollo Politico, Educacion Politica, Derecho Constitucional y Partidos Politicos, en instituciones del extranjero, organismos publicos, foros partidistas y universidades. Fue Director de Apoyo para la Concertacion and la Participacion Politica en la Secretaria de Gobernacion, de diciembre de 1988 a marzo de 1991. Fue Coordinador de Estudios y Proyectos Especiales de la Subsecretaria de Gobierno y Desarrollo Politico de la Secretaria de Gobernacion, de abril de 1991 a diciembre de 1992. Actualmente es Coordinador de Asesores del Director General del Instituto Federal Electoral.

Ha escrito articulos sobre nacionalismo, desobediencia civil, transicion politica y otros temas de actualidad en los diarios El Dia, El Sol de Mexico, El Nacional y El Financiero.

**ROLANDO CORDERA CAMPOS:** Licenciado en Economia (UNAM). Con estudios de postgrado en la London School of Economics, Londres, Inglaterra. Profesor titular de tiempo completo en la Facultad de Economia de la Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico. Coordinador del Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo Economico de Mexico en la Facultad de Economia de la UNAM. Colaborador de los diarios La Jornada y El Nacional, asi como de la revista Jueves de Excelsior. Miembro del Consejo Editorial de la revista Nexos y coordinador del Cuaderno de Nexos. Director y Conductor del programa de television semanal Nexos. Fue Presidente del Consejo Consultivo del Programa Nacional de Solidaridad. Consejero de la Comision de Derechos Humanos del Distrito Federal. Es miembro del Instituto de Estudios para la Transicion Democratica y la Academia Mexicana de Economia Politica.

Entre otras publicaciones, autor del libro *Las decisiones del poder*, Cal y Arena, 1989; *La disputa por la nacion*, con Carlos Tello, Siglo XXI Editores; y coordinador and coautor de los libros: *Desarrollo y crisis de la economia mexicana*, Fondo de Cultura Economica, 1981; *La desigualdad en Mexico*, Siglo XXI Editores, y *El reclamo democratico*, Siglo XXI Editores.

**JAQUI CHMIELEWSKI:**

Graduate Student, Department of Radio, TV and Film, The University of Texas at Austin.

ANA CRISTINA COVARRUBIAS: Licenciatura y maestria en Psicologia de 1959 a 1965. Doctorado en Psicologia Social, UNAM, 1972-1975. Presidente y Director General del Grupo CICA, S.A. de 1979 a la fecha. Asesora en Comunicacion de la Secretaria General del Consejo Nacional del Poblacion, 1990, 1991. Director General de Educacion para la Salud de la SSA, 1984-1985. Director General del 1er. Congreso Interamericano de Educacion para la Salud de la SSA, Mayo 1985. Asesora en comunicacion de la Subsecretaria de Planeacion de la SSA, 1979-1981. Asesora en Comunicacion de la Direccion General de Divulgacion de la CONASUPO, 1980-1982. Director de Investigacion de Televisa, de 1977 a 1979. Asesora en Comunicacion de la Vicepresidencia de Investigacion de Televisa, 1976-1977. Profesor de Comunicacion Social en la Facultad de Psicologia, Division de Estudios de Posgrado, Depto. de Psicologia Social, 1976-1991. Consejero de la Division de Estudios de Posgrado de la Facultad de Psicologia de la UNAM, 1980-1984. Profesor de Psicologia Social, Licenciatura de la Facultad de Psicologia de la UNAM, 1975-76. Profesor de Estadistica y Metodologia de la Investigacion, Escuela de Psicologia de la Univesidad Anahuac, 1965-1972. Profesor de Estadistica Aplicada a la Psicologia, Universidad Iberoamericana, 1962-1964.

JOSE ANTONIO CRESPO: Researcher at the Centro de Investigacion y Docencia Economica (CIDE) in Mexico City, and has held teaching positions at the Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa, the Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico, and the Universidad Iberoamericana. He is author of numerous articles on Mexican politics and contributes regularly as a political commentator to Mexico's journals and press. Currently he is working on a book manuscript comparing democratic structures in Mexico, India and Japan.

GUILLERMO DE LA PENA: Currently a Guggenheim Fellow and a visiting scholar at UT-Austin while on sabbatical leave of absence from CIESAS-Occidente. He earned a doctorate in Anthropology from Manchester University in 1977 and has written extensively on peasant social organization, regional politics and urban popular culture.

DENISE DRESSER: Received her Ph.D. from Princeton University. Professor of Political Science at the Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico (ITAM) desde 1992. She has consulted for the United Nations Development Program and the United Nations Economic Commission on Latin America and the Caribbean. Dr. Dresser has been visiting research fellow at the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego (1990-1991) and was postdoctoral fellow at the Center for International Studies, University of Southern California in 1994. She is on the advisory board of Este Pais and has recently finished a book manuscript on the politics of economic adjustment in Mexico. During 1994-1995 she will be working with the Inter-American Dialogue, Washington.

**FEDERICO ESTEVEZ:** Political scientist trained at Stanford and UCLA. Since 1983, he has been professor of Social Sciences at the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México in Mexico City, and since 1987, has served as Chair of ITAM's Social Sciences Dept. Before that he taught at the University of the Americas in Puebla, and held advisory positions in the Ministries of Finance and of Programming and Budget. His principal research affiliation has been with the Centro de Análisis e Investigación Económica, and he publishes regularly on Mexican politics and other domestic issues.

**LUIS FARIAS MACKEY:** Licenciado en derecho, analista político y exdirector ejecutivo de Capacitación Electoral de Instituto Federal Electoral (IFE).

**JOE FOWERAKER:** Professor of Government at the University of Essex, England. His specialization is social movements and political and democratic change. He has authored books on Brazil, Spain, Mexico and Latin America, and his research interests focus on citizenship rights and social movements.

**LUIS JAVIER GARRIDO:** Profesor investigador titular por oposición de la UNAM. Investigador nacional. Miembro del Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales de la UNAM. Profesor de la Facultad de Derecho de la UNAM. Profesor de la División de Posgrado de la Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales. Autor de *El Partido de la Revolución Institucionalizada* (Siglo XXI Editores, 1992) y *La Ruptura. La Corriente Democrática del PRI* (Grijalbo, 1993). Colaborador de los diarios *La Jornada*, *Diario de Yucatán* y *El Noroeste*.

**RAFAEL JIMENEZ:** Licenciatura en Ciencias Sociales en el ITAM. Especialista en encuestas y estudios de opinión pública: Asesor técnico de la Presidencia de la República; Estudios Sociales de BANAMEX; Director de Proyectos Especiales en Opinión Profesional; y Director de Departamento de Investigación en Reforma.

**SILVIA GOMEZ TAGLE:** Profesora investigadora de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales. Autora de varios libros acerca de el sistema político mexicano, las elecciones y el democratización. Durante 1994 participo con Alianza Cívica, organización que aglutino a más de 400 ONG, y cuya misión fue observar el desarrollo de las elecciones en México.

**MANUEL GONZALEZ OROPEZA:** Licenciado en derecho from the National University of Mexico. Master in Arts (Political Science-Public Law) from the University of California at Los Angeles. Doctorate in History from the National University of Mexico. He has been visiting scholar at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Visiting Professor at the Law School of UCLA. He is currently tenured faculty member of the Law School and research fellow at the Institute for Legal Research at UNAM. He has received the status of Investigador Nacional Award since 1984.

Chairman of the Graduate Division of the Law School at UNAM.

Among his publications are: *El Senado de la Republica*, 3 vol. (1987); *La Intervencion Federal en la desaparicion de Poderes* (2nd edition UNAM, 1987); and Commentaries to the 3rd and 4th edition of *Los Derechos del Pueblo Mexicano* (published by the Congreso de la Union).

**LAWRENCE S. GRAHAM:** Professor of Government, UT-Austin. He is a specialist in comparative politics whose interests concern issues in public policy and management. His publications on politics and bureaucracy have focused on Latin America (especially Brazil and Mexico) and Southern Europe (especially Portugal).

His more recent work has involved the study of development policy and programs in Latin America, as well as Southern and Eastern Europe. Illustrative of these publications are: *The State and Policy Outcomes in Latin America* (The Hoover Institution and Praeger Publishers, 1990), *The Political Economy of Brazil: Public Policies in an Era of Transition*, ed. with Robert H. Wilson (University of Texas Press, 1990), and *The Portuguese Military and the State: Rethinking Transitions in Europe and Latin America* (Westview Press, 1993).

**TONATIUH GUILLEN LOPEZ:** Holds a Ph. D. from the Colegio de Mexico. Researcher and Director of the Departamento de Administracion Publica at the Colegio de la Frontera Norte (COLEF), Tijuana. He has conducted widespread research on various aspects of Mexico's changing political culture and on opposition government in the border states, most notably Chihuahua and Baja California.

He is author of several books, the most recent of which is *Baja California, 1989-1992. Alternancia politica y transicion democratica* (Mexico, COLEF-CIIH/UNAM, 1993).

**JOSE ANGEL GURRIA TREVINO:** Secretary for International Affairs for the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI). Prior to this appointment, he worked for fourteen years at the Mexican Ministry of Finance and led the negotiating team restructuring Mexico's foreign debt. He has held other key financial posts, including President and CEO of the National Bank of Foreign Trade (BANCOMEXT), and President and CEO of National Financiera (NAFINSA).

**JOSEPH L. KLESNER:** Associate Professor of Political Science and Director of the International Studies Program at Kenyon College in Gambier, Ohio, where he has taught Latin American and comparative politics, international relations, and interdisciplinary international studies courses for nine years. His research has been on Mexican electoral politics. His dissertation (MIT, 1988) focused on a major electoral reform which expanded Mexico's party system in 1977. Other research interests

include the development of national identity in Latin America in light of current pressures toward economic integration in the western hemisphere and comparative perspectives on political liberalization in one-party regimes (especially Taiwan and Mexico).

His recent written papers and articles focus on Mexican electoral behavior and political party development. His book, *Political Liberalization in Mexico*, will be completed within the next year.

**ALAN KNIGHT:** B.A., Ph.D., Oxford University; Professor of History, UT Austin, 1986-1992; Professor of the History of Latin America and Director of the Latin American Centre, Oxford University, and Fellow of St. Antony's College, 1992-present. Professor Knight is the author of *The Mexican Revolution* (Cambridge, 1986), *U.S.-Mexican Relations, 1910-1940* (San Diego, 1987), and numerous articles on modern Mexican history. He is currently working on a history of Mexico in the 1930's and a general history of Mexico, from the Aztecs to Zedillo.

**ALONSO LUJAMBIO:** Lic. en Ciencias Sociales, ITAM; Candidato a Doctor en Ciencia Política, Yale. Especialista en legislación electoral y elecciones. Profesor de tiempo completo del Departamento de Ciencias Sociales del ITAM y director del Programa de Ciencia Política.

**AGUSTIN NAVARRO:** Political and Economic Consultant and Strategic Planner. A graduate of National University of Mexico and the Mexican Institute of Technology, he has completed post-graduate studies in business administration and economics. He served as Professor of Economic Promotion and Legislation and Professor of Political Economy at the Institute. Dr. Navarro has served as economic advisor for the President of Mexico in past administrations, and presently he is the editorial advisor to the President of Television Azteca S.A. de C. V. and political and economic advisor to the President of the National Action Party (PAN) Executive Committee.

Dr. Navarro is a syndicated columnist of *Excelsior* and contributor to national and international magazines and newspapers. He is the author of numerous essays and newspaper articles on political economy, international economics, banking and strategic planning. He wrote the "Administrative Audit of the Mexican Government (Executive Branch)" in 1970 and "Inflation and Unemployment" in 1978. He is a member of the Mont Pelerin Society, the Committee for Monetary Research and Education. He is currently President and Director of the Centro Mexicano de Investigación Socioeconómica y Educación Superior (MISES), with affiliated offices in Mexico City, Brea, CA. and Washington, DC.

**GUADALUPE PACHECO MENDEZ:** Licenciatura en Ciencias Políticas, Universidad

Nacional Autonoma en Mexico, 1972. Maestria en Ciencias Politicas, Universidad de Paris, 1974. Doctorado en Estudios Politicos, E.H.E.S.S., Paris, 1979. Profesora de la Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana (UAM) desde 1975. Miembro del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores, 1989-1992. Responsable del Departamento de Desarrollo Rural, de la Secretaria de Programacion y Presupuesto, 1983. Subdirectora de la revista Examen desde Julio 1994 y miembro del Consejo Editorial desde 1991. Jefe de Unidad en la Coordinacion General de Campana del PRI, 1994. Subsecretaria de Asuntos Internacionales, 1992-1994. Colaboradora en la coordinacion de asesores del Presidente del PRI, 1991-1992. Profesora del ICAP, 1991. Asesora en la Secretaria de Organizacion del Comitè Directivo del PRI en el D.F., 1989-1990.

Ha publicado diversos articulos academicos, entre los mas recientes destacan "El nuevo padron electoral" in Las elecciones de Salinas, un balance critico, (Flacso-Plaza & Valdez, Mexico 1992); "Urbanizacion, elecciones y cultura politica" en Estudios sociologicos, (El Colegio de Mexico, enero-abril de 1992); "La XIV Asamblea Nacional del PRI" en Estudios Mexicanos, Vol. 7, No. 2, (Universidad de California, Irvine, 1991). Es colaboradora regular de la revista Examen y ha publicado otros articulos en las revistas Vuelta, Politica, Nexos, El Cotidiano, Topodrilo e Historias y en el periodico La Jornada.

JACQUELINE PESHARD: Received her first degrees and her Ph.D from the UNAM in Social and Political Sciences. Currently she is Researcher/Professor at the Colegio de Mexico.

RICARDO PASCOE PIERCE: Coordinator of International Affairs, Cuauhtemoc Cardenas Presidential Campaign, Partido de la Revolucion Democratica (PRD).

GERMAN PEREZ FERNANDEZ DEL CASTILLO: Licenciado en Derecho, UNAM. Maestro en Ciencias Politicas y Sociales, UNAM. Doctor, Universidad de Frankfurt, Alemania. Profesor de tiempo completo en la Facultad de Ciencias Politicas. Fue Consejero Magistrado entre 1990 y marzo 1994.

RAYMUNDO RIVA PALACIO: Assistant Managing Editor at Reforma. Former correspondent in Washington, Paris, Madrid and Central America. Professor at Universidad Iberoamericana, where he teaches journalism. Nieman Fellow at Harvard University. He has written three books, two on journalism and one on Central America.

BRYAN ROBERTS: B.A. in History, Balliol College, Oxford; A.M. Sociology University of Chicago; Ph. D. in Sociology, University of Chicago (1964); M.A. Economy, Manchester. After completing his doctorate at the University of Chicago, he returned to the United Kingdom and taught at the University of Manchester for 22 years until 1986, when moved to Texas. Currently, Professor of Sociology at the University of

Texas at Austin. Holds the C.B. Smith Centennial Chair in U.S. Mexico Relations.

His published work includes: *Organizing Strangers: Poor Families in Guatemala City, Cities and Peasants: The Political Economy of Urbanization in the Third World* and (with Norman Long) *Miners, Peasants and Entrepreneurs: Regional Development in the Central Highlands of Peru*. He has also collaborated in the editing of several collections: *New Perspectives on Economic Life: The Sociology of Development in Latin America*, *Peasant Cooperation and Capitalist Development in Central Peru*, and currently a two volume reader *The Sociology of Development*.

AMERICA RODRIGUEZ: Earned her B.A. in English and Spanish Literature at Swarthmore College in 1978. For the next decade she worked as a journalist, most recently as a Los Angeles-based correspondent for National Public Radio. In 1993 she received her Ph.D. in Communication from the University of California, San Diego. She has recently published articles on the relationship between Mexican and U.S. television news production, and on the national news systems of the U.S., Mexico, and Canada.

VICTORIA E. RODRIGUEZ: Lic., ITESM; M.A., University of Texas - El Paso; Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley. Assistant Professor of Political Science at UTEP, 1989-1990; LBJ School of Public Affairs at UT-Austin, 1991-present. Her principal research interests revolve around political and administrative decentralization in Mexico, particularly intergovernmental relations and municipal politics.

She is author (with Peter Ward) of *Policymaking, Politics and Urban Governance in Chihuahua: The Experience of Recent Panista Governments* (1992), and *Political Change in Baja California: Democracy in the Making?* (1994), and joint editor of *Opposition Government in Mexico* (1995).

ANTONIO SANCHEZ GUTIERREZ: Lic. in Sociology from the Universidad Autonoma de Mexico; M.A. Ph.D Oxford. He is Researcher and Professor at Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) and at the Instituto Mexicano de Estudios Politicos (IMEP).

SAMUEL SCHMIDT: Director of the Center for Inter-American and Border Studies and Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Texas at El Paso.

Author of *The Deterioration of the Mexican Presidency* (University of Arizona Press, 1991), and *La autonomia relativa del Estado* (Quinto Sol, 1988). Co-editor of *Estudios cuantitativos sobre la historia de Mexico* (UNAM, 1988). Recently he finished a book-length manuscript on Mexican Political Humor. He writes a weekly column for *La Opinion* and *Unomasuno*. Recently he has been researching political humor,

democratization in Mexico and the Mexican network of power.

**DALE STORY:** Professor of Political Science and Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs at the University of Texas at Arlington. Most of his research has focused on Mexican political parties and the role of the private sector in Mexican politics. Among his chief accomplishments are serving as Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts; Department Chair, Political Science; Visiting Research Scholar, Centro de Investigacion y Docencia Economicas, Mexico City; Contributing Editor, Handbook for Latin American Studies; and President, International Studies Association-Southwest.

He is the author of *Industry, the State, and Public Policy in Mexico* and *The Mexican Ruling Party: Stability and Authority*, plus many additional articles, book reviews and professional papers on Mexican and Latin American politics.

**FEDERICO SUBERVI:** Associate Professor in the Department of Radio, TV and Film at the University of Texas - Austin. Came to the U.S. from Puerto Rico in 1975 to obtain a Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin at Madison. His areas of specialization are: mass communication and Latinos in the U.S.; Latinos, media and politics in the U.S.; mass media in Puerto Rico; and communication and ethnic groups in the U.S. and Brazil.

**PETER WARD:** B.A., Hull; M.S., Cambridge; Ph.D., Liverpool. Has held senior teaching positions at the Universities of London and Cambridge. In 1991 he was appointed to a professorship in the Department of Sociology and the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. Since 1993 he has been director of the Mexican Center of the Institute of Latin American Studies. Since 1977, he has served as sometime advisor to the Mexican government on housing and urban development.

He is author of several books on Mexico, among the most recent of which are: *Políticas de bienestar social en México, 1970-89* (1989), *México: Una megaciudad* (1991), and (with Victoria Rodríguez) *Policymaking, Politics and Urban Governance in Chihuahua: The Experience of Recent Panista Governments* (1991) and *Political Change in Baja California: Democracy in the Making?* (1994), and (editors) *Opposition Government in Mexico* (1995).

**SIDNEY WEINTRAUB:** B.A., Missouri; M.S., Yale; Ph.D., The American University. Career diplomat from 1949-1975, during which time he served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State. Since 1975 he has been Dean Rusk Professor of International Affairs at the Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs. He is currently on leave from the LBJ School to hold the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, DC.

Among his several books are: *Free Trade Between Mexico and the United States?* (1984);

Transforming the Mexican Economy: The Salinas Sexenio (1990); and A Marriage of Convenience: Relations between Mexico and the United States (1990). Currently he is working on a book entitled, NAFTA - What's Next?

SERGIO ZERMENO: Licenciatura de Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, UNAM. Dr. en Sociologia; Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Paris. Editoralista de La Jornada. Miembro de la presidencia de la Convencion National Democratica.

Sus publicaciones incluyen: Mexico: una democracia utopica: El movimiento estudiantil de 1968 (Siglo XXI Editores). Otros trabajos: "El regreso del lider" en Foweracker and Craig (eds.), Popular Movements and Political Change in Mexico. "La derrota de la sociedad," en Revista Mexicana de Sociologia.

## MEXICO'S ELECTORAL AFTERMATH AND POLITICAL FUTURE

Synthesis/Memoria of the Papers Presented at a Bi-National Conference Held at The University of Texas at Austin, Sept. 2-3, 1994.

Conference Organized by The Mexican Center of ILAS

Conference Sponsors:

The Ford Foundation, Mexico City

The Mexican Center of ILAS

With Additional Support from:

The College of Liberal Arts

The Institute of Latin American Studies

The Shell International Oil Company

The Copyright for this document is held by the Mexican Center of ILAS.

Downloading and redistribution are acceptable, but the neither the contents nor the text must be altered in any way. Referencing and accreditation should be as follows: Author's name, title of presentation, page nos., in Ward, P. M. et al., Synthesis/Memoria of the Bi-National Conference: Mexico's Electoral Aftermath and Political Future. September 2-3, 1994 (Austin: The Mexican Center of ILAS, University of Texas at Austin, 1994)

If you prefer an original hardcopy of this document, it is available from the Mexican Center at a nominal cost of \$5.00 per copy. Please make money checks and money orders (dollars only) to ILAS, and send your order to the Mexican Center, Institute of Latin American Studies, Sid Richardson Hall 1.310, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712. U.S.A

The Mexican Center of ILAS

Peter M. Ward, Director

Xochitl Medina Gonzalez, Conference Coordinator/Layout and Design

Dorothy Schepps, Editor/Administrative Assistant