

Will London's Schemes for Mexico's Elections Be Overturned?

by Gretchen Small

With just four months to go before the Mexican Presidential elections, who should deploy into that contest but Dick Cheney's Spanish ally, anti-Islam warrior José María Aznar, the former prime minister. The Spanish people had thrown Aznar and his crusade out of office more than a year ago, but there he was in the Mexico City headquarters of the National Action Party (PAN) on Feb. 21, urging Mexicans to join Cheney's global war, and elect "my old friend," the PAN's Felipe Calderón, as President on July 2, "for the good of this country."

Aznar's campaign on behalf of the PAN comes as no surprise, as they have the same historical roots. Aznar's Popular Party (PP) was founded to represent Generalissimo Francisco Franco's legacy in the post-Franco era, while the PAN emerged out of Mexico's pro-Hitler, pro-Franco Synarchist movement of the 1920s and 1930s.

Aznar has been trotting the globe, promising to return Synarchism to power in Spain any day now. Lately, he's told his sponsors in Washington that he can reconquer Ibero-America, too. Two weeks before the PAN welcomed him to Mexico, in a Feb. 12 interview with the Chilean daily *El Mercurio*, Aznar issued a call for his "good friends" in the region to rally behind him in a continent-wide crusade to crush a supposed "populist wave" threatening the region. He named Venezuela, Cuba, Bolivia, and "perhaps" Argentina as his immediate targets, and attacked Chile's incoming Bachelet government, as well.

Aznar got down to business at the PAN headquarters in Mexico. We must defend "liberal democracy," by guaranteeing wealth, markets, and private property above all, he told his PAN co-thinkers. He demanded that Mexico and the rest of the Americas join Cheney's war on "Islamic terrorism," telling his PAN hosts that "Ibero-America cannot stay on the sidelines of this struggle for democracy, freedom, and civilization."

Will Historic Mexico Be Broken?

PAN leaders were enthusiastic over this support from Cheney's Spaniard. Mexico's Constitution, however, expressly forbids foreign intervention into Mexico's internal affairs, as they are a matter to be resolved among Mexicans.

Leaders of the two main opposition parties, the Revolutionary Democratic Party (PRD) and the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), demanded that the Constitution be upheld. On Feb. 22, the political coordinating committee of the Chamber of Deputies passed a resolution demanding Aznar's expulsion from Mexico for violating the Constitution. PAN leaders protested that in this age of globalization, such prohibitions are anachronistic, but the PAN government opted in the end to quiet what had become a national uproar, by sending Aznar and his PAN hosts a letter quoting the Constitution.

History, much to the frustration of Mexico's modern would-be colonizers, has not yet been entirely forgotten in that country. Mexico is no longer a colony of Spain, and will not be re-conquered by "beads and necklaces," PRD Sen. César Raúl Ojeda Zubieta said of Aznar's visit, in reference to the first Spanish conquest in the 16th Century.

The PAN's welcoming of Aznar reminds us that the PAN still has the mentality of its 19th-Century predecessors, "who offered the throne to Maximilian" in the 1860s, PRI spokesman Eduardo Andrade noted. That Spanish-British-French attempt to re-establish Hapsburg rule over republican Mexico was defeated militarily by President Benito Juárez, with help from Abraham Lincoln, and ended with the execution of the would-be Emperor of Mexico at the Cerro de las Campanas in 1867.

Despite Mexico's growing political weakness over the past 25 years, it is the country's historic fierce commitment to its right to sovereign independence and development which the international Synarchist financiers have yet to crush. London and Wall Street's approach to the decisive 2006 elections, therefore, is not so simple as to put all their eggs in Aznar's friends' basket. That was the strategy in the last Presidential election six years ago, when the financiers threw their weight behind Coca-Cola salesman Vicente Fox and the PAN as the force that would impose the bankers' policies. Six years and only a few "structural reforms" later, that strategy has proved insufficient.

Financiers: Get Rid of Presidential System

The goal of the financiers in 2006, is not to elect or block this or that candidate, but to orchestrate the election

process itself, so as to create an outcome which finally buries the institutions and culture of Mexican independence. For this, they seek to replace Mexico's U.S.-modelled Presidential system with an Anglo-Dutch-style parliamentary system, so they can overthrow and change Mexican governments at will.

Two financier lackeys have led the campaign to dump the Presidential system for the past several years are Fox's former Foreign Minister Jorge Castañeda, who supports the PAN's Calderón, and George Soros's Manuel Camacho Solís, who is one of the top advisors to PRD candidate Andrés Manuel López Obrador. Castañeda and Camacho Solís freely admit that the goal of this reform is to break Mexico's ability to resist complete takeover by the financiers.

The City of London's *Economist* magazine was used to put forward a strategy to this effect, in its Feb. 25 issue. Asserting that when it comes to policy, there is not much difference between the PAN's Calderón, PRI candidate Roberto Madrazo, or the PRD's López Obrador, the *Economist* proposed that a coalition government be formed after the elections, to bring about the needed "sea-change in Mexican politics" which they had hoped would result from Fox's election. "Structural reforms" are sorely needed, particularly with respect to energy and pensions (privatization) and the tax system (the International Monetary Fund is pushing for a return to tax-farming, demanding that an "independent" agency collect taxes). "If a coalition were formed, it might just be possible that the next President, be he Mr. Calderón, or Mr. López Obrador, could push such changes through Congress," the *Economist* suggested.

Not Too Late To Overturn Election-Rigging

International financiers often rig a critical national election in a targetted country by controlling the choices presented. Such schemes can only work, however, if the voters act as if their only option is to choose dutifully among the candidates presented, and leave the campaigns as currently defined.

Well-known in Mexico for his unstinting support for that nation's sovereignty, U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche has been persistently pressed to declare which of the Mexican candidates he thinks should be supported. On Feb. 17, LaRouche replied to one such query, with a suggestion that the questioner view the election process differently:

"I have a different approach. First, I tend to be more a maker of potential Presidents, than a follower of any Presidential candidate. My duty, as a statesmen of some unusually relevant experience, is to inform them of what they must become, and let them decide for themselves to show themselves as committed to a principled mission of the quality needed for their nation, its place in the scheme of things, at that time, and with that choice of a better future.

"To paraphrase an American of times past, Eugene Debs, I would rather support a Presidential candidate who has cho-

sen a mission which makes him suitable for his time and place in history, than one who is not suitable, but only more likely to be elected," LaRouche wrote.

"We need a candidate in Mexico who has the right vision of the future, and the intellectual and moral commitment to that principled mission. Assist good political figures in developing and showing that they have those qualities. Give that benefit to as many as are suited for such encouragement, and thus seek to ensure the benefit for the republic, whichever among them wins."

Now return to the City of London's view, as put forward by the *Economist*. The *Economist* premises its plans on the PRD and PRI campaigns continuing as they have so far. In the case of the PRD, the *Economist* makes clear that London considers Camacho Solís key to ensuring that the PRD stays within the policy "consensus."

The *Economist* led its election analysis by celebrating "the sinking" of the PRI, which they made clear they do *not* wish included in the coalition government they envision. The key to controlling the PRI, from the London financiers' standpoint, is shattering the party altogether. Despite the PRI's corruption and many capitulations, they have been unable to eliminate the nationalist base within this party which led the country for 72 years, and which remains a formidable force in the nation's politics.

PRI candidate Roberto Madrazo, a corrupt machine man imposed as candidate by former President Carlos Salinas, one of the most hated men in Mexican history for his sell-out of Mexico to the North American Free Trade Accord (NAFTA), is doing exactly what the financiers wish: sinking the party by campaigning for free trade.

What Would Happen If . . . ?

What would happen to the overall election campaign, however, if nationalists within the PRI were to rise up and overthrow his candidacy, even at this late date? Sen. Manuel Bartlett, who led the successful Congressional opposition to energy privatization during the Fox Administration, reported on Feb. 3 that dumping Madrazo has become the talk in the halls of Congress. Madrazo is "the worst of the candidates," because he's pushing "the old neo-liberal doctrines which have failed throughout Latin America," Bartlett charged.

The fight is fierce. On Feb. 28, PRI spokesman Andrade quit his post, issuing a blistering open letter attacking the free-trade policies which Madrazo has adopted. Bare ambition for power dominates over any real interest in bettering society, "which is disintegrating at an accelerating pace," Andrade warned. Politicians turn to the polls to decide their policies today, "as if they can't think for themselves. The true politician is not someone who tells people what they already told the pollsters, but someone who defends a principle in which he believes, and which has an influence on the thinking of the people."