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Foreword

by Jimmy Carter

The Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, which I chair, has worked since 1986 to reinforce democracy in the Americas. We were pleased to play a role in the 1994 Mexican elections, which were an important step in the democratic development of Mexico.

As we have monitored the electoral process over the last several years, we have seen the Mexican government begin to recognize and address the problem of electoral credibility—that a plurality of the Mexican people did not believe the 1994 elections would be honest. One sign was the new safeguards introduced in the election process. A second was the accreditation of some 88,000 Mexican observers and nearly 1,000 foreign visitors to observe the August 21 elections.

The Council accepted the invitation to observe the elections in order to lend its support to all those groups working to ensure the integrity of the electoral process. As in other elections which we have observed, the Council seeks, through its presence before and on election day, to encourage citizen participation in the democratic process. In this light, we especially commend the thousands of Mexicans who worked diligently as election officials, party representatives at the polls, and observers, as well as the more than 35 million Mexicans who exercised their right to vote.

The Council delegation attending the August 21 elections represents the culmination of a long involvement in Mexico. Since 1990, the Council and The Carter Center have worked to analyze and report on the impact of NAFTA and the elections process, and have invited Mexicans to participate in our election monitoring activities in other countries, including my own. We appreciate the invitation from the Federal Electoral Institute to play a role in the Mexican elections and to report on our findings. We offer this report and its recommendations in the spirit of contributing to further improvements in the Mexican electoral process.

I would like personally to thank three members of the Council who led our delegation—former presidents Rodrigo Carazo of Costa Rica, Vinicio Cerezo of Guatemala, and former prime minister Joe Clark of Canada. Their leadership and dedication reflect the vitality and diversity of the Council, in which different members of our group of 25 take the lead on the numerous invitations and requests which we receive from throughout the hemisphere.

I also want to acknowledge the cooperation and support of the National Democratic Institute and the International Republican Institute, who organized the larger delegation in which our Council representatives participated. As we have witnessed in previous collaborations, these two institutions provide valuable experience in electoral assistance and monitoring around the globe. Finally, I thank all of the members of the Council delegation for volunteering their time and energy to this project, and Jennifer McCoy for organizing this mission as well as two pre-election missions and reports.
Preface

The Mexican Elections Project of The Carter Center of Emory University began in one sense in 1986 when one of us observed the electoral process in Chihuahua. A more concerted project began with informal discussions and trips to Mexico in 1990, and the participation of Mexican civic and political leaders in our election-monitoring delegations in Haiti, Guyana and the United States in 1990 and 1992. In response, Mexican civic groups invited The Carter Center to send a small group to witness their initial observation activities in two gubernatorial elections in Mexico in July 1992.

For the 1994 national elections, The Carter Center sponsored two expert teams to travel to Mexico to analyze the electoral reforms and the views of the parties about those reforms. The teams’ reports prepared for the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government were then published and distributed in Mexico and the United States, contributing, we hope, in a positive way to the ongoing debate over the election process in Mexico.

The decision to send a small Council team to observe the elections and to associate with the NDI/IRI effort was a difficult one. The invitation from the IFE arrived late, and there was not sufficient time to locate the resources or to field a large enough team to ensure that it could detect fraud if it were to occur. On the other hand, we had already invested considerable effort in the electoral process and were told by many Mexican leaders with whom we had worked that a Council presence would deter the possibility of fraud and encourage Mexicans to vote. We therefore chose not to send a comprehensive delegation as we had done in other transitional countries, but rather a small, knowledgeable team, led by three Council members, and associated with the NDI and IRI.

The Mexican Elections Project would not have been possible without the generous support of Joan Wueltle, the Cisneros Group, and the Agency for International Development. It also would not have been possible without the donation of time and effort by the members of the delegation, and the expertise of the pre-election teams who travelled to Mexico in September 1993 and June 1994. The following staff and interns at The Carter Center made a tremendous effort to ensure that the delegation was well-organized and efficient: David Carroll, Harriette Martin, Eric Bord, Alma Idiart, Susan Palmer, Deanna Congileo, Joanne O’Connor, Colleen Shea, and Jason Calder.

Finally, we want to thank the International Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute for their invitation to the Council to send a group to participate with their delegation. Together we formed an international delegation of 80 persons with wide experience in election processes and observation around the world.

This report is the fourth in our series of reports on the Mexican elections. It is a preliminary report on the activities of the delegation and assessment of the elections. After the elections, the three major parties filed over 1800 complaints, which the Federal Elections Tribunal has been investigating. The final outcome of the elections only became official on November 9 when the new Chamber of Deputies validated the presidential election. The full delegation report, to be published by the International Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute in early 1995, will provide a fuller analysis of the complaint process and outcomes.

Robert Pastor
Fellow and Director

Jennifer McCoy
Senior Research Associate

August 17-24, 1994

prepared by the
Latin American and Caribbean Program
The Carter Center

January 1995

Introduction

On August 21, 1994, Mexicans re-elected the ruling Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI), continuing its 65-year reign for another six years. Turning out in record-breaking numbers, voters defied pollsters predictions that a high-turn out would favor the opposition, and instead chose the PRI presidential candidate with a twenty-point margin over his closest competitor. After a series of electoral reforms and the accreditation of nearly 89,000 Mexican and foreign observers, the August 21 elections were widely seen as a test of the political commitment of Mexico’s government and political parties to an open, competitive election.

The Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government based at The Carter Center of Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., sent a 15-person team to observe the August 21, 1994 Mexican national elections. The Council team participated with the National Democratic Institute (NDI) and the International Republican Institute (IRI) to form an 80-person delegation from 14 countries that travelled to Mexico and visited 25 of the 31 Mexican states on election day. NDI and IRI will publish a full delegation report in early 1995.

The Council, a group of 25 current and former heads of government from throughout the Americas chaired by former president Jimmy Carter, had previously monitored 9 elections in the Americas. The Council has been involved informally in Mexico since 1990, but for the 1994 Presidential elections, it responded to a June 23 open invitation to “foreign visitors” from the Federal Election Institute, and to individual invitations to Council members from the three major political parties, by sending a small delegation to coordinate with others to support the democratic process in Mexico and report to the international community its observations about the process.

As part of the larger NDI/IRI international delegation, the Council was represented

After a series of electoral reforms and the accreditation of nearly 89,000 Mexican and foreign observers, the August 21 elections were widely seen as a test of the political commitment of Mexico’s government and political parties to an open, competitive election.
by former Costa Rican president Rodrigo Carazo, former Guatemalan president Vinicio Cerezo, and former Canadian prime minister Joe Clark. Mr. Clark also served as co-leader of the NDI/IRI delegation. Jim Wright, former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, was President Carter’s personal representative for the delegation. Also participating were former Deputy Secretary of State John Whitehead, author Nancy Dickerson Whitehead, former U.S. ambassador Harry Barnes, Mexico scholar Vikram Chand of Brown University, former OAS official Joaquin Daly, and Carter Center senior staff David Carroll and Jennifer McCoy.

Prior to the elections, The Carter Center published three reports on the Mexican observer groups and electoral process based on pre-election expert team visits to Mexico in June 1992, September 1993 and June 1994. The reports, which were widely read and cited in Mexico and the U.S., analyzed the progress in the reforms to the election laws, noted the continuing inequities in the campaign conditions, and highlighted the lack of confidence of the Mexican population in the voting process as a major challenge for the government leading up to the elections. In addition, The Carter Center and Council invited a representative group of Mexicans to observe the U.S. presidential elections in November 1992.

Delegation Activities and Findings
Upon arrival in Mexico on August 17, the delegation attended a full schedule of briefings by the UN, election authorities, political parties, and Mexican observer groups. The Council team along with the rest of the NDI/IRI delegation then divided into 34 two-person teams to travel to 25 states and the Federal District. Each team met state and local level party and election officials to get a sense of the political climate in each state and to learn of potential trouble spots. On election day, team members departed at 7:00 am to observe the opening of the polls, then visited ten to twenty polling stations per team before ending the day by observing the count at a single polling site. The day after the election, the entire delegation reconvened in Mexico City for debriefings and to prepare its preliminary statement which was delivered in a press conference on Tuesday afternoon, August 23 (see attachment).

The Council/NDI/IRI delegation found election day proceedings to be generally peaceful and orderly. A high voter turn-out of 77% of registered voters indicated the desire of the Mexican people to participate in choosing their leaders. With 88,000 Mexican observers and over 900 foreign visitors accredited for the first time, this was also the most independently-observed election in Mexican history.

Members of the delegation witnessed numerous administrative irregularities, such as opening polls late and inconsistencies in the checking of the indelible ink, as well as some serious problems, including subde intimidation, a ballot box burned by angry citizens after ballots ran out, and a polling site where voters were helped to mark their ballot in a non-secret vote (which overwhelmingly favored the opposition PRD). But the delegation did not detect any pattern of irregularities that would have affected the outcome of the presidential race. Overall, the delegation concluded that the procedural
aspects of the elections and the count were an improvement over the past and were a step forward in organizing credible, open, and honest elections.

Nevertheless, in its departure statement, the delegation expressed concern over the pre-election campaign conditions, especially the bias in media coverage favoring the PRI, the disparities in campaign resources and high campaign spending limits that only the PRI could meet, and the reported misuse of state resources for partisan purposes. (The Third Carter Center Report on the Mexican Elections assesses these problems in greater detail.) The delegation made several recommendations to improve the electoral process in the future and to enhance political dialogue and reconciliation in the post-election period. (See preliminary delegation statement.)

**Election Outcomes**

The outcome of the elections followed pre-election public opinion surveys, but surprised many analysts by the predominance of the PRI in both the presidential and congressional races. In the presidential race, the PRI candidate Ernesto Zedillo won with 48.77% of the votes cast; the PAN candidate Diego Fernandez de Cevallos won 25.94%; and the PRD candidate Cuauhtemoc Cardenas won 16.60%. The very numbers have been used to support different interpretations of the outcome: those who wish to emphasize a mandate for change use the percentage of total votes cast (a minority of 48.77% for Zedillo), while those who wish to emphasize that the PRI still commands a majority of public support use the percentage of valid votes cast, which exclude blank, mismarked, and write-in votes (50.18% for Zedillo).

The popular vote for the Senate and the Chamber mirrored the presidential vote, indicating that contrary to some expectations, voters did not split their vote in the presidential and legislative elections. (This tendency not to split the vote may have hurt the PAN in those states where it governed—Baja California, Chihuahua, and Guanajuato. In each case, the PRI swept both the presidential and congressional votes.)

A 1993 reform to the Senate election rules gave the winning party in each state 3 seats and the second-place winner one seat. Consequently, the PRI now has 95 of the 128 seats, the PAN 25, and the PRD 8 seats. In the Chamber of Deputies, initial results in the week after the election indicated that the PRI won 277 of 300 single-member districts, the PAN won 18, and the PRD won 5. In September, two congressional seats initially won by the PRI were overturned by the Electoral Tribunal: one seat in Jalisco went to the PAN and one seat in Michoacan went to the PRD.

In addition, there are 200 seats distributed by proportional representation. By law, no party can hold more than 300 total seats (60%) in the Chamber (or 315 if it wins more than 60% of the popular vote); therefore, the PRI is limited to 25 of the proportional representation seats. Results announced October 22 by the Federal Electoral Institute show that the PRI will have 300 total seats in the Cham-
ber of Deputies, the PAN 119, the PRD 71, and the Partido de los Trabajadores 10 seats. As a result, PRI holds substantial majorities in both houses of the new Congress.

Although still in the minority, opposition parties now have more congressional representation than they have at any time in the past with the exception of the 1988-91 Chamber of Deputies when the PRI had only 52% of the representatives. As a result of the 1993 reforms prohibiting any single party from holding the two thirds vote needed to amend the constitution, the PRI will not be able to approve any constitutional reforms without support from at least one other party.

Evaluation of the Vote

Skepticism about the PRI’s willingness to permit a clean election was widespread before the elections. Several polls conducted in June 1994 showed that 35-45% of the electorate expected fraud, while between 25 and 50% thought there would be clean elections (MORI, La Reforma, Civic Alliance). Even more alarming, 65% expected violence in the event of electoral fraud (Civic Alliance). Yet, the day after the elections, when early results showed a commanding 20% lead for the PRI, the streets were quiet, with neither jubilant victory celebrations nor massive protest.

New safeguards and 89,000 observers contributed to the peace. Perhaps most important, parallel vote tabulations, or “quick counts” done by several independent groups confirmed the official results, which otherwise might have been disbelieved. The Civic Alliance, a Mexican civic group fielding 11,000 observers and known to include many critics of the PRI, was the last to release its quick count, but the most important in lending credibility to the official results.

With the lack of confidence in the commitment of the government and ruling party to transparent elections, and the thousands of accredited observers representing many different organizations and perspectives, it is perhaps not surprising that a multitude of views surfaced regarding the conduct of the elections. In addition, many observer groups concentrated their efforts in limited geographic areas, giving rise to different pictures depending on the locale. The lack of consensus is further underscored by the multiple post-election reports presented by the members of the General Council of IFE, demonstrating dissenting assessments of the electoral process.

Conclusions ranged from the Zapatistas’ National Democratic Convention accusation of 8 million fraudulent votes for the PRI, nearly one-quarter of votes cast (La Jornada, September 4, 1994), to the U.S. ambassador’s comment that the elections represented “a major advance for democracy in Mexico” (New York Times, August 25, 1994). The opposition parties held sharply differing evaluations of the electoral process and its outcome. The PRD National Council concluded that “the official results cannot be trusted, nor are they the result of free and impartial elections. Therefore, these results are illegal, and we do not know who won or who lost” (La Jornada, September 13, 1994). On the other hand, the PAN National Council accepted the results, arguing that despite the prevalence of inequi-
ties, the official results “are the expression of the electorate” (El Financiero, September 6, 1994).

Our own delegation received no evidence that irregularities were sufficiently serious or widespread to have affected the outcome of the presidential race. Nevertheless, the delegation concluded that further reforms were needed to raise credibility and address the inordinately unequal campaign conditions in the future.

The opposition parties held sharply differing evaluations of the electoral process and its outcome. The PRD . . . concluded that . . . “these results are illegal, and we do not know who won or who lost.” . . . the PAN . . . accepted the results, arguing that despite the prevalence of inequities, the official results “are the expression of the electorate.”

The Mexican population’s cynicism and lack of trust in the process that we noted before the election was not entirely abated by the election outcome, but there was more faith in the election authorities. A poll done by La Reforma and El Norte newspapers in the week after the election showed that 61% thought the elections were clean, while 24% did not and 15% did not know. Likewise, 64% thought the Federal Electoral Institute (IFE) performed very well (The News, September 3, 1994).

Nevertheless, a number of irregularities were observed which may have had an effect on congressional or local races, and which continue to raise questions about the legitimacy of the outcome. The Civic Alliance conducted an exemplary, systematic analysis of the election-day process. In its September 19 report, the Alliance argued that the irregularities in this election comprised a “fraud of components.” None of them alone was sufficient to affect the outcome, but their totality may have altered congressional and local elections. The two most serious irregularities found in their statistical sample of 1,810 voting stations were pressure by party representatives to influence voters and violation of the secrecy of the vote. The Alliance noted that these problems were much more widespread in the rural and southern areas of the country.

One of the most controversial aspects of the election was the voter registration list. The Third Report on the Mexican Elections published by The Carter Center prior to the elections concluded that the voter registration list could adequately serve as the basis for a clean election and that the possibility of one source of fraud—padding the list with non-existent persons—was small. Nevertheless, the external audit of the list conducted before the election did not address a second potential source of fraud—the possible disfranchisement or exclusion of voters who believe themselves to be registered and qualified.

Our own delegation received no evidence that irregularities were sufficiently serious or widespread to have affected the outcome of the presidential race. Nevertheless, the delegation concluded that further reforms were needed to raise credibility and address the inordinately unequal campaign conditions in the future.

It was this concern with potential disfranchisement that was reflected in the most visible and volatile problem on election day: a shortage of ballots at the special casillas or voting stations set up for persons who were travelling for work or pleasure. Apparently, many persons who held valid voter cards but who did not appear on the list were also told to go to the special casillas in order to vote, thus adding to the unexpectedly high numbers of voters at the
special casillas. The Alliance’s initial finding that in 70% of the voting stations, some voters with valid identification cards were turned away because their names did not appear on the lists, raised suspicions that opposition sympathizers were deliberately “shaved” from the lists. The subsequent Alliance report on September 19, however, found that the number of voters potentially affected by this problem was not large: an average of four voters per station was noted, comprising less than 1% of the registered voters.

The political parties submitted over 1,800 electoral complaints to the Electoral Tribunal, and presented over 500 allegations of electoral fraud to the Special Prosecutor for Electoral Crimes. The PAN cited irregularities in almost 15% of the polling stations and questioned the outcome of 5 congressional races and some local races. The PRD filed the majority of the complaints and disputed the election of the governor of Chiapas (one of a few state-wide contests coinciding with the national elections), among others.

In September, state election authorities ruled inadmissible a number of polling station results, overturning the mayoral race of Monterrey. Consequently, the PAN won a narrow victory over the PRI. In addition, the Electoral Tribunal overturned two congressional seats, as noted above, and called for new elections for one Deputy in two other states—Puebla and Veracruz—by January 1995. As a result of the complaints, the Electoral Tribunal also annulled an additional 334,000 votes (less than one percent of the total valid votes) in the presidential election. (The forthcoming NDI/IRI delegation report will include an analysis of the complaint process and outcomes.)

Conclusions

Mexico has made progress toward more open, competitive elections, but the magnitude of complaints suggests there is still a long way to go. The most promising electoral reforms were the new voter registration list and tamper-proof voter ID card, new election-day procedures to minimize fraud, the increased independence of the Federal Electoral Institute’s General Council (Consejo General of IFE), provisions for Mexican and foreign observers, and a new criminal code with a special prosecutor to investigate complaints. In addition, the newly-required campaign finance reports will potentially allow an assessment of party revenues and expenditures, but the test is still to come to ensure that the reports accurately reflect campaign finances. Media access improved under pressure from the civic groups and the election authorities, but bias in coverage remained a critical issue throughout the campaign.

Civil society is better-organized and more autonomous as a result of this electoral process; the best indicator is the active and effective role played by civic groups in election-monitoring. The political party system is evolving toward a multi-party system, but with parties of unequal strength. Only the PRI has demonstrated a national reach, while the major opposition parties are developing regional strongholds.

Despite these gains, much remains to be done to achieve equitable campaign conditions and to generate widespread trust in the process. Most significant, if the test of a fair election in a transi-
tional democracy is whether all parties accept the process as fair and the results as legitimate. Mexico has not yet passed that test. The PRD did not trust the process, and did not accept the outcome.

As the delegation concluded, the opposition parties have a responsibility to present their complaints and pursue further reform through peaceful and constitutional means. However, the PRI, as the dominant force in the Congress and the executive branch, has a special responsibility to reach out to the opposition and to further the reforms. The challenge for the PRI is to avoid the temptation to become complacent or "triumphalist" in the wake of its victory, a strategy that would endanger the efforts to achieve credible and trusted elections.

What Remains to Be Done?
At the request of the Citizen Councilors, we conclude our report with suggestions for the Mexican electoral process. We fully acknowledge that many democracies, including the United States, have made little progress in some of the vexing issues that determine how fair and equitable a competition may be, most notably regulating and limiting campaign financing, assuring regular televised debates, and permitting affordable media advertising. But in Mexico, the lack of confidence in the process and the blurring of the roles of the governing political party and the state, make it even more imperative to work to erase perceptions of partisanship. We offer the following recommendations in the hopes of contributing to a dialogue in Mexico on how to further improve its own process.

The first and most urgent task is to bring closure to the debates over the electoral process. Even though the 1994 national election is over, in one vital sense the process is still open. The controversy over the voter registration list and the large number of complaints brought before the Electoral Tribunal suggest that a consensus has yet to be reached about the adequacy of the process. Likewise, the multiple reports presented by the General Council after the election are positive in that they demonstrate the independence of its members, but they also underscore the dissension and lack of closure on the process. Acceptance of the next elections will in large part be determined by the fairness with which the current complaints are addressed and resolved.

Second, the reforms already in place need to be carried through and assessed to determine their effectiveness and which areas may need further development. Third, additional reforms
may be desirable to make campaign conditions more competitive in Mexico. While election-day procedures have significantly improved, the unequal access to media and resources continue to limit the ability of political parties to compete on an equitable footing with the ruling party.

Finally, a concerted effort needs to be made to ensure that all of the major parties trust the process and accept the results of future elections. In other cases we have observed, the chasm of mistrust between government and opposition has been overcome through impartial and professional behavior of electoral authorities, agreements on changes in the rules negotiated among all of the major parties, and mediation by trusted outsiders. The reform efforts of the last four years in Mexico have begun to address the issue of confidence. We list below a number of specific suggestions that could help augment the level of confidence and make more effective future elections.

Recommendations

Bringing closure:

1. We urge President Zedillo to propose a commission that would, within six months, review the formal complaints about the electoral process and the registration list, report on their resolution, and make recommendations to remedy any problems identified. We suggest that civic monitoring groups participate in such a review, and perhaps trusted international observers as well.

Increasing transparency and trust:

2. Based on the positive impact of the first presidential candidate debate, it appears that televised debates among the candidates is one of the best means to boost public confidence in the electoral process, as well as increase voter capacity to make informed choices on election day. We urge more publicized debates among all candidates in future elections.

3. The IFE should improve and speed up the transmission and announcement of vote preliminary results on election night to alleviate suspicion and maintain calm.

Voter-registration lists:

4. The special casillas posed the most visible problem on election day. The best way to ensure that registered voters with a valid ID card have their names on the voters’ list is for them, with the help and encouragement of IFE and the political parties, to verify the preliminary nominal list during the claims and objections period, as well as the posted final list before election day. For those people who are registered but cannot vote on election day because of sickness, work, or travel, we suggest that the IFE General Counsel explore an absentee ballot system.

5. The IFE should conduct people-to-list audits of the nominal lists to ensure that voters are not inappropriately disenfranchised (i.e. omitted from the lists even though they have registered and hold a valid ID card).
6. The problems of bias in news coverage of parties and candidates, and expensive and unequal access to paid television time, arise from the oligopolistic structure of Mexican electronic media, particularly in television. We have gleaned three potential remedies from our conversations with Mexicans. We urge the IFE, government, political parties, civic monitoring groups, and media to undertake a thorough discussion of each option:

   a) The government could increase the pluralism and competitiveness of the electronic media by depoliticizing the granting of licenses and renewals to television and radio stations, increasing the number of licenses, and breaking up the conglomerates of Televisa and TV Azteca.

   b) The IFE could increase publicly-financed media time on an equal basis for all of the political parties, perhaps to the extent of prohibiting privately purchased campaign "spots."

   c) The Council for Broadcast News Media (CNIRT) could establish guidelines for balanced and objective news coverage of political campaigns and candidates, for televising debates, and for publishing quick counts after the close of the vote.

Campaign finance:

7. We urge the IFE General Council to assess the caps on campaign spending for each of the races in order to set reasonable limits within the reach of all of the major parties.

8. The IFE special commission to review political party finance reports should work diligently to analyze and verify these reports due by February 1995, making public the reports and their conclusions. In the future, the IFE should require financial reports during the campaign, rather than after, and enhance its own capacity to investigate campaign finance on a regular basis.

9. The IFE General Council should consider the merits of increasing public financing to any candidate or party that agrees to forgo private revenues.

Election authorities:

10. The growing autonomy of the IFE's General Council and the professionalization of the personnel, especially within the Federal Electoral Registry (RFE), are important reforms. The authority of the General Council needs to be more clearly defined, however, and the performance of district and state-level Citizen Councilors should be reviewed by the parties and the IFE, with partisan councilors replaced before the next election.

11. The double lottery to choose election-day casilla officials reduced the potential for partisan or government influence of these officials, but more training would be desirable to minimize the confusion of first-time officials on election day. In addition, arm bands to identify election officials and party representatives would help voters in identifying the officials and reduce the potential for undue influence or interference by party representatives in the polls.
Election observers:

12. We urge the IFE to simplify procedures for registering Mexican and foreign observers or visitors.

Complaint mechanisms:

13. The government should augment the resources of the special prosecutor for electoral crimes to enable that office to investigate complaints in a timely manner.
Appendices
APPENDIX I. SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITICAL PARTIES</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF VOTES CAST (Including null votes)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF VALID VOTES (Not including null votes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRI</td>
<td>17,336,325</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>50.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>9,222,899</td>
<td>25.94</td>
<td>26.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td>5,901,557</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>17.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>975,356</td>
<td>02.74</td>
<td>02.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVEEM</td>
<td>330,381</td>
<td>00.93</td>
<td>00.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFCRN</td>
<td>301,524</td>
<td>00.85</td>
<td>00.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARM</td>
<td>195,086</td>
<td>00.55</td>
<td>00.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>168,603</td>
<td>00.47</td>
<td>00.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>99,216</td>
<td>00.28</td>
<td>00.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>18,554</td>
<td>00.05</td>
<td>00.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER ELECTORAL INFORMATION

Total valid votes\(^1\) 34,215,501 97.18%
Null votes 1,007,820 02.82%
Number of votes cast 35,550,283

Number of votes cast 35,550,283 77.74%
Registered voters not voting 10,178,770 22.26%
Number of registered voters 45,729,053

SOURCE: Instituto Federal Electoral, August 29, 1994

---

\(^1\)The results became official when they were validated by the newly-elected Chamber of Deputies on November 9, 1994. Voting to confirm the victory of Ernesto Zedillo were 300 PRI and 4PT. Abstaining were 119 PAN. Voting against were 71 PRD and 6 PT.

\(^2\)Includes 334,000 votes subsequently annulled by the Electoral Tribunal as a result of the 585 complaints filed by the political parties. Final percentages, not available at the time of the printing of this report, may change slightly as a result.
OFFICIAL LEGISLATIVE RESULTS

SENATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRI</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SEATS</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of the 1993 electoral reforms, the Senate was doubled to 128 seats, representing 31 states and the federal district; 96 of these seats were elected on August 21, 1994 and 32 carried over from the last election period. (PRI 31, PAN 1)

In this election, the party winning the “relative majority” in each senatorial district gained two seats, while one seat was awarded to the “primary minority” party in each state. Beginning in the year 2000, four senators will be elected from each state, three of which will go to the first place party (relative majority) and one of which will go to the second place party (primary minority) in each state.

CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRI</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 500 seats in the Chamber of Deputies. 300 are elected directly. The other 200 are determined by the percentage of the vote received in the election in five divisions of the country.

No party can have more than 300 representatives in the Chamber of Deputies, unless it wins 60% of the popular vote, which raises the maximum to 315 so that no one party has a two-thirds majority.

Two seats initially won by PRI were overturned by the Federal Electoral Tribunal in September 1994.

Source: Instituto Federal Electoral, August 29, 1994; October 24, 1994
### CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES
(Number of Directly Elected Deputies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ELECTORAL DISTRICTS</th>
<th>DEPUTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PRI 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PRI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>PRI 8, PRD 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PRI 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrito Federal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>PRI 37, PAN 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PRI 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PRI 12, PAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PRI 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PRI 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>PRI 11, PAN 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>PRI 33, PAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PRI 11, PAN 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRI 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PRI 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo Leon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>PRI 9, PAN 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PRI 9, PAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>PRI 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queretaro</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PRI 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PRI 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>PRI 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PRI 6, PAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PRI 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>PRI 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>PRI 22, PAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRI 3, PAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PRI 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 One seat in each of these states will be re-elected in late 1994 or in January of 1995.

Source: Instituto Federal Electoral, August 29, 1994
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Relative Majority</th>
<th>Primary Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>PRI 48.6%</td>
<td>PAN 34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>PRI 48.3%</td>
<td>PAN 36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>PRI 57.2%</td>
<td>PAN 31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>PRI 55.0%</td>
<td>PRD 22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>PRI 48.8%</td>
<td>PAN 28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>PRI 52.4%</td>
<td>PAN 25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>PRI 45.9%</td>
<td>PRD 31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>PRI 57.6%</td>
<td>PAN 29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrito Federal</td>
<td>PRI 42.0%</td>
<td>PAN 26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>PRI 47.1%</td>
<td>PAN 23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>PRI 53.4%</td>
<td>PAN 29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>PRI 48.4%</td>
<td>PRD 33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>PRI 58.9%</td>
<td>PAN 16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>PRI 44.1%</td>
<td>PAN 41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>PRI 44.8%</td>
<td>PAN 26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacan</td>
<td>PRI 43.8%</td>
<td>PRD 34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>PRI 49.6%</td>
<td>PAN 19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>PRI 57.5%</td>
<td>PRD 15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo Leon</td>
<td>PRI 48.0%</td>
<td>PAN 39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>PRI 50.3%</td>
<td>PRD 26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>PRI 50.3%</td>
<td>PAN 25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queretaro</td>
<td>PRI 60.8%</td>
<td>PAN 27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>PRI 54.0%</td>
<td>PAN 26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosi</td>
<td>PRI 58.3%</td>
<td>PAN 24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>PRI 51.4%</td>
<td>PAN 31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>PRI 47.8%</td>
<td>PAN 32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>PRI 56.3%</td>
<td>PRD 31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>PRI 48.0%</td>
<td>PAN 20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>PRI 52.3%</td>
<td>PAN 22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>PRI 51.7%</td>
<td>PRD 22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatan</td>
<td>PRI 52.7%</td>
<td>PAN 40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>PRI 59.6%</td>
<td>PAN 21.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Instituto Federal Electoral, August 29, 1994
THE COUNCIL OF FREELY ELECTED HEADS OF GOVERNMENT

The Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government is an informal group of 25 current and former heads of government from throughout the Americas. The Council was established in November 1986 at a meeting chaired by former U.S. Presidents Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford on "Reinforcing Democracy in the Americas" at the Carter Center. The Council’s goals are to reinforce democracy in the Americas, promote multilateral efforts to resolve conflict in the hemisphere, and to advance regional economic cooperation.

The Council has been a pioneer in mediating and observing elections. The Council or its representatives have observed elections in Panama (1989, 1994), Nicaragua (1989-1990), the Dominican Republic (1990), Haiti (1987,1990), Guyana (1990-1992), Suriname (1991), the United States (1992), Paraguay (1993), and Mexico (1992, 1994). The elections in Nicaragua and Haiti were the first free elections accepted by all parties in the two nations’ histories, and in Guyana, the first such elections in 28 years. The Council has worked since the elections to help consolidate democracy in Guyana, Nicaragua, and Panama. After the agreement negotiated by Jimmy Carter, Senator Sam Nunn, and General Colin Powell in September 1994 in Haiti, and the return the next month of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide, the Council sent a mission led by former Prime Minister Michael Manley and Dr. Robert Pastor to assess whether the Council could be helpful there. President Aristide and other political leaders invited the Council to be “partners” in building democracy there.

The Council is based at the Latin American and Caribbean Program of the Carter Center at Emory University. Dr. Robert Pastor, Fellow at the Center, is Executive Secretary of the Council; Dr. David Carroll is Associate Director; Dr. Jennifer McCoy, Senior Research Associate; and Ms. Harriette Martin, Administrative Assistant.

Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government
Jimmy Carter, former U.S. President, Chairman of the Council
George Price, former Prime Minister of Belize, Vice-Chairman

Jean-Bertrand Aristide, President of Haiti (1991-present)
Rafael Caldera, President of Venezuela (1969-1974, 1994-present)
John Compton, Prime Minister of St. Lucia (1987-present)
Luis Alberto Lacalle, President of Uruguay (1989-present)
P.J. Patterson, Prime Minister of Jamaica (1992-present)

Nicholas Ardito-Barletta, former Panamanian President (1984-1985)
Oscar Arias Sánchez, former Costa Rican President (1986-1990)
Patricio Aylwin Azocar, former President of Chile (1990-1994)
Belisario Betancur, former Colombian President (1982-1986)
Rodrigo Carazo, former Costa Rican President (1978-1982)
Vinicio Cerezo, former Guatemalan President (1986-1990)
Joseph Clark, former Canadian Prime Minister (1979-1980)
Gerald Ford, former U.S. President (1974-1977)
Osvaldo Hurtado, former Ecuadoran President (1981-1984)
Alfonso López Michelsen, former Colombian President (1974-1978)
Erskine Sandiford, former Prime Minister of Barbados (1987-1994)
Julio María Sanguinetti, former Uruguayan President (1985-1989)
Edward Seaga, former Jamaican Prime Minister (1980-1988)
Pierre Trudeau, former Canadian Prime Minister (1968-1979)
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Panama and Guyana.


Joseph Clark, former Prime Minister of Canada (1979-80).

Jim Wright, former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and
personal representative of President Jimmy Carter, Chairman of
the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government.
Participated in Council delegations to Haiti and Panama.

Others

Harry Barnes, Director of Conflict Resolution and Human Rights
Programs at the Carter Center of Emory University. Former
ambassador to Chile, India, and Romania.

David Carroll, Associate Director of the Latin American and
Caribbean Program at the Carter Center of Emory University.
Participated in Council delegations to Guyana, Paraguay, and
Panama.
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Nancy Dickerson Whitehead, author and lecturer. Former correspondent for CBS and NBC. President, Television Corporation of America.

Staff

Eric Bord, Attorney and consultant to The Carter Center. Participated in Council delegations to Nicaragua and Guyana.

Deanna Congileo, Associate Director of Public Information at The Carter Center of Emory University.

Alma Idiart, Hewlett Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Program at The Carter Center of Emory University. Graduate student of Sociology at Emory University.

Harriette Martin, Program Administrative Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Program at The Carter Center of Emory University. Participated in Council delegation to Panama.

Susan Palmer, Assistant Director of Programs, Conflict Resolution Program at The Carter Center of Emory University. Participated in Council delegation to Panama.
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PRELIMINARY STATEMENT
BY THE IRI/NDI INTERNATIONAL DELEGATION
TO THE AUGUST 21 MEXICAN ELECTIONS
August 23, 1994

The international delegation sponsored by the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) and the International Republican Institute (IRI) is pleased to offer this preliminary statement on the August 21 elections in Mexico.

Our delegation, comprised of 80 members from 17 countries, witnessed the elections in 25 Mexican states and the Federal District. The delegation includes former heads of state and government, former diplomats, elected officials, political party and civic leaders, legal scholars, regional specialists and elections experts. A delegation of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government/Carter Center of Emory University participated in the delegation.

This international delegation was invited and welcomed by the three major political parties, electoral authorities and civic organizations. We were provided access to all stages of the election process and enjoyed the same rights afforded to election observers in other countries. Our delegation came to witness the elections. We did not seek to supervise the elections or certify them. Ultimately, it is the Mexican people who will determine the legitimacy of the elections.

The primary purposes of the delegation are to demonstrate the international community’s continued support for the democratic process in Mexico and to provide the international community with an objective assessment of the August 21 elections. We also are seeking to learn from the Mexican people about the nature of the electoral process and its implications for the further development of Mexico’s democratic institutions.

The delegation’s mandate included the examination of three aspects of the election process -- the campaign, election day proceedings, and the tabulation of results to date. This statement is a preliminary assessment of these issues. In addition to its direct observations, the delegation also relied on information gathered during the entire pre-election period by IRI, NDI and the Carter Center.
We note that the tabulation of results and the resolution of any electoral complaints have yet to be completed. NDI and IRI will continue to monitor post-election developments and will issue a more detailed report at a later date.

The delegation arrived in Mexico on August 17. Prior to the election, the delegates met at the national level with representatives of the Federal Electoral Institute (IFE), including Citizen Councilors, the three largest political parties, the United Nations, news media, and national election monitoring organizations. The delegation then divided into 34 teams and deployed throughout the country. The delegation's teams held local meetings similar to those at the national level and observed the voting, counting and tabulation processes.

THE ELECTORAL PROCESS

This election represents a significant step forward for the Mexican democratic process.

The delegation was particularly impressed by the high voter turnout demonstrating the intense interest of the Mexican people in expressing their will through the electoral process.

The delegation was also impressed with the high degree of citizen participation in the elections. Political parties actively campaigned and deployed thousands of party representatives at the polling sites (casillas) to observe the voting and counting process. Representatives of nonpartisan civic groups also stationed thousands of pollwatchers to help ensure the integrity of the process. These activities gave tangible expression to the Mexican people's commitment to democracy.

We were inspired by those citizens who worked diligently and for long hours as polling officials --- men, women and young persons. We also applaud the many party representatives who worked cooperatively at the polling places.

While the delegation focused its efforts on the presidential race, it recognizes the significance of the federal legislative elections as well as the elections for state and local offices. Returns indicate that the new National Congress (Congreso de la Union) will include stronger representation of all three political parties. This creates the potential for a new and more balanced relationship between the executive and legislative branches of government.

The delegation notes a number of positive developments resulting from recent electoral reforms. Overall the procedural aspects were improved dramatically over previous elections. Among the critical reforms noted by the delegation were:
• instituting a new computerized Register of Voters (Padron) and new voter photo-identification cards to create a modern system for verifying voter eligibility. The delegation was impressed by this new system. The political parties were provided access to the Register of Voters prior to the election in order to review its accuracy, and the Register was independently audited;

• modifying the membership of IFE’s General Council as well as IFE’s 32 Local and 300 District Councils so that Citizen Councilors hold the majority of votes, thus increasing IFE’s independence and public confidence in its decisions;

• employing a double lottery to select polling site (casilla) officials to help ensure their impartiality;

• permitting national election observers and inviting international visitors in order to increase the transparency of the elections and public confidence in the process;

• recognizing the legal basis for political parties, news media and civic groups to carry out independent parallel vote tabulations (PVTs or rapid counts), which added credibility to IFE’s preliminary results;

• modifying the criminal code to define specific electoral crimes and corresponding sanctions as well as naming a Special Electoral Prosecutor;

• instituting a number of election-day procedural safeguards, such as curtained voting booths, transparent ballot boxes, sequentially numbered ballot packets, improved indelible ink, posting of polling site results and providing tally sheets to party representatives.

The delegation notes that IFE invited the United Nations to support the electoral process. The UN played an important role in assisting the efforts of national observers.

During the pre-election period, the political parties were able to communicate with the electorate through the news media, rallies and other avenues. The first-ever debate among the leading presidential candidates was nationally televised.

Notwithstanding these positive developments, some problems in the electoral process caused concern for the delegation. The following are among these concerns.

1) While the pre-election campaign and the voting process were more open and peaceful than many previous elections, the delegation deplores acts of political violence. The most dramatic incident was the tragic assassination of presidential
candidate Luis Donaldo Colosio. In addition, more than two hundred political party activists have been allegedly murdered since the last federal elections. Most of these murderers have yet to be apprehended. The delegation expresses its sorrow over the loss of life resulting from such incidents and hopes that efforts will be made to end political violence.

2) Credible sources reported that there was widespread use of state resources to advance the electoral cause of the governing parties at the national and state levels. Some of these incidents are presently being reviewed by the Special Electoral Prosecutor.

3) The delegation noted with concern the large disparity of resources between the governing party and other political parties. While the introduction of campaign finance limitations represented a potentially important electoral reform, the ceiling was set so high that it permitted the governing party to take advantage of significantly more resources than those of the other parties.

4) The delegation was greatly troubled by numerous reports of bias in favor of the governing party that was evident in the broadcast news media, particularly in television coverage of the election campaign. This was documented in credible studies by the Mexican Academy for Human Rights, a member organization of Civic Alliance, and by IFE's own commission to monitor radio and television news programs. While some steps were taken to remedy this problem, they did not effectively eliminate broadcast news bias.

5) As mentioned earlier, the delegation commends the recognition of national election observers and international visitors for the first time. The accreditation process for national observers, however, could have been less cumbersome.

6) A significant number of prospective voters was disenfranchised at the special casillas set up for individuals traveling on election day. The political parties agreed that IFE would limit the number of ballots delivered to each special casilla to 300 for each federal office. By the early afternoon, many special casillas ran out of ballots, and large numbers of prospective voters waiting in line were turned away from the polls. These individuals comprised two categories: those who were away from home and those who possessed valid voter identification cards but whose names were not on the voter's lists at their casillas.

7) On election day, delegation members noted a number of minor irregularities and isolated instances of intimidation of voters. In addition, delegation members received a number of
allegations of partisan behavior by some local election officials.

8) The delegation commends the creation of the Special Prosecutor's Office for Electoral Crimes and the appointment of a highly respected individual to head that office (the Special Electoral Prosecutor). The office appears to be independent and currently possesses resources to pursue its mandate. At the same time, the delegation notes with concern that the Special Electoral Prosecutor was not appointed until July 19. This did not provide adequate time to organize the office and effectively process cases prior to the elections. Only one of the more than 240 complaints lodged with the Special Electoral Prosecutor reached the courts by election day. The late appointment of the Special Electoral Prosecutor precluded the possibility of sending a strong message prior to the elections that electoral abuses would not be tolerated.

While the delegation takes the above-mentioned problems seriously, it has received no evidence to suggest that they would have affected the outcome of the presidential contest.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Prior to August 21, many citizens questioned the integrity of Mexico's electoral process, despite all of the legal and procedural reforms effected since the last national elections. From our experience in other countries, when doubts are raised concerning the fairness of an electoral system, additional safeguards should be introduced even if the law meets an otherwise acceptable standard. In Mexico, the longevity of the ruling party imposes a special responsibility on it to help ensure that the electoral process is not only administratively correct but free from the perception of partisanship. All parties share an obligation to respond to the elections in a responsible manner.

The high voter turnout was an encouraging sign that progress is being made in addressing this issue. The delegation believes that this election should help to reduce skepticism. We commend the recent electoral reforms, and hope that electoral reforms will be continued and intensified in the immediate post-election period. In this spirit, the delegation respectfully offers the following recommendations.

1) All political parties should build upon their efforts in creating the Agreement for Peace, Justice and Democracy. This could be done by establishing mechanisms for ongoing dialogue on crucial issues affecting public confidence in the political system. This would reinforce a political culture of tolerance and pluralism.
2) The government and the political parties should take steps to follow up on elements of the Agreement for Peace, Justice and Democracy. These would include:

- undertaking a review of political party financing, in order to establish more equitable electoral competition;
- taking effective measures to prevent the misuse of state funds and resources in support of any political party or candidate;
- establishing clear and enforceable guidelines on equal access to the news media for all political contestants.

3) The continued development of independent civic organizations should be encouraged to become a strong and permanent feature of the Mexican democratic process.

4) The government and the council for broadcast news media should establish guidelines for balanced and objective news coverage of electoral contestants and issues of public importance that bear on voters' choices. These guidelines should include clear provisions allowing the broadcast of independent parallel vote tabulations (also known as rapid or quick counts). Debates between political contestants for various offices also should be broadcast. Additional voter education announcements, in all local languages, should be broadcast in order to further raise public confidence in the electoral process.

5) All electoral complaints lodged with IFE and the Federal Electoral Tribunal, as well as all cases brought to the Special Electoral Prosecutor should be promptly processed in order to provide effective remedies for abuses of electoral rights. The Special Prosecutor's Office for Electoral Crimes should be provided with the necessary resources to effectively pursue its mandate in a timely manner, and consideration should be given to establishing it as a permanent body.

6) Problems that took place at the special casillas on election day should be examined in order to improve the system or adopt alternative measures. Confidence would be enhanced by a public report on the results of that examination.

7) Any registry of voters is likely to contain some errors. One type of error is to omit the names of individuals who properly completed all steps of the registration process and who even received their voter identification cards. In order to prevent the disenfranchisement of such individuals, IFE should consider implementing a system for casting challenged or tendered ballots on election day.
8) Efforts should be made to further ensure IFE's autonomy. IFE should also continue to review complaints concerning partisan behavior of local and district electoral officials and take appropriate action against those found to have acted improperly.

The delegation would like to stress that it recognizes and commends the improvements made as a result of recent reforms to the Mexican electoral system. The recommendations set forth here are made with modesty and in a spirit of cooperation. The delegation urges that all electoral disputes be resolved peacefully and through legal means.

The delegation would like to express its appreciation to the government, IFE, the political parties, civic organizations and the Mexican people for their warm hospitality. It would not have been possible to accomplish our tasks without the generous cooperation of those with whom we met. Members of the delegation will remain in Mexico to follow post-election developments, and the delegation will release a more detailed report at a later date.
Carter Center to Send Election Observers

An international panel headed by former President Jimmy Carter will send 10 observers to Mexico to monitor the presidential elections, the Carter Center said Aug. 8.

The delegation, representing the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, will be led by former Canadian Prime Minister Joe Clark and will be in Mexico from Aug 17-24. Reuters news agency reported.

The Council delegation will join a 60-member delegation organized by the National Democratic Institute and the International Republican Institute.

The Atlanta-based Carter Center, a vehicle for the former president's diplomatic initiatives, also released a study recommending more debates in Mexico as well as voter checks of final voter registration lists.
Safeguards in place for Mexican vote

A president will be chosen Sunday. Some experts doubt election fraud will end.

By Andrew Maykuth
Inquirer Staff Writer

MEXICO CITY — Mexican elections have been crooked for so long — or so the opposition party's political claims go — that they've become a national joke. But the Mexican government is determined to hold a fair vote and a prompt count in Sunday's pivotal presidential election.

Arturo Vargas, head of the Federal Electoral Institute, said yesterday that the government will issue "quick counts" on election night that project a fair sampling of the national vote — although independent exit polls are still banned.

The preliminary vote-count system, like many of the reforms instituted by Mexico in recent years, appears on the surface to be foolproof. But some experts have their doubts.

The only way the PRI can win is if they falsify the election," said John Bailey, a Georgetown University expert on Mexican politics. "But the experts are looking at this and say to you: 'Well, it can fail.'"

A fair number of Mexicans share his distrust of the governing party, which is known as the PRI.

"The only way the PRI can win is if they falsify the election," said Efrain Quinones, a Mexico City ice cream vendor who supports a leftist opposition party.

"The PRI is a good example of what's wrong with the system," said a PRI candidate who leads in most polls over Diego Fernandez of the conservative National Action Party and Cuauhtemoc Cardenas of the leftist Democratic Revolution Party.

The government spent $750 million in the last two years to modernize the vote-counting system.

A United Nations group, which is advising Mexican groups that will observe the elections, this week said the greater influence of civilians in the electoral institute and the introduction of photo IDs to eligible voters were significant advances.

The changes included updating and purging voter rolls — some precincts routinely report Turnout rates than in other areas — and installing transparent ballot boxes so that the boxes at least aren't stuffed before the polls open.

The government hired Polaris de Mexico for $55 million to produce photo credentials for the 44 million registered voters, reducing the likelihood of the mass counterfeiting that occurred in the past.

And for the first time, the nongovernmental Mexican government is allowing international "observers" to observe the polling, though they are not permitted to interfere. The observers are dominated by American groups, including the Carter Center of Emory University and officials of the Republican and Democratic parties.

The government's upsweeps in the polls — Cardenas actually fell behind in the campaign in May after a poor performance in the first-ever televised presidential debates — has also restored some confidence to investors, who have bid up prices for Mexican stocks and bonds in recent weeks.

Jorge Martinez, an analyst for Goldman Sachs & Co., said that the recent downturn in Mexican markets was caused because Mexican interest rates became more attractive, "not because the level of confidence had been relieved."

"Most of our clients are optimistic, but just in case, they're holding back with their plans," he said.

Leading in the presidential race is the Institutional Revolutionary Party's Ernesto Zedillo. He campaigned Sunday in Mexico City.

"We think that the fact the victory will be by a narrow margin opens the gates for the opposition to complain," said Mauricio Lara, a vice president of CEMEX-WFA, the Baja California, P.O., econometric firm that studies Mexican issues.

Some experts contend that Mexico's distrust of the electoral system discounts the believability of the polls, which show Zedillo with a lead of 20 points over his conservative opponent.

"Polls don't work in Mexico because people lie to the people taking the survey," said Rodolfo Campa, a Mexican political expert at Tulane University. He said that supporters of the leftist candidate are more likely to conceal their sentiments from pollsters, whom they believe work for the government.

Nancy Beiden, a Washington political consultant who conducted an independent survey of voters last week, said a majority of voters acknowledged "they do not feel free to say what they think about politics."

Still, Beiden said, the poll results showed Zedillo with such "a surprisingly big lead" that it was unlikely to erode much even if some voters incorrectly voted for the PRI.

The government is not the only one concerned about the election.

The United States and Canada made clear that Mexico would reform its political system as part of the NAFTA, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Paris-based group of wealthy nations that admitted Mexico earlier this year, also requires stronger states to practice democracy.

It is uncertain if one clear election will establish confidence in the Mexican system, but early reviews of the electoral reforms have been positive.
Mexico cool to election observers

Foreigners given too little access to certify fairness

By Nancy Nusser
STAFF CORRESPONDENT

Mexico City — Mexico offered to host Meden Benjamin and her flock of U.S. election monitors, but when they arrived to prepare for this Sunday's presidential vote, they said they felt like uninvited guests.

"In other countries, our observer position was clear. We knew we had access," said Benjamin, head of the San Francisco group Global Exchange. "Here we're finding out on the ground, in practice, if we'll have access."

At least 650 foreigners, more than half of them from the United States, have been accredited so far as international observers to monitor the fairness of Sunday's landmark vote.

But many say they feel as if they are being accepted only grudgingly by the authorities. While the government has billed the observers as important guarantors of a clean race, some maintain that it is unclear whether they will be given the freedom to judge whether the vote is fair or fraudulent.

The governing Institutional Revolutionary Party, known by the Spanish abbreviation PRI, has been accused in the past of using fraud to maintain its 65-year lock on power, but it has promised to hold a fair vote this year.

Still, said Delal Baer, an observer from the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, "Mexico was deeply, deeply ambivalent" about whether it wanted foreign poll monitors.

Jennifer McCoy, a staff member at Atlanta's Carter Center, which sent a 20-member team, said delegates don't have the official observer responsibilities they have enjoyed in other countries. As a result, her team will not "pretend to judge or certify the election," she said.

"Mexico did not want us to play the kind of role we've played in other countries," McCoy said.

Mexican election observers, meanwhile, complained of irregularities in voting lists and said thousands of Mexican poll watchers have not been accredited, The Associated Press reported.

Civic Alliance, the largest independent group of Mexican observers, said the Federal Electoral Institute had certified just 3,000 of its 12,000 proposed domestic observers.

"We are still hopeful that everyone will be accredited," said Enrique Calderon, a spokesman for Civic Alliance, which reported that offices of some Mexican observers had been ransacked and anonymous threats were made.

Mexican Forum, an independent observer group backed by Mexican-Americans, said it had found several irregularities in just one official voting list for a representative neighborhood in the capital.

Mexican Forum questioned whether the Federal Electoral Institute had done an adequate job of verifying voter lists, but the election body has said its list is more than 90 percent accurate.

International election monitors said the distrust among ordinary Mexicans of the government's promise of a fair election was extraordinarily high.

In the past, the Mexican government has viewed the use of foreign election observers as a violation of national sovereignty. But this year, the pressure for clean elections has been intense, and as part of a series of reforms, election officials invited foreigners to watch the vote.
Confianza de Canadá y Estados Unidos Hacia el País: Winfield

Siguiendo de la página anterior, James Jones, al señalar que "la atmósfera que he detectado en México es de confianza, aunque naturalmente hay alguna preocupación respecto al cambio en el proceso y del sistema".

Winfield dijo que México ha instrumentado un sistema electoral confiable que ayudará a asegurar resultados "limpios". De todas maneras, dijo, se tiene que hacer una distinción entre fraude e irregulares; como en la mayoría de los países, dijo, puede haber ciertas irregularidades debido a fallas técnicas o errores inocentes.

Este tipo de incidentes son comprensibles y no deberían distraer de ninguna manera la validez del mismo proceso.

Asimismo, el diplomático canadiense aseguró que los casos aislados de violencia no se deben de reflejar en la nación de una manera global.

"Puede haber ocasiones donde existen casos de violencia en el ámbito de la opinión pública, pero el consenso en México es el de prevenir la violencia y eso mejora la probabilidad de que las cosas marchen correctamente. Sin embargo, admitió que no hay manera de predecir qué es lo que va a suceder. "Desafortunadamente, hay personas en cada sociedad que prefieren usar la violencia que el diálogo". Pero eso no es una reflexión de la sociedad en su totalidad, y si eso tomaría lugar aquí, estoy seguro que Canadá apoyaría a las autoridades mexicanas en sus esfuerzos para controlar ese tipo de eventos y evitar que se hagan daño a las personas que se encuentran en contra de los derechos de sus conciudadanos.

Winfield dijo que su gobierno comprende que ciertos actos de protesta y violencia acompañan muchas veces a los periodos de cambio político. Habrá 51 visitantes canadienses durante los comicios.

Por su parte, el embajador Jones indicó que después de haber presenciado diversas elecciones, dijo que al final del día no se puede predecir exactamente qué circunstancias puedan conllevar a la violencia. No quiero caer en ese tipo de especulación, pero yo creo que es lo que uno puede decir es que en Estados Unidos todos tenemos grandes esperanzas de que lo que se haga en México.

Si las elecciones se realizan de manera transparente, los resultados serán respetados de manera absoluta por la comunidad internacional.

Estados Unidos, que está enviando alrededor de 540 visitantes, estaría muy desilusionado como muchos mexicanos si los comicios fueran seguidos por una violencia mafiosa, y aunque subrayó que cada situación es diferente en un sentido general, el gobierno del Presidente Clinton daría su apoyo en caso de que brotaran actos aislados de violencia.

Entrevistado por separado en un hotel capitalino, Jim Wright, líder de la mayoría en la Cámara de Representantes de Washington durante 10 años, dijo que es evidente que se ha realizado un esfuerzo sincero y un trabajo exhaustivo para lograr unas elecciones limpias y transparentes. En tanto que el Centro de Atención a Visitantes Extranjeros informó por su parte que en el DF ya se acreditarán 600 extranjeros.

Por su parte, Joe Clark, el primer ministro de Canadá, señaló que el propósito de la visita de la delegación de 80 miembros de la Cámara de Representantes de Canadá es el de demostrar el apoyo de su gobierno.

El embajador Winfield indicó que los miembros de esta delegación no serán representantes de sus gobiernos; es decir, cada miembro está aquí a título personal. "Por ello, nosotros no haremos recomendaciones que se refieran a los temas bilaterales entre nuestros respectivos países y México. Al probar un criterio, independiente y objetivo de las elecciones del 21 de agosto, esperamos dar una valiosa contribución al juicio importante de las elecciones que se harán por la gente de México. También esperamos que nuestra presencia ayude a incrementar la confianza de los mexicanos en el proceso electoral.

Estamos encontrándonos con un amplio espectro de mexicanos, incluido el gobierno, políticos, candidatos, representantes de partidos, líderes de asociaciones civiles, etcétera. La delegación se dividirá en equipos que saldrán de la ciudad de México a 24
Descartan fraude

No hay razones de peso que pudieran alterar el resultado de las elecciones, indican observadores

Por María De Alva

Aunque no quisieron darse el calificativo a las elecciones de "limpias y justas", el Centro Carter, junto al Instituto Nacional de Democracia y el Instituto Internacional Republicano, indicaron ayer que aunque hubo algunos problemas en el proceso, no hay evidencias suficientes que pudieran haber cambiado el resultado de la elección presidencial.

"En base a lo que hemos visto no hay razones de peso que pudieran alterar el resultado de las elecciones" anotó Paul Kirk, quien es uno de los dirigentes de esa coalición de organizaciones.

Agregó que estas elecciones no estuvieron libres de problemas y que las principales fallas fueron las campañas por la inequidad de recursos que habría entre los partidos, así como en los medios de comunicación, especialmente la televisión.

Kirk estuvo junto a Jennifer McCoy del Centro Carter, Bruce McLolm, presidente del IRI, Kenneth Wollock, presidente del NDI y el diputado chileno, Andrés Allamand.

"Estas han sido las elecciones más abiertas que ha habido en México, con más participación de representantes de partidos y de la ciudadanía, pero lo más importante es que quien tuvo la palabra más poderosa fue la sociedad mexicana al presentarse en forma masiva a las casillas, lo que ocurrió aquí el domingo, nunca ha sucedido en la historia del país", subrayó.

Los visitantes internacionales dijeron que no era posible calificar a las elecciones porque los procesos democráticos son más globales que el simple sufragio e implican otras cosas como lo que ocurre antes y después de las elecciones.

"La delegación repudia los actos de violencia política pre electoral que se han dado, el caso más dramático fue el asesinato del candidato Luis Donaldo Colosio, además de más de 200 activistas políticos que fueron asesinados desde las últimas elecciones federales", dice la delegación en un informe previo.

Agrega que fuentes fidedignas han reportado que hubo uso de recursos del Estado en favor del partido dominante en los niveles federales y locales, aunque admitieron que el Fiscal Especial para Delitos Electorales ya está revisando esto.

Reiteraron sus críticas por los problemas ocurridos con las casillas especiales y por la burocracia para acreditar a observadores nacionales.

Los visitantes sugirieron la creación de una oficina especializada en crímenes electorales, la cual pudiera encabezar el fiscal electoral.

Las propuestas del Carter

- El grupo de visitantes extranjeros que integran el Centro Carter, sugirieron medidas para mejorar los procesos electorales.

1. Todos los partidos deben unir esfuerzos para crear un acuerdo de paz, justicia y democracia para restaurar el diálogo.

2. Revisar el financiamiento de los partidos, el uso indebido de recursos del Estado y establecer parámetros para la cobertura en los medios.

3. Apoyar a las organizaciones cívicas.

4. Establecer guías específicas para la cobertura de los candidatos.

5. Establecer los recursos necesarios para la Fiscalía Especial.

6. Examinar los problemas de las casillas especiales.

7. Revisar el proceso de registro en el IFE para evitar que se omitan nombres en las listas nominales.

8. Hacer más esfuerzos para independizar al IFE.
Foreign observers offer findings
Irregularities wouldn’t have changed outcome, they say

By Christine MacDonald
Special Contributer to The Dallas Morning News

MEXICO CITY — An international delegation of election observers said Tuesday that the irregularities it chronicled during Mexico’s presidential race were not great enough to change the outcome of Sunday’s vote.

In its preliminary report, the observer group called the Aug. 21 election “a significant step forward for the Mexican democratic process.”

But it said that significant reforms still must be made to ensure an equal playing field for all political parties and greater credibility for Mexico’s political system.

Ernesto Zedillo of the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, won the presidential contest, according to official but incomplete results. The outcome assures Mr. Zedillo’s party, which has ruled Mexico for 65 years, of another six years in power.

In its seven-page report, the international delegation expressed concern for the widespread use of state resources to fund PRI election campaigns and the ruling party’s vastly greater financial resources and media access during the campaign.

The observers from 17 countries also deplored political violence that took the life of PRI presidential candidate Luis Donaldo Colosio in March and has resulted in the killing of more than 200 political activists in the past six years.

Several “minor irregularities,” “isolated instances” of voter intimi-

“... We have serious concerns particularly about the (fairness of) campaign conditions. A continued effort to address these concerns is urgent.”

— Jennifer McCoy, Carter Center researcher

The foreign politicians, academics and civic activists also described as “positive developments” Mexico’s recent electoral reforms.

Critical improvements, it said, were the use of photo-identification cards and curtained voting booths, the participation of national and foreign observers, implementation of tougher election laws and the naming of a special prosecutor to handle election law violations.

The observer group recommended that additional measures be taken to assure greater public confidence in Mexico’s political system.

It called for a review of party financing rules and for measures to prevent the use of state funds and other resources to back candidates or parties. And it said that guidelines should be established to guarantee equal access to the media for all political contenders.

“We have serious concerns particularly about the (fairness of) campaign conditions,” said Jennifer McCoy, a senior researcher at the Carter Center in Atlanta.

“A continued effort to address these concerns is urgent,” she said.

The group also urged civic groups and political parties to maintain an “ongoing dialogue on crucial issues affecting public confidence in the political system.”

The report called for government officials to quickly investigate all irregularities it outlined. It said an immediate investigation should be made of problems at the country’s special polling booths, which ran short of ballots and prevented thousands of Mexicans from casting their vote Sunday.

Although the reforms have dramatically changed Mexico’s political landscape, Andres Allamand, president of Chile’s National Restoration Party and a delegation leader, said much more remains to be done.

“There is no doubt that Mexicans have a lot of work ahead of them to consolidate this transition” to democracy, Mr. Allamand said.

Christine MacDonald is a freelance journalist based in Mexico City.
Effect of Fraud In Mexican Vote Hotly Debated
Even if Outcome Is Deemed Fair, the PRI Is Likely To Face Calls for Reform

By DIANNE SOLIS
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
MEXICO CITY - Mexican and foreign observers raised new questions about the fairness of Sunday's Mexican presidential elections, but they appeared to be divided on whether the irregularities played a significant role in the commanding lead of ruling-party candidate Ernesto Zedillo.

The findings, no matter what the conclusion, should put more pressure on the incoming government of Dr. Zedillo, the economist, to further democratize his authoritarian party, known as the PRI, and make it less prone to election fraud. Dr. Zedillo has called for national dialogue with all opposition parties to form a common platform to govern Mexico.

Civic Alliance, the largest election-watchdog group, said its members detected "serious irregularities" in the weekend polling. The alliance had previously indicated its observers had found some problems, but it said yesterday that there were widespread questions about the accuracy of the voting lists posted at polling places.

Extent of Irregularities
"There is a big debate within Civic Alliance about whether the irregularities are high but the results stand," said Primitivo Rodriguez, a Civic Alliance leader, "or whether there are enough irregularities to change the outcome meaning there was fraud and Zedillo can't govern.

The group's decision will play an important role in giving credibility to any calls by the opposition parties for civil unrest. For that reason, at least one cabinet minister has been pushing Civic Alliance to characterize the elections as "fair."

Meanwhile, foreign observers stopped short of calling the elections fair, citing numerous irregularities. They did praise highly the unprecedented turnout of 70% as a sign of voter confidence in the process. But Paul Kirk, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee in the U.S., said the delegation received "no evidence to suggest [irregularities] affected the outcome of the presidential contest."

With 75% of the votes counted as of late yesterday, Dr. Zedillo led with 49% of the votes. In second place was Diego Fernandez de Cevallos of the center-right PAN with 28%. Cuauhtemoc Cardenas, of the leftist PRD, was third with 17%.

PRI Majority in Lower House
Nearly complete results show the PRI winning a majority in the lower house, where some had thought the ruling party could be reduced to less than 4%. The PRI will retain its historic control of the Senate, but because of complex changes, one-fourth of the seats will automatically go to the opposition.

In a surprise blow for the center-right PAN, partial voting results showed the PRI winning in the border states of Baja California and Chihuahua, both of which have PAN governors. But it appeared possible that the PAN would register majorities in two states with PRI governors, the central state of Jalisco and the border state of Nuevo Leon, home of President Carlos Salinas de Gortari.

In the southernmost state of Chiapas, scene of an armed uprising in January, it appeared a PRI governor was elected. In the state's rebel-held zone, though, voting was 8-to-1 for the leftist PRD, whose gubernatorial candidate, a newspaper editor, was injured in a highway crash last month. The family blamed the incident on the ruling party.
Experts: Irregularities Didn’t Affect Election Result

By SHASTA DARLINGTON
The News Staff Reporter

While minor irregularities marred Sunday’s elections, this did not affect the outcome, a group of high-profile international experts said Tuesday.

“This election represents a significant step forward for the Mexican democratic process,” said Paul Kirk, the chairman of the National Democratic Institute (NDI).

NDI, funded by the U.S. Congress, promotes democracy throughout the world.

After reviewing the accounts of their 50 international visitors, NDI issued a report praising the high voter turnout and public participation as well as citing irregularities.

Kenneth Wollack, president of NDI, said, “Problems existed, but did not affect the outcome of the process or deny the people their will.”

Former U.S. House Speaker Jim Wright said that the high voter turnout — estimated to be around 70 percent — “indicates the election results are indeed reflective of the public will.”

Beyond these statements, however, the visitors refused to qualify the elections, saying it is not their role to declare the elections fair or unfair.

“Our delegation came to witness the elections,” said Kirk, the former chairman of the U.S. Democratic Party. “We did not seek to supervise the elections or certify them. Ultimately, it is the Mexican people who will determine the legitimacy of the elections.”

Jennifer McCoy of the Carter Center, run by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter, said that the “accumulated impact” of the pre-election problems and electoral irregularities they did witness was not enough to change the presidential contest.

Irregularities cited by the visitors included:
- The assassination of Luis Donaldo Colosio, presidential candidate of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), and the murder of some 20 activists — mostly from opposition parties — between 1988 and 1994.
- The use of state resources to advance the electoral cause of the governing parties at regional levels.
- The large disparity of campaign resources between the governing party and other political parties.
- The media bias in favor of the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI).
- The difficult election observer and visitor accreditation process.
- The problems with high turnout at the “special” polling places — used by travelers who were outside of their assigned voting districts — and the high number of voters with credentials who were not on the voter list at their polling places.
- Minor irregularities and isolated instances of intimidation that occurred on election day.
- The apparent ineffectiveness of the Special Prosecutor’s Office to handle the high number of electoral crimes.

“While the delegation takes the above-mentioned problems seriously, it has received no evidence to suggest that they would have affected the outcome of the presidential contest.”