

Copyright  
by  
Frederic Kenneth Cady  
2012

**The Report Committee for Frederic Kenneth Cady  
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:**

**Political Party Transformation in Mexico:**

**The Case of Candidate Selection Reform in the Partido Revolucionario Institucional**

**(PRI) in Mexico (2000-2006)**

**APPROVED BY  
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

**Supervisor:**

---

Henry A. Dietz

---

Raul L. Madrid

**Political Party Transformation in Mexico:  
The Case of Candidate Selection Reform in the Partido Revolucionario Institucional  
(PRI) in Mexico (2000-2006)**

by

**Frederic Kenneth Cady B.A.; M.P.A.**

**Report**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of  
The University of Texas at Austin  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

**Master of Arts**

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**August 2012**

## **Dedication**

I would like to thank everyone who helped me along the way. Many thanks go out to my friends, teachers, professors, colleagues, students, and family. A very special thank you goes to my wife, Yenny Huerta Jimenez.

## **Abstract**

### **Political Party Transformation in Mexico:**

#### **The Case of Candidate Selection Reform in the Partido Revolucionario Institucional**

##### **(PRI) in Mexico (2000-2006)**

Frederic Kenneth Cady M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2012

Supervisor: Henry A. Dietz

The Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) in Mexico lost power in 2000 after controlling the governing structure for 71 years. With the old rules gone forever, the PRI needed to regroup in order to survive as a viable party. This thesis explores how the PRI went about transforming its candidate selection procedures from 2000 to 2006 in order to remain a viable political party. Since the president of Mexico made most candidate selection decisions previously, the party had no choice but to reform its procedures. What emerged was a battle for power and influence between and among the party leaders at the national level and party affiliated state governors. Those state governors sought to dominate party structures within their states as the President of the Republic once dominated the party nationally. To restore the legitimacy many in the party thought it lost, the PRI first experimented with open primaries. It eventually concluded that open primaries caused divisions, thus often hurting the party electorally. As time passed, the PRI moved away from selecting candidates through open primaries and sought to nominate unity candidates.

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1 - Introduction .....	1
The Hegemonic PRI and Mexico's Transition to Democracy .....	3
The Puzzle .....	7
The Research Question .....	10
Summary of the Argument.....	10
Research Design .....	13
Field Research Overview .....	14
Case Study Selection Justification.....	17
Framework within the Literature.....	21
Chapter 2 - Candidate Selection at the National Level .....	26
Candidate Selection Prior to 2000.....	26
The 1999 Presidential Primary .....	31
Candidate Selection Reforms at the 18th National Assembly .....	35
Candidate Selection in the 2003 Mid-Term Elections.....	42
Alliance with the PVEM.....	43
Districts in Which the PRI Ran Solo .....	47
The Proportional Representation List .....	49
Chapter 3 - Candidate Selection at the Sub-national Level.....	54
The Case of Chihuahua.....	55
The Case of Yucatan.....	63
The Case of the State of Mexico .....	65
The 2003-2006 Gubernatorial Election Cycle .....	71

Chapter 4 - Selecting the 2006 Presidential Candidate .....	81
Chapter 5 - Conclusions .....	87
Appendix - Interview List.....	94
Works Cited .....	104

## Chapter 1 - Introduction

*After July 2, 2000, many in the PRI asked “what do we do now?” They saw the tomb of the PRI looming in the distance.<sup>1</sup>*

On July 2, 2000 the world as it was known for seventy-one years came to an end for the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI). The “perfect dictatorship” was no more.<sup>2</sup> Though its hegemonic status had declined significantly by that time, the loss of the national presidency came as a major shock to the PRI and its members. On election night in 2000 the PRI’s presidential candidate Francisco Labastida and other party officials at party headquarters in Mexico City were hesitant to concede defeat, even after it was obvious that the PRI had lost. They thought that maybe President Zedillo might do something to save them and victory would be theirs after all, as it had always been. This was not to be. As Labastida was slow in conceding, President Zedillo went on television and congratulated Vicente Fox on his electoral victory. Hence the PRI’s first presidential loss ever was official. It was truly a “Noche Priiste.”<sup>3</sup> Some Priistas never forgave Zedillo for his actions that night. The world changed, and the big question for the party was what would come next.<sup>4</sup>

Emotions within the party spanned the gauntlet. There was disappointment, panic, shock, reflection, and a search for answers. What went wrong? A common

---

<sup>1</sup> Interview with Federico Madrazo, Subsecretario de Organización de la Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Populares (CNOP), Mexico City, February 18, 2003.

<sup>2</sup> Peruvian author Mario Vargas Llosa referred to Mexico governed by the PRI as a perfect dictatorship during a speech in 1990.

<sup>3</sup> The pun is taken from the title of Alberto Vieyra’s book *La Noche Prieste del 2000* (Costa-Amic Editores, S.A., 2002). The title likens July 2, 2000 to the “Noche Triste” when on June 30, 1520 Hernan Cortes barely escaped with his life from Tenochtitlan.

<sup>4</sup> The actions of candidate Labastida and President Zedillo on the night of July 2, 2000 are well documented in Julia Preston and Samuel Dillon’s book *Opening Mexico: The Making of a Democracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2004.

response to this question was that the PRI had lost touch over the years, with its bases and with the Mexican people more generally.<sup>5</sup> Lots of fingers were pointed at Presidents Zedillo, Salinas, and De la Madrid. They took the party in a neo-liberal direction, away from its revolutionary roots. If just only, many politicians within the PRI argued, the party had not turned to the right in the 1980s. If had not embraced neo-liberalism as it did. Little mention was made by Priistas in the years following 2000 of a corrupt PRI or of a PRI dominated by “caciques.”<sup>6</sup> Some did see the tomb of the PRI in the distance. Some, especially on the left, hoped for it. It was not to be, however, as the PRI would adjust, survive, and sometimes thrive. There were many bumps along the road. The PRI came in a distant third place in the 2006 elections. But as the decade progressed, the PRI would remain Mexico’s strongest party. Then on July 1, 2012, the PRI would once again win the Mexican presidency with Enrique Peña Nieto as its candidate. However, there is no turning back to a pre-2000 Mexico. The PRI had to learn how to thrive in a more democratic Mexico. This thesis examines how the PRI adjusted and remained a viable, strong party during its first six years out of power (2000-2006). My basic research question asks how the PRI experimented with changes in the way in which it selects its candidates for public office.

In this thesis I first describe how the PRI operated in its hegemonic heyday, and how circumstances changed as Mexico slowly made the transition to democratic governance. Second, I lay out my basic research questions, puzzles, arguments, and

---

<sup>5</sup>This was a very common response of many of the PRI party officials that I interviewed (primarily in 2002-2003) during my field research.

<sup>6</sup> Cacique is a term that refers to a political boss, usually in rural Mexico.

research design of the thesis, and place the thesis within the context of pertinent political science literature. Then I concentrate on candidate selection reform by first discussing how the process worked prior to 2000 and then analyzing post-2000 candidate selection reform at the national level and then at the sub-national level, investigating primarily my case study states. I conclude by examining the late-2005 process in which the PRI selected its candidate for the presidency and implications that the 2000-2006 experience has had on more recent events.

### **The Hegemonic PRI and Mexico's Transition to Democracy**

The Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) governed Mexico for more than seven decades. The party was formed in 1929<sup>7</sup> by former Mexican President Plutarco Elias Calles as a vehicle for revolutionary elites to arbitrate disputes and peacefully transfer power among themselves. Though the Mexican Revolution<sup>8</sup> was officially over by the 1920s, there was considerable violence and political instability during that decade, as the revolutionary elite often took to considerable in-fighting. The PRI was the means to end this political instability. Thus, unlike a great majority of political parties in the world that work to achieve power after their founding, the PRI was born to power. During the period of PRI rule, Mexico was a fairly stable country, especially when compared with other nations in Latin America, so the original goal of the party was largely met.

---

<sup>7</sup> Actually the party took its current name in 1946. At its founding in 1929 its original name was the Partido Nacional Revolucionario (PNR). In 1938, the party's name changed to the Partido de la Revolución Mexicana (PMR).

<sup>8</sup> The Mexican Revolution occurred between 1910 and 1920.

But the PRI was most often cited in the political science literature as a hegemonic party. A concept first discussed by Giovanni Sartori, a hegemonic party system is one in which a dominant political party for the most part controls the political system. Other political parties are allowed to exist and compete in elections, but under highly unequal terms. Elections take place at regular intervals with multiple parties on the ballot, but only the hegemonic party really has an opportunity to secure power within the system. Since the hegemonic party is the only means by which one access power, individuals with political ambitions are usually drawn to the party as the only avenue by which their ambitions can be realized. The opposition parties that do exist serve as window dressing to help legitimate the system and thus the hegemonic party.<sup>9</sup>

Under PRI hegemony, the President of the Republic, controlled or heavily influenced most aspects of the political system. In what is often termed “*presidencialismo*”<sup>10</sup> the national president controlled not only the party structure as the “primer Priista,” but also had the biggest hand in deciding who would be the party’s nominees for public office. The PRI’s nomination was most often tantamount to securing the actual post. Since there is no reelection in Mexico, members of the Mexican House of Deputies or the Mexican Senate could not establish a political power base of their own. After their terms were up, they had to rely on the party structure, and thus the president, for their next political post. Therefore, if they acted against the wishes of the president, their political careers might well be in jeopardy. Such reality kept the party structure and

---

<sup>9</sup> Sartori, Giovanni. 1976. Parties and Party Systems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>10</sup> Carpizo, Jorge. 1978. El Presidencialismo Mexicano. Mexico D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.

the legislative branch subservient to the President of the Republic. At the very top of the system, in what many regarded as the president's greatest power, the President of the Republic had the power to name his own successor by being able to choose who the PRI's nominee.

During the period of PRI hegemony in Mexico, the classification of the regime varied. During the 1950s and 1960s Mexico was often classified as a democracy, though not a liberal one.<sup>11</sup> Compared to the many military governments that existed in Latin America at the time, PRI governed Mexico did not look bad in comparison. Though after the "Third Wave" of democracy took hold, most increasingly classified Mexico's hegemonic party system as authoritarian or at least quasi-authoritarian.<sup>12</sup> It was, however, a relatively benign authoritarian system. Priista governments usually preferred the carrot to the stick as a means of maintaining control.

Mexico's transition to democracy was a comparatively slow process. There was no dramatic event that one can point to that clearly delineates the start of the process. The political system had been slowly opening up for many years prior to the 2000 elections, the point where almost all scholars agree represents the point at which Mexico completed the transition to democracy. One could point to the electoral reforms enacted in 1977 in which proportional representation in the House of Deputies was expanded in

---

<sup>11</sup> Cline, Howard F. 1965. The U.S. and Mexico. New York: Atheneum.

<sup>12</sup> The Third Wave of Democracy was coined by Samuel Huntington with his book The Third Wave of Democracy: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993). The Third Wave began in 1974 and continued through the rest of the century.

order to give opposition parties more spaces as a starting point for the transition.<sup>13</sup> Other key events in the slow transition occurred during the 1980s when the government recognized victories by opposition parties in various municipal elections.<sup>14</sup> These opposition victories mainly occurred in northern Mexico and included several state capitals. In 1989, the opposition won its first gubernatorial election, in Baja California. During the 1990s, the slow democratization process continued. Most importantly the Federal Electoral Institute (IFE) became a completely autonomous organization in 1996. Opposition parties continued to gain strength, winning municipal elections in most of Mexico's largest urban areas. By 1997, the PRI lost its majority in the Chamber of Deputies and it lost the first ever local election in the Federal District.

As the PRI began losing electoral strength, pressure for the party to reform emerged. The party had always been flexible throughout its hegemonic period. Many scholars who have studied the PRI have documented its historical flexibility. Dale Story, in his classic examination of the hegemonic PRI, illustrated how the party was a pragmatic one that kept the many diverse groups under its tent happy by ensuring power was transferred among them.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, Rogelio Hernández argued that the PRI's adaptive capacity has not only allowed it to change and survive, but to continue winning

---

<sup>13</sup> The 1977 reforms were enacted in response to the 1976 presidential election in which the major opposition party, the Partido Acción Nacional (PAN), did not run a candidate. The fact that opposition parties did offer candidates to post in elections helped earn the PRI-led hegemonic system a degree of legitimacy. The PAN's actions in 1976 were, therefore, problematic for the regime.

<sup>14</sup> In 1983, opposition parties, mostly the PAN, won the municipal presidency in Chihuahua City (state capital), Ciudad Juarez, Durango (state capital), Hermosillo (state capital), among others.

<sup>15</sup> Story, Dale. 1986. The Mexican Ruling Party: Stability and Authority. New York: Praeger.

elections, albeit not with the same frequency as before.<sup>16</sup> During the 1980s, in some locales the PRI came to the realization that it must take into account candidate appeal when nominating candidates for public office. During the 1990s, it enacted reforms meant to weaken the party's traditional sectors in order to adjust to more current societal realities.<sup>17</sup> The party also started to experiment with internal democracy in the late-1990s when it held a series of party primaries to select candidates.

Nothing, however, prepared the PRI for losing the national presidency in the 2000 elections. After 2000, the party no longer had the person who for seventy-plus years had served as its father figure. Like a family who has lost its father, the PRI had no other choice but to change the manner in which it conducts business. Since 2000 the PRI reformed in many ways. The party, though weaker as an opposition party, certainly did not vanish. After two "sexenios"<sup>18</sup> in the opposition, the PRI is still in most ways Mexico's strongest political party. It demonstrated this reality by winning back the presidency in 2012. It has learned how to compete and thrive in a more democratic Mexico.

### **The Puzzle**

It is the context of the PRI's adaptability, the transformation process, and its continuing survival and prosperity in a more democratic Mexico where my basic puzzle

---

<sup>16</sup> Hernandez Rodriguez, Rogelio. 1998. "The Partido Revolucionario Institucional," in Governing Mexico: Political Parties and Elections. Monica Serrano (ed.) The Institute of Latin American Studies, University of London.

<sup>17</sup> The PRI's traditional sectors are labor (mainly housed in the Confederación de Trabajadores Mexicanos), peasant (mainly in the Confederación Campesina Nacional), and popular (Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Populares).

<sup>18</sup> A sexenio is the Spanish term for that is widely used when referring to the six-year term that Mexican presidents serve.

is found. First, many scholars initially questioned the PRI's ability to survive in a more democratic Mexico. When comparing the PRI to the former communist parties of Eastern Europe in the 1990s, José Antonio Crespo questioned whether the PRI had a future, and whether it could adapt to new circumstances. He seemed to be inclined to doubt it.<sup>19</sup> Though not as pessimistic, Joy Langston foresaw that the PRI would suffer collective action problems if it lost the national presidency, as the top-down impositions that once forced PRI politicians to cooperate would no longer exist.<sup>20</sup> Priistas who were once forced to cooperate and maintain discipline would have more freedom to act on their own, perhaps to the detriment of the party's future.

Many authoritarian parties that ruled in other countries did not survive the democratization process. Others had to serve a penance period in which their power was severely diminished, or they briefly disappeared before reemerging under a different name. None of these outcomes has been part of the PRI's experience. Many democratization studies assume that authoritarian structures, for the most part, will be rooted out and replaced with more democratic institutions during the democratic transition and consolidation periods.<sup>21</sup> The first part of the puzzle, therefore, is how a hegemonic party that operated in an authoritarian system survived and prospered in a democratic system. Part of the answer to this puzzle lies in the PRI's historic pragmatism

---

<sup>19</sup> Crespo, José Antonio. 1998. ¿Tiene Futuro el PRI? Mexico D.F.: Grijalbo.

<sup>20</sup> Langston, Joy. 2003. "Rising from the Ashes? Reorganizing and Unifying PRI's State Party Organizations after Electoral Defeat," Comparative Political Studies, 36:3. 293-318.

<sup>21</sup> Diamond, Larry. 1999. Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Linz, Juan J. and Alfred Stepan. 1996. Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

and flexibility. Though the competition that the PRI faced prior to 2000 was under conditions that favored the PRI, the party did have experience participating in competitive elections. Since the Mexican transition to democracy was slow, the PRI had many years to adjust. Unlike other authoritarian parties, the PRI was more prepared to face its new circumstances.

Since the PRI did not wither away and has adjusted to life in a more democratic Mexico, it makes sense to examine how the PRI went about reforming. Since 2000, the PRI has to a degree changed the way it conducts its business. This was of course critical, since the President of the Republic is no longer a party member. Reforms have varied in form and in depth. More democratic methods of candidate selection and party leadership selection have been tried out. Party statutes were reformed to allow for more participation from previously underrepresented groups. Yet the democratization of the party has been far from complete or widely implemented. As its 2000 loss fades into the past and the PRI remains a powerful political party, more open selection processes have become much less frequent. Party leaders adapted strategies that allow them to avoid implementing new party regulations. Governors in the states where the PRI has remained in power often have tried to assume the “all powerful” role that the President of the Republic once played in the party within the respective states that they govern, and at times with considerable success.

The second part of the puzzle lies in the direction that reform has taken in the post-2000 PRI. Given that Mexico has made the transition to democracy and is in the process of consolidating this transition and deepening its democracy, why have the

reforms within the PRI not led to democratic procedures being more widely implemented and consolidated. Given that the PRI has legitimacy problems with certain segments of the Mexican population, why have reforms that were meant to broaden participation in the party remained largely unfulfilled? Why did the PRI eventually abandon the use of open primaries to select its candidates? It is the second part of this puzzle that I primarily focus on in this thesis.

### **The Research Question**

This thesis has three primary research questions. First, why did the PRI embarked on a reform process? Since the PRI ruled Mexico for many years and has many groups with vested interests, the party could have resisted reform to a greater extent than it did. Second, why were some attempted reforms left unfulfilled? To adapt reform on paper is one part of the process. To actually carry out the reform is yet another matter. The PRI has reformed its statutes in many instances, but many of these changes have not been successfully implemented. Third, and most important, why did the reform/transformation process within the PRI take the direction that it did? It can be argued that after the PRI lost the national presidency in 2000, reform going to be seen as inevitable. There were several roads that the reform process could have taken. Why the reform/transformation process took the direction that it did is, therefore, the most important question that my thesis addresses.

### **Summary of the Argument**

I argue that reform within the PRI was at first caused by increasing levels of electoral competition and its accompanying loss of electoral strength. In addition to

losing electoral spaces, many in the PRI perceived that the party was losing legitimacy in the eyes of society. Even before 2000 the PRI started to select its candidates with more care. Candidate appeal became a greater consideration for the party. The party's internal structure was also modified well before 2000, and it experimented with party primaries to select candidates in 1998-1999. The loss of the national presidency, I argue, made party reform unavoidable. It forced new actors to make the important party decisions that the President of the Republic once made. Despite this, not all reform has been "more democratic" in nature.

In regard to explaining the direction that reform has taken, I argue ambitious new elites within the party crucially influenced this direction. After 2000, the party structure became a much more valuable asset to advance one's career.<sup>22</sup> For example, Roberto Madrazo sought the presidency of the PRI's National Executive Committee (CEN) essentially to further his own presidential ambitions. Such ambitions, along with those of others within the party structure, have influenced the direction that the party and reform within the party has taken. In those states that are still governed by Priistas, governors have often tried to assume the all-encompassing role that the national president once played, but within the state party structure. Given this reality, CEN leaders are much more likely to influence party structures in states that are not governed by the PRI.

I also argue that issues of legitimacy and electoral competition pushed early reform in the direction of more open and democratic methods for selecting party leaders,

---

<sup>22</sup> Before 2000, cabinet posts in the executive branch were considered the most crucial slots to obtain when seeking to advance one's political career in Mexico.

candidates for public office, and operating procedures in general. Generally, in Priista-governed states, reform was less likely to be more democratic and open in nature, as more open processes hindered the governor's ability to call the shots. Furthermore, as the PRI began to recover some of its electoral strength and break its decline, the direction of reform became more closed and democratic mechanisms were used less frequently to select leaders and candidates. Also working against more open processes within the party was the perception (and partial reality) that they caused divisions within the party that ended up harming the PRI in the electoral arena.

After the PRI came in third place in 2006 with Roberto Madrazo as its standard bearer, the party concluded that it really did not matter the mechanisms were used to select candidates. What mattered was party unity and the quality of candidate. Party primaries often worked against party unity, as competition became a zero sum game in many ways. It became harder to compensate the losers with more democratic selection methods, as the sting of loss was much more public. The horse trading that went on in private prior to 2000 was more difficult to accomplish without a Priista in Los Pinos.<sup>23</sup> As a result, after utilizing party primaries quite a bit between 2000 and 2006, such mechanisms for candidate and party leadership selection have been used much less frequently after 2006. After more than a sexenio out of power, what replaced the President of the Republic as the "decider" within the party was a more complex system of competing elites. At the state level, the Priista governor took over the role of the "decider." At the national level, leaders of the PRI's CEN, Priista governors, and Priista

---

<sup>23</sup> Los Pinos is the Mexican White House, or where the President of the Republic resides in Mexico City.

leaders in the Mexican Congress battle for power and influence. In this way, politics within the PRI have become more competitive as well as more pluralistic.

### **Research Design**

The dependent variable in this study is party reform. I define reform in three ways: 1) changes in party statutes or norms that impact party leadership selection; 2) changes in party statutes or norms that modify the party's operating procedures; 3) changes in party statutes that govern the manner in which the party selects its candidates for public office. I will focus almost exclusively on the third definition of party reform, candidate selection, though I will make references to the first two.

Key independent variables in this study include: 1) electoral competition and electoral loss; 2) the presence or absence of a President of the Republic that is Priista; 3) the presence or absence (at the sub-national level) of a governor that is Priista; 4) the ambitions and desires of the post-2000 elites within the party; and 5) the fear of party fracture and division.

I examine the process of change within the PRI primarily after its loss of the national presidency in 2000. However, where certain trends in reform predate 2000 or events significantly influence the post-2000 reform process, I include such reforms or events. I conducted extensive field research in 2002 and 2003 in Mexico, and much of my analysis stems from this research. Many follow-up trips to Mexico also aided this research. The analysis ends with the presidential election of 2006, which resulted in the PRI's second straight presidential election loss. Analyzing the period from 2000 to 2006 allows for a complete examination of the first major political period in the post-

hegemonic PRI. Since the Mexican president serves a six-year term, ending analysis in 2006 allowed me to examine all major events in what is one political cycle in Mexico. In this time period, the party adjusted to its status as an opposition party and life without the President of the Republic being a Priista. It rewrote its party statutes in two major national party assemblies. It chose new leaders at the national level several times and in all the state PRIs as well. The party also went through the process of choosing candidates for federal deputy, along with having to choose candidates for governor, local deputies, and municipal president in most every state. Lastly, in 2005, it selected its first presidential candidate without the presence of a Priista as President of the Republic.

### **Field Research Overview**

During my field research in Mexico I conducted interviews with 73 different people, with some interviewed on more than one occasion. I conducted interviews primarily in Mexico City, Chihuahua City, Mérida, and Toluca.<sup>24</sup> I interviewed numerous officials within the PRI. Interviewees included members of current and past national party structures, federal deputies (primarily from my case study states) and federal senators. In my case study states, I interviewed most key members of the state party structure, including the then current party presidents, local Priista deputies, and some leaders in the party structure at the municipal level. I also interviewed several academics and others knowledgeable of changes within the PRI who are considered experts in either Mexican politics or state and local politics.

---

<sup>24</sup> The later three cities are the state capitals of the three states that I chose as case studies. Chihuahua City is the capital of the state of Chihuahua; Mérida is the capital of Yucatan, with Toluca the capital of the state of Mexico.

During my field research I also collected many party documents and numerous other sorts of literature on the PRI and Mexican politics. The Benson Latin American library at the University of Texas-Austin also served as a primary source in obtaining literature before and after my field research period. Beginning in late-2001 and continuing throughout my research period, I followed party activity in several Mexican newspapers (national and local dailies) on a regular basis.<sup>25</sup>

My goal was to reach an understanding and provide an explanation and analysis of the post-2000 reform process in the PRI. To do an adequate job, I focused my research at both the national and sub-national level. Given the history of centralism in the PRI and the Mexican political system, examining the party reform from a national level perspective is a must. Even though sub-national party units have more autonomy in the post-2000 era, there still exists a centralistic mindset and signals from the national level are not taken lightly. Perhaps more important, the PRI, along with Mexico's other political parties, is a national party. Statutes are derived at the national level and with few exceptions state-level PRI party units do not have their own set of regulations that differ or even expand upon those written at the national level.<sup>26</sup> All sub-national PRI units are bound by the statutes produced at the national level. This is in contrast with countries such as the United States where sub-national parties are for the most part

---

<sup>25</sup> Newspapers that were extensively utilized include, at the national level, *El Universal*, *La Jornada*, and *Reforma*. Local dailies utilized include *El Diario de Chihuahua*, *El Heraldo de Chihuahua*, *El Diario* (Ciudad Juárez), *El Sol de Toluca*, *El Diario de Yucatán*, *El Mundo al Día* (Mérida), and *Por Esto* (Mérida).

<sup>26</sup> As is discussed in Chapter 4, the state of Mexico is a partial exception to this rule. In 2005, the PRI in the state of Mexico held a state assembly (the first for a sub-national PRI) that produced a set of statutes. Though these regulations did not override those produced by the PRI at the national level.

autonomous from the national party. Furthermore, many resources are located in Mexico City, including not only the national party headquarters but also the headquarters of PRI-affiliated sectors. Moreover, with the location of the national legislative bodies in the Federal District, I was able to interview federal deputies and senators from my case study states in Mexico City and was able to learn about the party in other sub-national locations as well.

Mexico is, however, a federal republic. Since Mexico's transition to democracy began, state and local governments have assumed more authority. As Rogelio Hernández argues, such increase in authority has crept its way into the party system as well.<sup>27</sup> As already noted, Priista governors have become major power brokers in the party and there is no longer a Priista in Los Pinos that has the informal authority to veto their decisions. The electoral calendar in Mexico is extremely staggered, with numerous sub-national elections occurring each year. Significant variation can be found in the manner in which candidates have been selected within the sub-national PRIs, along with some variation on how each PRI operates more generally. For example, some of the most significant reforms within the PRI were first implemented at the sub-national level. It is also been documented that in certain regions in Mexico there were still "authoritarian enclaves."<sup>28</sup> To achieve a more complete understanding, it made sense to explore reform within the sub-national PRI party units as well. Some reforms can be to a degree examined in all

---

<sup>27</sup> Hernández-Rodríguez, Rogelio. 2003. "The Renovation of Old Institutions: State Governors and the Political Transition in Mexico," *Latin American Politics and Society*, 45:4, 97-127.

<sup>28</sup> Lawson, Chappell. 2000. "Mexico's Unfinished Transition: Democratization and Authoritarian Enclaves,"

*Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos*, 16:2, 267-287.

Mexican states. High profile events such as gubernatorial selection processes are one such example. It is unfeasible, however, to examine in-depth party structures in all 31 Mexican states. As a result, I chose three states for in-depth case study: Chihuahua, the state of Mexico, and Yucatan.

### **Case Study Selection Justification**

**Chihuahua.** Before 2000, the PRI in Chihuahua had a reputation for being a reformist PRI (see Table 1.1).<sup>29</sup> Chihuahua is a state situated on the U.S.-Mexico border. It has comparatively high levels of wealth and industry. Its location close to the U.S. and the boom of the maquiladora industry in the last several decades has also made it a state that has attracted many migrants from other parts of Mexico, especially to Ciudad Juárez. A stereotype also existed in location, as some said its proximity to the U.S. and exposure to U.S. culture made the state more amenable to democratization.

It is not surprising, therefore, that it was in Chihuahua where the PRI experienced some of its first major political defeats. In 1983, it lost the municipal presidency elections to the PAN in fifteen key municipalities, including the state capital and the state's largest city, Ciudad Juárez. In 1992, Chihuahua became only the second state where the PRI lost a gubernatorial election.<sup>30</sup> What the PRI experienced at the national level in 2000 and the adjustment necessary afterwards was a situation that the PRI in Chihuahua had already faced years earlier.<sup>31</sup> Most importantly, in 1998 Chihuahua was the first state where the PRI held an open primary to select its gubernatorial candidate. It

---

<sup>29</sup> Analysis and research in the state of Chihuahua occurred before narco-violence began to overwhelm the state in 2007, especially in Ciudad Juárez.

<sup>30</sup> The PRI's first loss in a gubernatorial election was in Baja California in 1989.

<sup>31</sup> Interview with Graciela Ortiz González, Presidenta del PRI Chihuahuense, Chihuahua City, July 3, 2003.

then became the first state where the PRI regained the governor's office in a state where it had previously lost it. Given this, the PRI in Chihuahua was seen as a vanguard for the PRI all throughout Mexico. The PRI Chihuahuense was accustomed to electoral competition long before PRIs in other states had to even think about the issue. Electoral competition remained high in Chihuahua, with significant variation. For example, the PRI had managed for many years to maintain control of the municipal presidency in Chihuahua City after losing it for a single trienio in the 1980s.<sup>32</sup> On the other hand, the PRI had experienced major problems in Ciudad Juárez, as it lost the municipal presidency in five straight elections between 1992 and 2002. Moreover, between 1998 and 2004 Chihuahua had one of the more high profile Priista governors in Patricio Martínez. He had the reputation for being a very strong, influential governor. The unique history of the PRI in Chihuahua and the political variation that exists in the state makes it an ideal case to provide insights on reform within the PRI.

**The state of Mexico.** The state of Mexico is the nation's most populous state. It is also the wealthiest and most industrial state in Mexico, though the wealth distribution is unequal and there are large patches of rural areas in the states. It surrounds the Federal District on three sides, with a large share of the state's population essentially residing in suburbs of Mexico City. These areas adjacent to Mexico City are areas of high migration from other parts of Mexico. Outside of these suburbs of Mexico City and the state capital of Toluca, the state is dotted with small towns and rural areas. Given these socio-

---

<sup>32</sup> Trienio is the Spanish term that is used to describe the three year terms that municipal presidents in Mexico serve.

demographic conditions, many say that the state of Mexico is a politically a bellwether state or in other words a political laboratory.<sup>33</sup> Often what happens in the state of Mexico may predict what may happen nationally. Many in the PRI in the state of Mexico also argue that the party structure in the state similarly serves as a bellwether for other state-level PRIs.<sup>34</sup>

The reputation of the PRI in the state of Mexico in regard to its reformist nature is somewhat mixed (see Table 1.1). The state of Mexico is not seen as an authoritarian enclave, but it was home to a highly influential (but somewhat mythical) group of Priista politicians called the Grupo Atlacomulco. Led historically by the extremely influential Carlos Hank González, it is said that this group essentially made the decisions in the PRI Mexiquense<sup>35</sup> and was a powerful force in the PRI nationally. Also, the state of Mexico has had since 2000 some of the most prominent Priista governors, including Arturo Montiel Rojas and Enrique Peña Nieto. Montiel (1999-2005) had presidential ambitions and, as a result, relations between the PRI Mexiquense and the national party structure were strained when Roberto Madrazo controlled the CEN presidency. Peña Nieto (2005-2011) became the leading contender for the PRI's presidential nomination in 2012 early on. He of course obtained the nomination and won the presidency in July of that year. Despite the presence of such powerful politicians, the PRI Mexiquense has initiated some interesting reforms, with some later copied by other party units. Though the PRI has

---

<sup>33</sup> Interview with Cesar Camacho Quiroz, Senator and ex-Governor of the state of Mexico, Mexico City, March 14, 2003.

<sup>34</sup> Interview with Héctor Karim Carvallo Delfín, Secretario Particular del Instituto de Capacitación y Desarrollo Político (ICADEP) Filial Estado de México, Toluca, May 26, 2003.

<sup>35</sup> A *Mexiquense* is someone or something from the state of Mexico.

never lost the governor's office in the state, it does face significant competition from both the left and right, especially in the areas surrounding the Federal District. Given its importance and status as a bellwether, the state of Mexico is almost a mandatory inclusion as a case study.

**Yucatan.** Yucatan's socio-demographic characteristics are much different than my other two case study states. It is a southern state that is comparatively poor and that has a large indigenous population. It could be considered one of those states that some scholars have labeled an authoritarian enclave. Patron-client relationships and the like traditionally have not been uncommon to find in Yucatan. There also exists a significant urban-rural split in the state, with approximately 40% of the state's population residing in the capital Mérida.

The PRI Yucateco has historically not been characterized as a reformist PRI (see Table 1.1). On the contrary, it has been seen as a cacique-led PRI.<sup>36</sup> For decades the PRI Yucateco's strongman was Victor Cervera Pacheco, who had the distinction of serving as the state's governor on two different occasions.<sup>37</sup> During the 1990s, the PRI in Yucatan started to decline. It lost the municipal presidency in Mérida in 1990 and was unable to regain control for twenty years. Though the PRI had managed to stay strong outside of Mérida, in 2001 it lost control of the governor's office. After that loss, the PRI Yucateco declined a bit further in electoral strength. It did, however, regain control of the governor's office in 2007. There was little reform in the PRI Yucateco during the period

---

<sup>36</sup> *Cacique* is a term used to describe a political boss or patron in the more indigenous areas of Mexico.

<sup>37</sup> Victor Cervera Pacheco was the interim governor of Yucatan from 1984 to 1988. Since he was not an elected governor, he was not bound by the no-reelection clause in the Mexican Constitution. He was elected in his own right in 1995, and served as the governor of Yucatan until 2001.

that Cervera controlled the party. After 2001, its reform record has been mixed. Yucatan serves as a good inclusion for in-depth study primarily due to its reputation as a more traditionalist PRI.

**Table 1.1**  
**Case Study State Information**

	<b>Party Reputation (2000-2007)</b>	<b>Party's Political Experience<sup>38</sup></b>	<b>Location</b>
Chihuahua	Reformist	Lost state in 1992. Won it back in 1998 and maintained control in 2004	North
Mexico	Mixed	Never lost	Central
Yucatan	Traditional	Lost state for the first time in 2001. Won it back in 2007	Southeast

### **Framework within the Literature**

The PRI was studied substantially during its hegemonic heyday. As the PRI's electoral fortunes began to decline, many questioned whether the PRI would remain a viable party. When comparing the PRI to the former communist parties of Eastern Europe, José Antonio Crespo questioned whether the PRI had a future, and whether this party that was born to power could adapt to new circumstances. He seemed to be inclined to doubt it.<sup>39</sup> Though not as pessimistic, Joy Langston foresaw that the PRI would suffer collective action problems if it lost the national presidency, as the top-down impositions that once forced PRI politicians to cooperate would no longer exist.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> The party's political experience column only refers to gubernatorial elections in that state.

<sup>39</sup> Crespo, José Antonio. 1998. *¿Tiene Futuro el PRI?* Mexico D.F.: Grijalbo.

<sup>40</sup> Langston, Joy. 2003. "Rising from the Ashes? Reorganizing and Unifying PRI's State Party Organizations After Electoral Defeat," *Comparative Political Studies*. 36:3. 293-318.

Priistas that were once forced to cooperate and maintain discipline would have more freedom to act on their own, perhaps to the detriment of the party's future.

The PRI in its hegemonic period, however, was comparatively flexible. Dale Story's examination of the hegemonic PRI illustrated how the party was flexible in various ways. One such example of its flexibility is that despite its official revolutionary and nationalist ideology, the PRI was in reality a highly pragmatic party that was able to accommodate numerous modes of thought.<sup>41</sup> In the capacity of governing, Burgess and Levitsky speak of a PRI that had a high adaptive capacity.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, Rogelio Hernández argues that the PRI's adaptive capacity has not only allowed it to change and survive, but to continue winning elections.<sup>43</sup> It is not surprising, therefore, that the PRI has been able to adapt to the reality that its traditional primary candidate selector no longer exists. During the 1990s, furthermore, the PRI, to a degree, moved away from a situation in which the president and/or governors played a dominant role in selecting candidates. So when the President of the Republic disappeared from the picture, the party had some experience to bank on and an adaptive capacity to move forward.

During the 1990s, Joy Langston illustrates how party actors who were once denied power to influence decision-making within the party were able to reform party

---

<sup>41</sup> Story, Dale. 1986. The Mexican Ruling Party: Stability and Authority. New York: Praeger.

<sup>42</sup> Burgess, Katrina and Steven Levitsky. 2003. "Explaining Populist Party Adaptation in Latin America: Environmental and Organizational Determinants of Party Change in Argentina, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela," Comparative Political Studies, 36:8, 881-911.

<sup>43</sup> Hernández Rodríguez, Rogelio. 1998. "The Partido Revolucionario Institucional," in Governing Mexico: Political Parties and Elections. Monica Serrano (ed.) The Institute of Latin American Studies, University of London.

statutes to partially rectify this situation, particularly in regard to candidate selection.<sup>44</sup> At times Mexican presidents were able to overcome these new limitations on their power, but at other times they were not. However, a regulatory framework to select candidates outside traditional top-down methods began to be implemented before the PRI lost national power. Even if a president or governor took the lead role in selecting a PRI candidate for public office, during the 1990s (to some extent) party rules needed to be taken into consideration. Such a reality still impacts the post-2000 PRI, as though party leaders and governors have at times been able to maneuver their way around party statutes, they cannot ignore them entirely. In the post-hegemonic PRI, the reality is that a written framework does exist for candidate selection.

In his analysis of the post-2000 PRI, Tun-jen Cheng illustrates how the PRI has adapted to new circumstances and the role that political entrepreneurship has played in the process. In particular, he illustrates the manner in which CEN president Roberto Madrazo used the party structure to further his own political ambitions.<sup>45</sup> Such an argument is important to understanding candidate selection in the post-2000 PRI. As Langston argues, rules do matter, but political entrepreneurship plays a role in which mechanisms are selected and in whether a route will be chosen that allows the party to bypass the official rules. Lastly, Rogelio Hernández shows how the Mexican governor has become more powerful in a more democratic Mexico. The governors always had significant power on paper, but were somewhat subordinate to the president in reality. In

---

<sup>44</sup> Langston, Joy. 2001. "Why Rules Matter: Changes in Candidate Selection in Mexico's PRI, 1988-2000," *Journal of Latin American Studies*. 33: 485-511.

<sup>45</sup> Cheng, Tun-jen. 2008. "Embracing Defeat: The KMT and the PRI After 2000," in Joseph Wong and Edward Freidman (eds.) *Political Transitions in Dominant Party Systems*. New York: Routledge.

post-2000 Mexico, governors have become among the most significant political players in Mexico. Such reality has also extended itself to the party system within the PRI.<sup>46</sup> PRI governors have become some of the most important political entrepreneurs that exist within the party, a reality that has a significant impact on candidate selection. I might perhaps go one step further and say that, in certain cases, PRI governors go beyond being political entrepreneurs. Often times they have assumed the all-powerful role that the President of the Republic once played in the party structure, but within their respective states.

The realities of electoral competition and the loss of the figure of the national president have forced the PRI to reform its candidate selection methods. Official party statutes exist and are important, but the ambitions of party leaders and electoral realities continue to influence the direction that such reform takes.

In this introductory chapter I set the stage for this thesis. I described how the PRI lost national power and some of the consequences of that loss for the party. I laid out my research questions and discussed the puzzles involving candidate selection reform in the PRI. I explained how I went about designing this project. The PRI experimented quite a bit with candidate selection between 2000 and 2006. The party initially thought letting the militancy and Mexican society choose its candidates would enhance the party's

---

<sup>46</sup> Hernández Rodríguez, Rogelio. 2003. "The Renovation of Old Institutions: State Governors and the Political Transition in Mexico," *Latin American Politics and Society*, 45:4, 97-127

legitimacy. It later concluded that it fostered division instead. The next chapter explores how candidate selection reform and experimentation played out at the national level.

## **Chapter 2 – Candidate Selection at the National Level**

About a year after it handed over power to the Partido Acción Nacional (PAN) in 2000, the PRI reformed its candidate selection statutes at its 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly. Less than two years later, the statutes were implemented to select candidates for the 2003 mid-term elections. This chapter first explores the norms of candidate selection in the PRI prior to 2000 and then examines candidate selection reform at the national level leading up to the 2003 mid-terms. The processes and consequences turned out to be a bit more complicated than many imagined they would be.

### **Candidate Selection Prior to 2000**

To understand the changes that occurred after the PRI lost national power in 2000, I first must briefly discuss candidate selection norms of the hegemonic PRI. As discussed above, the President of the Republic traditionally played the role of the “chief candidate selector.” The Mexican president did not select every candidate for public office personally, but he was the final arbitrator of the process. Since loyalty to the president was a key facet of system and most power flowed through him, candidate selection was important, as Mexico in theory had separation of powers. Though the PRI’s traditional sectors, state governors, and regional leaders were allowed to nominate congressional candidates, all nominations were subject to presidential approval, with the president actually nominating about 20 percent of the candidates himself.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Smith, Peter. 1979. Labyrinths of Power: Political Recruitment in Twentieth Century Mexico. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

In the Mexican Chamber of Deputies, there is no direct reelection, so a deputy could not establish an independent power base. He or she was reliant on the president for his/her next post in government. Though the president was the final arbitrator of who would or would not become a deputy, the process was traditionally one that involved negotiation and consultation. There were many groups under the PRI's tent and in some fashion they had to be kept happy. Awarding posts in the Chamber of Deputies or in the Senate was a way to keep various key actors content within the system. The PRI's traditional sectors were historically awarded a quota of deputy slots. Certain electoral districts were also historically thought of as belonging to a specific sector, and in these districts the sector leaders were influential in selecting the candidate. A slot in the Mexican Senate was often the reward for long term loyalty to the party. Loyalty and friendship to the president and/or other party elites such as state governors and the like were traditionally influential factors in deciding who the party nominated to run for public office.

PRI governors and other regional elites played a more substantial role in selecting candidates for state congress and the municipal presidencies. Though formally given independent powers by the Mexican Constitution, Mexican governors were subordinate to the President of the Republic during the heyday of the PRI's hegemony. Since state governors were perhaps among the most important formally elected politicians, the President of the Republic traditionally played the key role in deciding who would become the PRI nominee. The president's informal powers were so great in this regard that he

could also remove a governor from office if he deemed it necessary.<sup>48</sup> The president would then informally appoint another person to the post who would then be rubber stamped by the state legislature.<sup>49</sup> The Mexican president also played a role at times in selecting candidates for important municipal presidencies. Most sub-national nominations, however, were usually left to the discretion of the Priista governor and other regional strongmen.

The most significant power that the Mexican president traditionally held in regard to candidate selection was the ability to select his own successor. In what was commonly known as the “*dedazo*,” the President of the Republic selected the PRI’s nominee to be the next Mexican president.<sup>50</sup> Since the PRI always emerged victorious, this ability was tantamount to naming his successor. Pre-candidates would emerge, usually among people who had been members of the president’s cabinet, and they would try to curry the president’s favor. After consulting numerous party elites, the president would eventually choose from among them. Given the powers held by the Mexican president, many Priistas had a significant stake in the decision. The *dedazo* was perhaps considered the president’s greatest power.

The *dedazo*, however, was not used arbitrarily. As stated, the president did consult important party elites, such as the head of the PRI’s traditional sectors and the

---

<sup>48</sup> Amezcua, Adriana and Juan E. Pardinias. 1997. Todos Los Gobernadores del Presidente: Cuando el Dedo de Uno Aplasta el Voto Popular. Mexico D.F.: Grijalbo.

<sup>49</sup> Though each Mexican president since the formation of the PRI has removed state governors from office for various reasons, this phenomenon was particularly widespread during the sexenio of Carlos Salinas de Gortari (1988-1994) when 17 governors did not end up serving their full terms in office.

<sup>50</sup> For more information on this process see Jorge Castañeda’s (2000) Perpetuating Power: How Mexican Presidents Were Chosen. New York: The New Press.

like. In later days, pre-candidates took on a quasi-official status, making presentations to the Mexican Congress and expressing their policy views at forums, etc.<sup>51</sup> Despite the fact that the President of the Republic personally made the final decision, in what was labeled “the swinging of the pendulum,” the person chosen to be the PRI’s candidate often held a political ideology that was different from the president who chose him. In this manner, the different ideological factions within the PRI were kept content.<sup>52</sup> In fact, the dedazo method of selecting the PRI’s presidential candidate really started to become problematic for the party when it became apparent in 1987 that the pendulum was not going to swing back to the left.

Prior to 2000, there were attempts to “democratize” candidate selection within the PRI. These efforts usually did not stand the test of time, but they did exist. One such effort was launched when Carlos Madrazo was party president during 1964-65. Appointed CEN president by Gustavo Díaz Ordaz in 1964, Madrazo designed a program that was intended to bring more internal democracy to the PRI, especially in regard to candidate selection for municipal presidencies. Madrazo’s plan set out to give more power to party militants and, to a degree, shift power away from party bosses at the sub-national level. In 1965, the PRI held a series of party primaries to its select candidates for the various municipal presidencies in play that year. These primaries were not popular among the PRI elites in the states affected. For example, in Sinaloa, the governor already had in mind who he wanted to place in the candidacy slots. The primaries took

---

<sup>51</sup> Camp, Roderic Ai. 1999. Politics in Mexico: The Decline of Authoritarianism. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<sup>52</sup> Story, Dale. 1986. The Mexican Ruling Party: Stability and Authority. New York: Praeger.

place, but there were accusations of fraud after the governor's candidates emerged victorious, which then led to infighting between Madrazo and Sinaloa's Sánchez Celis.<sup>53</sup> The controversy in Sinaloa marked the end of such reform and Madrazo's plans were not implemented any further. Moreover, Madrazo was soon removed from his post as CEN president in part because of the discontent among PRI elites at the sub-national level with the changes that he was trying to enact.<sup>54</sup>

Starting in the 1980s, certain groups within the PRI became disenchanted with candidate selection within the party, particularly at the highest levels. In 1987, Cuauhtémoc Cardenas, the former Priista governor of Michoacan and son of legendary former President Lázaro Cardenas, bolted from the PRI and ran for the presidency as the candidate of a leftist coalition in part due to alienation over the party's closed method of selecting its presidential candidate. As mentioned earlier, it became obvious that the pendulum was not going to swing to the left. Also, the "políticos," those Priistas who served primarily in elective office or in the party structure, had increasingly been denied access to the highest posts in government and were beginning to become somewhat frustrated. By the late-1980s, the technocrats within the PRI had come to dominate the executive branch of government.<sup>55</sup>

Given technocratic dominance, at the PRI's 17<sup>th</sup> National Assembly in 1996 the políticos took revenge. The party enacted requirements that its presidential candidate

---

<sup>53</sup> Lomelí Vanegas, Leonardo. 2000 "La Presidencia de Carlos A. Madrazo," in El Partido de la Revolución: Institución y conflicto (1928-1999). Miguel González Compean and Leonardo Lomelí (eds.). Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

<sup>54</sup> Story, Dale. 1986. The Mexican Ruling Party: Stability and Authority. New York: Praeger.

<sup>55</sup> Centeno, Miguel Angel. 1994. Democracy Within Reason: Technocratic Revolution in Mexico. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

have held prior elective office. The reason for this new party statute was the aforementioned frustration of the party's political wing because it was continuously passed over for the party's presidential nomination, among other important positions within government. Also, President Ernesto Zedillo was an accidental president, having been nominated the PRI's candidate after the murder of original candidate Luis Donaldo Colosio. Having come to the presidency with little to no experience with the party apparatus, he vowed that he would maintain a healthy distance from the party, something very untraditional for Mexican presidents of Priista extraction. Given the circumstances of his presidency, Zedillo was informally a degree weaker than his predecessors, thus allowing the *politicos* to challenge his authority at times.

Many of the rules that governed candidate selection in the PRI prior to 2000 were informal in nature. The enactment of rules that were meant to limit the autonomy of the President of the Republic at the 17<sup>th</sup> National Assembly led some scholars to argue that formal rules now mattered more within the PRI.<sup>56</sup> As Langston demonstrates during the 1990s, it was harder for President Zedillo to sidestep party statutes than was the case for his predecessor, Carlos Salinas de Gortari.

### **The 1999 Presidential Primary**

It was in 1999, however, that the PRI enacted its most high profile reform in the presidential candidate selection process, and perhaps its most important reform up to that point. When it came time to select the PRI's nominee for president in 2000, President

---

<sup>56</sup> Langston, Joy. 2001. "Why Rules Matter: Changes in Candidate Selection in Mexico's PRI, 1988-2000," Journal of Latin American Studies: 33: 485-511.

Zedillo decided that he would cut off his finger, so to speak, and not use the infamous *dedazo* to choose the party's nominee.<sup>57</sup> In place of the *dedazo*, the PRI used an open party primary. Other than what might have been Zedillo's personal reasons for not trying to impose a candidate, the PRI decided to use an open selection process in an attempt to polish its undemocratic image, with the *dedazo* being a prime example of undemocratic practices within the party. By utilizing an open primary, perhaps the PRI would not be seen as a corrupt party dominated by the national president and local *caciques*. Priistas felt that its candidate would receive a degree of societal legitimacy that would then help lead the PRI to victory in 2000.

This was seen as necessary because the PRI had been losing electoral strength throughout the course of the 1990s. It had lost a handful of gubernatorial elections and had lost most of the municipal presidency elections in Mexico's largest urban areas. In 1997, the PRI not only lost the first ever mayoral elections in Mexico City, but it also lost its majority in the Chamber of Deputies. As discussed in-depth below, the party had successfully employed an open primary in Chihuahua to help it win back the gubernatorial office in that state that had been lost to the PAN six years earlier. The PRI hoped that the success in Chihuahua would repeat itself at the national level.

The presidential primary was held in November 1999. Since a Priista membership list did not really exist, voting was open to all Mexicans with voting credentials issued by the Federal Elections Institute (IFE). Four candidates ran in the

---

<sup>57</sup> Shirk, David A. 2005. Mexico's New Politics: The PAN and Democratic Change. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

primary: Francisco Labastida, Roberto Madrazo, Manuel Bartlett, and Humberto Roque. The race, however, came down to two candidates: Labastida and Madrazo. Critics claimed that the open primary was a *dedazo* in disguise because out of all the pre-candidates, Labastida was the closest to Zedillo. Under the old system, the interior minister usually was best positioned to receive the *dedazo* from the president. It was thought that Priistas would be looking for a signal from President Zedillo, and if it appeared that he supported a certain candidate, such assumptions would give that candidate an unfair advantage over the others. Since Labastida was the only pre-candidate to have served in Zedillo's cabinet, it was assumed that he was Zedillo's preferred or "unofficial" candidate.<sup>58</sup> Furthermore, the winner was determined not by who obtained the most overall votes, but by who won more votes in each of Mexico's 300 congressional districts. Critics pointed out that a rule as such did not serve to benefit the candidate that could appeal to the most voters, but to one whose support was more geographically dispersed. Since Labastida had served as interior minister, he was more known throughout the republic. The rules, therefore, gave Labastida an added advantage.

Roberto Madrazo, on the other hand, was the candidate on the worst terms with President Zedillo. Madrazo had been governor of the state of Tabasco, elected in 1994. Madrazo's victory was tainted with accusations that he violated electoral regulations. Zedillo tried to prevent Madrazo from taking office, but Madrazo resisted the president's pressure to step aside. Since that time, relations between Zedillo and Madrazo had been

---

<sup>58</sup> Interview with Laura Ocampo Gutiérrez, Coordinadora de Mujeres del Movimiento Territorial (PRI), Mexico City, February 6, 2003.

less than cordial. During the primary, Madrazo tried to paint Labastida as Zedillo's preferred candidate, and a vote for him (Madrazo) would be a vote that would help crush the old system of presidential preference in selecting the party's presidential candidate. In the end, Labastida won the primary easily; as he carried 272 of the 300 electoral districts.

Despite speculation as to whether Zedillo had a preferred candidate, it is clear that the November 1999 primary represented a major candidate selection reform for the PRI. It is unclear whether the decision to have a primary was made solely to make the PRI more competitive in the 2000 election, or whether Zedillo's lack of desire to use the *dedazo* played more of a role. The PRI was aware that it would have a harder time winning in 2000, but victory was still expected. By utilizing a primary for candidate selection, the PRI felt that its nominee would go into the campaign with added legitimacy, and that this added legitimacy would help ensure victory. The major sub-national elections that the PRI lost between 1995 and 2000 could point to a possibility that the PRI was feeling the heat of competition, but the PRI's expectation of victory in 2000 could also signify that the party simply did not want to take any chances. The PRI did get a boost in the polls after the primary was held, but in the end it went down to defeat in 2000. Some in the PRI claim, including Labastida himself, that the divisiveness of the primary hurt him in the end. However, no major defections occurred because of the primary, and other studies have demonstrated that the primary was not a determining

factor in the PRI's 2000 loss.<sup>59</sup> The experience did serve as a lesson to the party: more democratic forms of candidate selection do not guarantee the party victory and they may not even make victory more likely.

### **Candidate Selection Reforms at the 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly**

The whole party structure was in shock after the PRI lost the presidency. Usually political parties are formed to seek power. The PRI was formed in 1929 to wield power, so it found itself in the totally unfamiliar position of an opposition party. Since the party's primary candidate selector and arbitrator was no longer around, the PRI had no other choice but to reform the manner in which it selected its candidates. Other strong actors could exert authority following the loss, and in fact Priista governors, leaders of the PRI's National Executive Committee (CEN), and even congressional leaders to some degree all made such attempts, but the reality of the situation is that none of these actors could come close to filling the void. Battles for power and influence between the leaders of the PRI CEN and the governors of Priista extraction have guided the direction that candidate selection has taken in the post-2000 PRI.

Party leaders engaged in a good deal of reflection after July 2000.<sup>60</sup> At this time, some people saw the PRI's tomb waiting to be filled.<sup>61</sup> General conclusions reached were that often candidates selected by the PRI to run for public office were not reflective

---

<sup>59</sup> McCann, James A. 2004. "Primary Priming," in Mexico's Pivotal Democratic Election: Candidates, Voters, and the Presidential Campaign of 2000, eds. Jorge I. Domínguez and Chappell Lawson. Stanford and La Jolla, CA: Stanford University Press and the Center for U.S.-Mexico Studies, UCSD.

<sup>60</sup> Interview with Samuel Aguilar Solís, Secretario Técnico de la Presidencia (PRI CEN), Mexico City, February 11, 2003.

<sup>61</sup> Interview with Federico Madrazo, Subsecretario de Organización de la Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Populares (CNOP), Mexico City, February 18, 2003.

of Mexican society. Political connections, whether through friendship or loyalty to the president, governors or other PRI elites often mattered more than candidate appeal or qualifications for the job. The PRI's traditional sectors were still awarded slots, though the traditional quota system had been done away with by 2000.

The first major act of reform for the PRI occurred with the party's 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly, which occurred in November 2001. At this assembly, the PRI re-wrote its party statutes. The party was still reeling from losing the national presidency, and it had lost most of the important sub-national elections that followed.<sup>62</sup> It was a demoralized party that gathered at the assembly, and many argue that the assembly represented a catharsis for the PRI.<sup>63</sup> Given the atmosphere, many of the proposed changes may not have been well thought through, but they represented the first time such an undertaking occurred without the guidance of the national president. One could say that the 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly represented the PRI's emergence as a truly independent political party.

A hope among some was that the 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly would put an end to the un-written rules that governed party activity in the past, especially in regard to candidate selection.<sup>64</sup> New party statutes (Article 181 governs the methods) allow for three methods of candidate selection.<sup>65</sup> First, candidates can be directly selected in a party

---

<sup>62</sup> After July 2000, the PRI lost gubernatorial elections in Chiapas (2000), Jalisco (2000), Yucatan (May 2001), and Baja California (July 2001). The PRI won in the state of Tabasco (2000).

<sup>63</sup> Interview with Carlos Reta Martinez, Secretario General Adjunto (Secretary General's office of the CEN), Mexico City, February 26, 2003.

<sup>64</sup> Interview with Juan Salgado Brito, Secretario de Organización de la Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Populares (CNOP), Mexico City, February 19, 2003.

<sup>65</sup> Partido Revolucionario Institucional, Documentos Básicos. Edición Septiembre 2002.

primary.<sup>66</sup> Participation can be limited to those listed on the party register, or the primary can be opened up to PRI sympathizers as well.<sup>67</sup> Second, a candidate can be selected by a delegate convention. If the PRI uses a delegate convention to select candidates, 50 percent of the delegates must be elected, and the other 50 percent can include party leaders and sector representatives of various sorts. Third, indigenous communities can select candidates for municipal presidency only through “uses and customs,” meaning by utilizing methods that are traditional to those communities.<sup>68</sup>

Different methods were allowed for in order to give the party some flexibility in candidate selection, so that the particular method chosen would match the individual circumstance of each election. A message that the PRI was trying to send out through these new statutes was that the party would no longer employ the “dedazo” when selecting candidates. The new methods were thought to be more democratic in nature. In some fashion, actual party members (and not party elites) were to select future Priista candidates. Put in the words of some Priistas, candidate selection was to be put back into the hands of the legitimate owners of the party, namely its militancy. Part of the thinking behind these new regulations was also that the PRI had lost legitimacy with Mexican society, and that more open methods of candidate selection would help the PRI regain the legitimacy that it lost and would be more likely to win future elections.

---

<sup>66</sup> These party primaries are usually referred to as a “consulta a la base” in Spanish.

<sup>67</sup> Since no official “padrón Priista” (or PRI party voting register) exists, when the party uses a party primary, participation is usually opened up to anyone that has an IFE credential.

<sup>68</sup> Interview with Victor Manuel Saucedo Perdomo, Coordinador de Legalidad y Transparencia en la Comisión Nacional de Procesos Internos (PRI), Mexico City, February 20, 2003.

**Open Primary.** More than with any other method of candidate selection allowed for under 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly statutes, Priistas thought that using the open party primary could solve many of its problems with candidate selection. First, if a party primary were used, it would be harder for critics to argue that a “dedazo” was used to select the candidate, even if there happened to be a Priista governor or municipal president in that particular locale. Since the general populace selected the candidate, he/she would more likely be representative of that population, unlike candidates imposed from above. Those who voted for the candidate in the primary would be more likely to vote for the candidate again in the general election. Generally, the PRI’s candidate would be more legitimate in societal eyes. If the candidate that the PRI offers was seen as legitimate, by extension so would the party itself. The loss of such legitimacy with the Mexican people was what many Priistas thought led to its decline in the 1980s and 1990s and its defeat in 2000.

However, some of the optimism of the 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly about a party primary came up against a hard fact of life: its use did not help the party win in 2000.<sup>69</sup> As has been known in other countries, a party primary does not always produce the candidate with the best chance of winning in the general election. Furthermore, since participation in PRI party primaries was open to any registered voter, non-Priistas could influence the vote, perhaps to the detriment of the party.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Interview with Eric Rubio Barthell, Senador por Yucatan, Mexico City, April 2, 2003.

<sup>70</sup> Interview with Canek Vázquez Góngora, Secretario General por la Juventud Popular Revolucionaria Comité Ejecutivo Nacional del PRI, Mexico City, February 13, 2003.

In reality, however, what plagued the PRI the most with the use of the party primary were defections and divisions. Such divisions can perhaps be explained through a number of factors. First, there are now more exit options for internal losers. When the PRI was the only game in town, to defect from the party after not being chosen as the party's candidate meant the end of one's political career. With the emergence of opposition parties and the fact that these parties could actually win, the exit option was a viable alternative for disgruntled Priistas. Furthermore, with the PRI no longer controlling the executive branch at the national level and in many sub-national locales, the party had fewer resources to placate losers in the internal process, making it more likely that the losers would defect.

An open party primary, moreover, is conducted to a certain degree out in the open. If divisions exist in the party, they are more likely to be displayed to the public when the party utilizes an open primary. When these internal party fights occur in the public realm, they are more likely to result in hard feelings and discontent. Losers of these internal party fights are then more likely to defect after the primary is over. As I discuss below, quite frequently when the PRI employed an open primary to select its gubernatorial candidate, losers defected to an opposition party. Often these defectors garnered the nomination of another party and ended up winning in the general election. These divisions are one of the two major reasons why the PRI has begun turning away from using the open primary.

Despite the fact that a party primary is more open in nature, it is still difficult to defeat a candidate that has unofficial backing from a Priista governor or municipal

president. Such circumstances have led the PRI in some sub-national locales to utilize other methods. As is the case in almost any political setting, those candidates with more money and party connections are more likely to win a primary, especially in Mexico, where campaigning is limited to a short period of time. Lastly, a party primary is the method of selection that costs the most money to hold. Now that the PRI is no longer in power at the national level, its resources are more limited. In 2003, the party was fined quite substantially by the Federal Electoral Institute (IFE) as a result of its role in the Pemexgate scandal.<sup>71</sup> Since the fine significantly affected the PRI's finances, some argue that the party should avoid party primaries when selecting candidates due to their higher costs.

**Delegate Convention.** Selecting candidates through use of a delegate convention also has its critics and supporters. Critics claim that it is less democratic and more prone to control by party elites, especially the governor if the state is in PRI hands. Since party elites constitute many of the delegates, it is even more difficult to defeat a candidate who is unofficially backed by the governor or municipal president. Some go as far as saying that it is virtually impossible to defeat a candidate that is unofficially backed by a Priista governor at a delegate convention.<sup>72</sup> In certain instances, pre-selected candidates are merely ratified by the convention. On the other hand, others argue that a delegate convention is just as democratic as a primary because many of the delegates are elected,

---

<sup>71</sup> In 2003, IFE fined the PRI substantially as a result of the Labastida campaign receiving illegal donations from the Pemex worker's union in 2000.

<sup>72</sup> Interview with Canek Vázquez Góngora, Secretario General por la Juventud Popular Revolucionaria Comité Ejecutivo Nacional del PRI, Mexico City, February 13, 2003.

with statutes calling for at least 50 percent to be selected in such a manner.<sup>73</sup> Since only those more identified with the party participate, the selected candidate is even more likely to be reflective of the militancy of the party.

The use of the delegate convention seems to be the preferred method of candidate selection in states governed by Priistas, with the governor's perceived favored candidate usually emerging victorious. It also appears to be the case that fewer losers defect from the party afterwards. Perhaps since divisions do not become as public, the Priista governor and other elites are able to placate the losers before they are compelled to defect. Also, the party may employ this method when it is a clear consensus behind a certain candidate or a certain candidate is more likely to emerge victorious.

**Unity Candidate.** Another unofficial method of candidate selection in the post-2000 PRI is that of the party nominating a "unity candidate." If there is only one pre-candidate for a given post prior to onset of the selection process, that candidate will be the PRI's candidate. Also, if other pre-candidates withdraw prior to a scheduled primary or delegate assembly, a unity candidate will be named. Proponents of this method argue that if the party has a unity candidate, divisions and defections are less likely to occur. Unity candidates are more likely to emerge in states that are governed by Priistas, as the governor has the clout to arrange the political agreements necessary to make it happen. If it is clear that a certain candidate is going to win in the internal process or is the candidate that is strongly preferred by the governor, other pre-candidates may step aside, but they

---

<sup>73</sup> Interview with Víctor Manuel Saucedo Perdomo, Coordinador de Legalidad y Transparencia en la Comisión Nacional de Procesos Internos (PRI), Mexico City, February 20, 2003.

often do so with the anticipation that they may receive some other post as compensation. If the candidacy in question is gubernatorial, perhaps the pre-candidates who withdraw to allow a unity candidacy will expect a post in the future administration if the PRI wins. Again, unity candidates are more likely to occur in PRI governed states or in state where a Priista victory is likely. It is in these states that more resources exist to placate the pre-candidates that withdraw. On the other hand, one could argue that a unity candidate amounts to little more than a *dedazo*. In PRI governed states, a unity candidate is usually one who is close to the governor. In non-PRI governed states, he is often one associated with party leadership at the national level.

### **Candidate Selection in the 2003 Mid-Term Elections**

For national level posts, the PRI's first chance to implement its candidate selection reforms occurred with the mid-term elections in July 2003.<sup>74</sup> Mexico has a mixed system of congressional representation in the lower house, part district-based representation and part proportional representation.<sup>75</sup> Party statutes addressed the candidates that the party offered for the 300 district-based slots. It was the party's initial intention to select its district-based congressional candidates using the open party primary method. It was still felt at this point that an open primary could provide the party's candidates with badly needed societal legitimacy. Many primaries were in-fact held, but

---

<sup>74</sup> The July 2003 mid-term congressional elections were only for slots in the Chamber of Deputies (The Mexican Congress's lower house). Mexican senators serve 6-year terms and are elected in conjunction with the President of the Republic.

<sup>75</sup> Mexico's Chamber of Deputies has 500 members. Three hundred of the members are elected by district, with the other 200 divided out to the parties based on proportions of the vote share obtained.

other circumstances also influenced candidate selection and turned out to allow the PRI to avoid using the open party primary in all cases.

### **Alliance with the PVEM**

The first factor that allowed the PRI to circumvent party statutes in selecting some of its candidates for the July 2003 mid-term elections was a partial electoral alliance. Since 2000, electoral alliances between large and small parties have become common. In 2000, the PRI's major competitors, the Partido Acción Nacional (PAN) and the Partido de la Revolución Democrática (PRD), both formed electoral alliances with smaller political parties. In 2003, the PRI decided to form an electoral alliance as well. Following the example of the PRI in the state of Mexico,<sup>76</sup> the PRI at the national level decided to enter into a partial electoral alliance with the Partido Verde Ecologista de México (PVEM). Out of a total of three hundred district seats nationally, the PRI-PVEM alliance (La Alianza para Todos) offered candidates for ninety-seven.

The new PRI statutes written at the 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly allowed for electoral alliances. Articles seven through nine of these statutes address alliances.<sup>77</sup> If the PRI enters into an electoral alliance, then the mechanisms for candidate selection expressed in the statutes are not applicable. The logic behind dismissing the statutes was that the PRI cannot impose its regulations on the party with which it is allying. The mechanism for candidate selection is therefore negotiated between the different parties involved. In regard to the PRI-PVEM alliance in 2003, the PVEM was awarded a certain vote share

---

<sup>76</sup> For local elections in March 2003, the PRI in the state of Mexico entered into an alliance with the PVEM. This represented the first PRI entity to enter into an electoral alliance after 2000. The circumstances behind this alliance is discussed below.

<sup>77</sup> Partido Revolucionario Institucional, Documentos Básicos. Edición Septiembre 2002.

that was later translated into congressional seats through proportional representation. Most of the candidates (ninety-two of ninety-seven) were Priistas.<sup>78</sup> As a result of the alliance, party leaders were able to appoint unity candidates in these ninety-two districts, thus avoiding a statutory need to have a primary or delegate convention.

The ninety-seven districts in which the PRI entered into coalition with the PVEM were negotiated by the PRI's National Executive Committee (CEN). The criteria on which districts would be alliance districts were based seemingly on electoral calculations. Supposedly, districts in which the PRI might benefit from the alliance were chosen. These included districts where the PRI was running very close with its opposition (primarily the PAN) or districts where the PRI had little chance of winning. Those districts in which the PRI felt it could win on its own or ones where the PVEM saw no benefit in running with the PRI were not included. Districts in eleven states were included as part of the alliance.<sup>79</sup> Of these eleven states, only five were PRI governed states. Five of the six states holding coinciding gubernatorial elections were included. All these states were either ones where the PRI had lost in the past (Nuevo Leon and Queretaro) or ones in which it seemed that the election would be very close (Campeche, San Luis Potosi, and Sonora). The districts chosen to be included in the alliance suggest that the PRI was more likely to enact reforms of various sorts (in this case entering into alliance) for reasons of electoral strength, either because it needed the few percentage

---

<sup>78</sup> Claudia Guerrero. "Consuman PRI-PVEM Alianza con Riesgos," *Reforma*. 2 March 2003, 6A.

<sup>79</sup> PRI-PVEM alliance districts were in Aguascalientes, Baja California Sur, Campeche, Chihuahua, Guanajuato, the state of Mexico, Nuevo Leon, Queretaro, San Luis Potosi, Sonora, and Yucatan.

points of the vote that the PVEM might provide in order to win, or because it stood little chance of winning in any event and the reform came at little cost.

From all indications, candidates in the alliance districts that were not PRI-governed were chosen by party leaders at both the national and state level, as the PRI CEN has much more influence with state PRIs that do not have Priista governors. Since many of these districts were not ones in which the PRI was particularly strong, the CEN probably did not directly benefit from its influence in candidate selection, meaning it did not result in many elected federal deputies on whose support CEN leaders could rely on in internal party disputes. The PRI/PVEM alliance only emerged victorious in thirteen of the thirty-six districts in non-PRI governed states, with ten of the thirteen victories coming in Nuevo Leon. The increased influence over candidate selection probably did allow CEN leaders (Roberto Madrazo in particular) to establish more links in those states. Sixty-one of the ninety-seven districts where the PRI entered into electoral alliance with the PVEM were located in Priista governed states. Since governors post-2000 are among the most significant political players in Mexico, they have become important political entrepreneurs within the party and have a significant impact on candidate selection.

It is not surprising, therefore, that those candidates that came from alliance districts in PRI governed states were chosen by the Priista governor, officials close to the governor, and state party leaders, usually members of the PRI's Comité Directivo Estatal (CDE). In these Priista governed states, national party leaders had little to no input in selecting the candidates. In Chihuahua, for example, units that were part of or associated with the PRI, such as its official sectors, were allowed to propose candidates. It was the

governor and the CDE, primarily the president of the CDE, who made the final decisions on the eight district-based candidates in that state.<sup>80</sup> Since Governor Patricio Martínez was on good terms with the PRI CEN, the CEN was consulted in the process, but the balance in the decision-making was at the state level.<sup>81</sup> Six of the eight Priistas running were victorious, and it may be the case that these deputies were more bound to and influenced by the governor than they were by CEN leaders.

In the state of Mexico, again party elites and those close to the governor chose the candidates in that state's thirty-six districts. In consultation with the governor, that state's PRI CDE and the state PRI's Internal Processes Commission made the final decisions. They employed surveys to help them identify the best candidates. Since the period to select the candidates came only a few weeks after state-level elections, the party did not have time to use the more elaborate process that it employed in those elections.<sup>82</sup> Given that eleven state legislators, four municipal presidents, and two functionaries from the Arturo Montiel administration were given candidate slots,<sup>83</sup> those close to the governor were taken care of. Since Governor Montiel and the president of the PRI CEN Roberto Madrazo were not on good terms (having been rivals for the PRI's nomination for president in 2006) the CEN had no influence on candidacy decisions in the state of Mexico. In fact, given this rivalry, it was important that Governor Montiel have as many

---

<sup>80</sup> Though there are nine federal deputy districts in Chihuahua and the PRI entered into an alliance with the PVEM in all nine, only eight of the candidates came from the PRI. A PVEM member was the candidate in one Ciudad Juárez based district.

<sup>81</sup> Interview with Omar Venegas Quintana, Asesor al Instituto de Capacitación y Desarrollo Político (ICADEP) Filial Chihuahua, Chihuahua City, July 8, 2003.

<sup>82</sup> Interview with Isidro Pastor Medrano, Presidente del Comité Directivo Estatal (PRI Mexiquense), Toluca, June 10, 2003.

<sup>83</sup> Enrique Gómez, "Define PRI Mexiquense Candidatos a Diputados," Reforma. 6 April 2003, 6A.

deputies as loyal to him as possible, as this could have helped him in his quest for the PRI's nomination in 2006. The bottom line, however, was that the PRI's alliance with the PVEM allowed elites within the PRI, whether members of the CEN or Priista governors, to choose almost one-third of the party's district-based candidates without using the mechanisms called for in the party's statutes. Decisions often helped further ambitions of party leaders or demonstrated the power that Priista governors have within their own states.

### **Districts in Which the PRI Ran Solo**

In the 203 districts where the PRI ran on its own, generally more open methods of candidate selection were used. Open party primaries were utilized to select candidates in 123 of the districts. In sixty-nine districts only one candidate ran in the primary, and in seven districts a unity candidate was offered (the CEN designated the candidate in four districts). The general trend was that those states that did not have a Priista governor tended to have open primaries. Most of the districts in which only a single candidate ran or there was a unity candidate were in PRI governed states. The states that had the most districts in which only one candidate was running in a primary were Colima, Hidalgo, Oaxaca, Puebla, Sinaloa, Tabasco, and Tamaulipas.<sup>84</sup> It comes as no surprise that all of these states had PRI governors, as it fits the general proposition that in PRI governed states candidate selection methods were more likely to be more closed.

The prevalence of the open primary in non-PRI governed states provides evidence that if a PRI governor is not in power, there is a greater likelihood that more open

---

<sup>84</sup> Claudia Guerrero, "Buscan 544 en el Tricolor Candidatura," Reforma. 13 March 2003, 13A.

methods of candidate selection will be used. This makes logical sense because there is no one person in charge and thus a greater probability of power struggles within the party in these states. No single person, in the form of a Priista President of the Republic or governor is available to mediate these struggles. In PRI governed states, the governor is the “primer Priista,” the guiding force behind the state party, and if he so chooses, has the final word in regard to candidate selection.

Of the fourteen Mexican states<sup>85</sup> where the most primaries were held in 2003, only five were PRI governed. Many of the locations where the PRI held primaries were where the PRI was weak. For example, primaries were held in most of the districts in Baja California, the Federal District, and Jalisco, not shining examples of where the Priista “voto duro” (hard core vote) resides. In the 2003 general election, the PRI lost in all the districts in Baja California and in the Federal District<sup>86</sup>, with the party teetering on the brink of irrelevance in the latter. The use of open primaries to select candidates in these locales probably represented a reality that the PRI had nothing to lose in these districts by opening up its candidate selection process. In all likelihood the candidate who garnered the nomination would lose in the general election. These slots were therefore not particularly valuable to ambitious politicians. Party leaders, particularly those in the CEN, did not try to use these nominations as a way to placate party members whose loyalty they might have needed in the future. In this manner the PRI bolstered the number of open primaries it held, thus making their candidate selection process look

---

<sup>85</sup> The Federal District is included in this number although technically it is not a state.

<sup>86</sup> The Federal District has 30 legislative districts on to itself.

more democratic than it really was. Those Priistas who actually became federal deputies were more likely not to have faced real competition to secure the party's nomination in an open primary. This is not to say that many competitive primaries were not held, as there were. The use of open primaries did represent a genuine reform in the PRI, and they were used to an extent that would not have been possible if a Priista were still residing in Los Pinos.

### **The Proportional Representation List**

Choosing the district-based candidates for the July 2003 mid-term elections was only part of the candidate selection process for the PRI. Left to be done after the district-based candidacies were decided were the proportional representation lists.<sup>87</sup> The CEN realized that the district-based slots would be determined or highly influenced by the governors in states that the PRI controlled. Yet, on the other hand, the CEN believed that the proportional representation list would be its domain. The 2003 proportional representation list was the first that was not highly influenced or guided by the presence of a Priista president or presidential candidate. As such, the PRI's official sectors and units could make recommendations for the list, but it was formulated by the CEN and then submitted to the PRI's National Political Council (CPN) for approval.<sup>88</sup> PRI statutes do not specifically address responsibility for formulating the list other than requiring approval by the National Political Council. There are, however, gender and age

---

<sup>87</sup> In Mexico, proportional representation seats in the Chamber of Deputies are apportioned based on vote totals in five circumscriptions. For each circumscription the parties are required to submit 80 names to IFE, 40 primary names and 40 replacement names in case a primary cannot serve out his/her full term.

<sup>88</sup> Interview with Efraín Morales Ayón, Coordinador de Enlace con los Subsecretarios de la Secretaría de Programa de Acción y Gestión Social (PRI CEN), Mexico City, February 17, 2003.

requirements that must be taken into consideration, along with numerous political considerations.

Though conflict existed within the CEN when formulating the list, most dissent emerged from the PRI governors and some state-level PRI units. The CEN constructed the list in a manner that prevented many Priista governors (state of Mexico Governor Arturo Montiel in particular) from influencing who appeared on the list. Persons who Montiel would have liked to be placed on the list to represent the state of Mexico did not appear on the final list. Supposedly, Madrazo had given Montiel assurances that the people in question would be considered for inclusion on the list. Because of this assurance, Montiel did not push to have these people nominated for district -based slots, as he might have if he knew that they would not appear on the proportional representation list.<sup>89</sup>

The fact that many PRI governors were excluded from helping formulate the list was not surprising. The responsibility for submitting the list to the IFE clearly belongs to the party structure at the national level. Since CEN President Roberto Madrazo openly had presidential ambitions at the time, it was in his interests to have as many deputies as possible serving who would support his nomination in 2006. Yet his influence in determining district-based candidates was relatively weak (especially in PRI governed states), so he had to use the proportional representation list to further his own presidential ambitions. Given that several Priista governors were his competitors for the 2006 nomination, it was not in his interest to place people who are close to them on the

---

<sup>89</sup> Anonymous Interview, Mexico City, 2003.

proportional representation list, especially those of his primary competitor Arturo Montiel. Priistas in the state of Mexico were not the only ones upset with the final list; Priistas in the southern state of Guerrero was so angry with the proportional representation list that their leaders publicly said that Madrazo was persona non-grata in Guerrero.

Roberto Madrazo was not the only PRI elite who felt it was in his/her own personal interest to influence the list. The PRI's secretary general,<sup>90</sup> Elba Esther Gordillo, also did all she could to determine who made it on the list. In her case, direct personal ambition played a key role. It was her desire to be the next leader of the Priista faction in the Chamber of Deputies. Not only did she appear at the top of the list in one circumscription, she also tried to place as many of her own supporters as possible on the list to ensure that her ambition would be fulfilled. Also, many Priista elites, such as former governors and the like, wanted slots on the list as a way to avoid having to run campaigns in a district. All in all it appeared that being on the proportional representation list gave an individual greater prestige than being a candidate to represent a specific district.

Also, there were demands from the PRI's traditional sectors to be awarded slots on the list. Though specific quotas for the sectors had long been done away with, the sectors still saw themselves entitled to have their members represented in the Chamber of

---

<sup>90</sup> The secretary general of the CEN is the 2<sup>nd</sup> in command of the party structure.

Deputies. This was especially true for the labor (CTM) and peasant (CNC) sectors.<sup>91</sup> What became apparent to the CTM and CNC (especially the CTM) was that the individuals they offered usually had a very hard time garnering district-based candidacies under more open methods of selection, especially when the open primary was utilized. Given this reality, the PRI's traditional sectors opposed the new methods of candidate selection such as the open primary.<sup>92</sup> To illustrate, the state of Jalisco was the first PRI entity to hold its primaries to nominate district-based candidates for the July 2003 elections. The PRI in Jalisco held seventeen primaries in February (about a month before the PRI held most other primaries). The CTM and CNC offered candidates in many of these primaries, and their candidates lost in every race in which they entered.<sup>93</sup> The CTM in particular then started to press for slots on the proportional representation list. CTM leaders stressed in the media that the PRI needed to recognize the important role that the CTM played and continued to play in the party.<sup>94</sup> In the end, the CTM did get places on the list for its affiliates, but it was not entirely satisfied with the final results.<sup>95</sup>

The 2003 process saw responsibility for the proportional representation list change hands. Before leaders in the party structure certainly had a role in formulating it, but the person primarily responsible for guiding its formulation was the President of the Republic or the PRI's presidential candidate. In 2003, the CEN (particularly the

---

<sup>91</sup> The PRI's three major traditional sectors are labor (housed largely in the Confederación de Trabajadores Mexicanos), peasant (Confederación Nacional Campesina) and popular (Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Populares or CNOP).

<sup>92</sup> Interview with Carlos Reta Martínez, Secretario General Adjunto (Secretary General's office of the CEN), Mexico City, February 26, 2003.

<sup>93</sup> Carlos Maguey, "Pierden la CNC y el Sector Obrero," Reforma. February 25, 2003. 8A.

<sup>94</sup> Carlos Velasco, "Advertencia de la CTM al PRI si le Niega Candidaturas," El Universal. February 26, 2003. A8.

<sup>95</sup> Interview with Jose Ramirez Gamero, Diputado Federal, Mexico City, April 10, 2003.

president, secretary general, and the internal processes commission) took the lead in its formulation. It is not surprising that the list was used as a weapon to further the ambitions of the party's top two leaders. Since other party elites, whose help Madrazo and Gordillo might have needed later, had to be kept happy, newer forces in the PRI, such as young people and women, did not fare as well with the proportional representation list.

The PRI picked up some additional legislative seats in the 2003 mid-term elections. Though implementing the candidate selection reforms proved a bit more complicated than envisioned, the 2003 experience was viewed as more successful than not. In hindsight, some problems were evident, but the party seemed hopeful. The primary focus of 2003 was at the national level. The focus shifted to the sub-national level the next few years, as a plethora of gubernatorial elections were on the electoral calendar.

### **Chapter 3 - Candidate Selection at the Sub-national Level<sup>96</sup>**

The weakening and end of the hegemonic party system had significant consequences for Mexican states. Mexican states always had power on paper, but not in practice. After 2000, state power became real. This state autonomy trickled into the party system. In the post-2000 PRI, state parties often choose their own mechanisms of candidate selection. Therefore, there was a significant amount of variation in methods used by state PRIs. In this chapter, I first take an in-depth look at the candidate selection experiences in my case study states, and then I briefly examine the gubernatorial nomination processes in most other states between 2002 and 2006. As the case at the national level, open primaries were in vogue at first, but they were seen as divisive as time passed.

Despite the fact that the PRI was for much of its history a hegemonic party controlled from above by the President of the Republic, candidate selection reform actually started at the sub-national level. Since sub-national elections are held in an extremely staggered fashion in Mexico, most of the candidate selection action can be found at the sub-national level. To really understand candidate selection reforms within the PRI, it is absolutely necessary to examine the PRI in various Mexican states. The general trend that can be found is that the PRI was using more closed methods of candidate selection as time passed. In the late-1990s and early 2000s, the PRI often chose its gubernatorial candidates through open primaries. As time passed, the PRI

---

<sup>96</sup> A large part of my sub-national analysis is based on the three states (Chihuahua, Mexico, and Yucatan) that I chose as case study states.

moved away from the open primary, preferring the use of the delegate convention or the unity candidate. This is especially true in states governed by Priistas. One thing that is quite clear in the post-2000 PRI is that the Priista governor has become the owner of his party in the state in which he governs.<sup>97</sup> Since electoral alliance has been the norm for the PRI since 2003, state PRI's have been able to avoid statutory requirements in candidate selection, thus ensuring persons close to the governor receive candidacy slots. Experience has also demonstrated the use of more open methods of candidate selection, such as the primary, has fostered divisions and defections. As a result, the PRI has increasingly tried to avoid using such methods to select candidates. Though the open primary is still on the books, it is often seen as a method of last resort.

### **The Case of Chihuahua**

One of the state PRIs that has been at the forefront of candidate selection change is Chihuahua. In this northern border state, the PRI faced significant electoral competition much earlier than it did in other locales. In 1983, the PRI in Chihuahua lost numerous municipal presidency elections to the PAN. The PRI lost in almost all of Chihuahua's important cities, including the capital and the state's largest city Ciudad Juárez. These defeats were a red flag for the PRI and forced the party to start to rethink its candidate selection strategy. The PRI Chihuahuense came to the realization that in circumstances of electoral competition, the party had to select its candidates with better care, as party hacks and those chosen for reasons of loyalty to the president or governor

---

<sup>97</sup> Interview with Eulogio Carpio Mejía, Secretario de Acción Electoral (PRI Mexiquense), Toluca, May 21, 2003.

would probably not win in free and fair elections. In other words, the party no longer had the luxury of nominating unattractive candidates. Therefore, the PRI in Chihuahua started to monitor the profile of those whom it selected as candidate more carefully.<sup>98</sup> As electoral competition continued throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the ability to win a free election became the primary determinate for candidate selection, with party loyalty and connections becoming less of a concern. However, it was not until the PRI lost the governor's office in Chihuahua to the PAN in 1992 when the reform process really took off.<sup>99</sup> Throughout the post-1983 period, the party experimented with the use of more open methods of candidate selection at the municipal level. The reform process came to fruition in 1998 when the PRI used an open primary to select its gubernatorial candidate. The PRI in Chihuahua was the first such state PRI to use such an open method to select its gubernatorial candidate.

The PRI Chihuahuense calculated that if it used an open primary to select its gubernatorial candidate, its candidate would garner a degree of societal legitimacy. The fact that its candidates in the past lacked such legitimacy, as they were often imposed by the president, governor, or other elites within the PRI, was seen as a key reason for the PRI's decline in Chihuahua. One party leader commented that in the past people in Chihuahua did not like the "form" in which the party operated, with its methods of

---

<sup>98</sup> Interview with José Silveyra Hinojos, Sub-secretario al Secretario General del PRI Chihuahuense, Chihuahua City, July 11, 2003.

<sup>99</sup> The PRI's gubernatorial loss in Chihuahua in 1992 was the second such loss for the PRI. The first occurred in Baja California in 1989.

candidate selection being one such form.<sup>100</sup> If a primary were utilized, it would be much more difficult for opponents to criticize its candidate as the product of a “dedazo.” Others felt that the PRI’s decline could be traced to the fact that in a variety of ways the party had distanced itself from the people. If the populace selected the PRI candidate, it would signify that the party was returning to the people. To help toward this end, in the Chihuahua primary anybody with a national voting credential was allowed to participate.

For the 1998 gubernatorial election, two major pre-candidates emerged to compete in the then experimental PRI party primary: Patricio Martínez and Artemio Iglesias. Martínez was then a federal deputy who had been a popular mayor of Chihuahua City and had a background in private business. Iglesias had been a federal senator and, at the time, had control of the party structure in the state. Martínez won the primary and then went on to win the general election. Martínez’s victory represented the first time that the PRI had lost the governor’s office in one election and then regained it the following election. The party primary, many argue, was a key factor in the PRI’s victory. It gave the appearance that the PRI was changing its ways. When given a choice, PRI militants chose an attractive candidate, as Martínez had been a popular mayor and had a business background in a state where the entrepreneurial sector is very important. In other words, Martínez was an appealing candidate to a broad cross-section of Chihuahuenses. Iglesias, on the other hand, was seen as a more conventional, old-guard politician.

---

<sup>100</sup> Interview with Graciela Ortiz González, Presidenta del PRI Chihuahuense, Chihuahua City, July 3, 2003.

Critics of the PRI primary in Chihuahua point to a potential “dedazo” in disguise. Iglesias’ faction in the state PRI was clearly dominant in the years following 1992. If candidate selection had been left to the party structure, Iglesias would have been the clear favorite and probably would have obtained the nomination. At the time President Zedillo’s chief of staff, Liéban Saenz Ortiz, was from Chihuahua. Saenz was close to Martínez and favored him for the candidacy. Short of blatant intervention on the part of President Zedillo, it was likely that Iglesias would have won in a more closed process at the state level. So the decision was made at the national level to go with a party primary to select the candidate, thus giving Martínez a better chance at winning. Because of all this, critics claim that President Zedillo’s “chosen” candidate was nominated.<sup>101</sup>

Despite criticisms of the “true intentions” of the PRI primary in Chihuahua, it did represent real reform. Electoral loss in 1992 may have triggered it, but even if a Priista had been governor, the PRI Chihuahuense knew that it had to offer an attractive candidate in order to win in 1998. The political situation in 1998 was such that an overt use of the dedazo (whether by the president or a governor) would most likely have not been viewed kindly by voters in a high competition state like Chihuahua.

The PRI in Chihuahua continued to utilize more open methods of candidate selection. Open primaries started to become the norm to select candidates for municipal presidency; it was utilized to select many municipal presidency candidates in 1998, 2001,

---

<sup>101</sup>Interview with Juan Ramón Flores Gutiérrez, ex-federal deputy (1997-2000) from Chihuahua, Chihuahua City, July 5, 2003.

and 2004.<sup>102</sup> To an extent not evident in other state PRIs, the use of the open primary became somewhat institutionalized in the PRI Chihuahuense. However, in 2004, most of the PRI's candidates for the municipal presidency in larger cities were unity candidates. Generally, when the PRI offers a unity candidate, party leadership convinces other potential pre-candidates to step aside in favor of the candidate that is favored by party leadership for whatever reason. Sometimes survey data are used by party leadership to convince other pre-candidates to step aside in favor of a unity candidate.<sup>103</sup> In Ciudad Juárez, for example, the PRI had not won the municipal presidency since 1989. They chose to offer former Senator Héctor Murguía as their unity candidate, as he was viewed as the candidate with the highest profile and as having the best chance at winning.<sup>104</sup> Prior to announcing a unity candidate in Ciudad Juárez, there were seven announced pre-candidates for the PRI's nomination, some who held significant posts in government.<sup>105</sup> Such unity candidacies led some to criticize the party's nomination process. By this time, however, there was a feeling in the PRI all throughout Mexico that open primaries had great potential to divide the party, so if they could be avoided in favor of a unity candidacy, they should be. Despite this reality, the PRI Chihuahuense did use open primaries to select its candidates for municipal president in fifty-eight of Chihuahua's

---

<sup>102</sup> Interview with José Silveyra Hinojos, Sub-secretario al Secretario General del PRI Chihuahuense, Chihuahua City, July 11, 2003.

<sup>103</sup> Cruz Sáenz, César. "Abre PRI Elección a Alcaldes," El Diario de Chihuahua (internet edition). February 11, 2004.

<sup>104</sup> Murguía won his race, and became the first Priista to win the municipal presidency in Ciudad Juárez since 1989.

<sup>105</sup> Minjárez, Gabriela. "Suplirá a Valencia Diputado Federal," El Diario de Cuidad Juárez (internet edition). February 10, 2004.

sixty-seven municipalities. In nine of the state's larger cities unity candidates were offered.<sup>106</sup>

In the PRI Chihuahuense, however, if all major pre-candidates do not choose to withdraw, the norm is to go forward with a party primary. This was the case in 2004 in the capital, Chihuahua City. Party leadership tried to create a unity candidacy around federal deputy Martha Laguette. At one point the party leadership announced that a unity candidacy had been established.<sup>107</sup> One pre-candidate refused to step aside, so the PRI Chihuahuense held a primary to determine the nominee. It was clear that Laguette was the favored candidate of party leadership and was someone viewed as close to Governor Martínez. The party in this case wanted to avoid having the primary, but held it nevertheless. Party primaries had become institutionalized enough in Chihuahua where if a politician has a broad enough stature, he/she could demand that one be held in accordance with the party statutes, which do not mention "unity candidates" as a method of candidate selection. Also, in this case party leaders knew that Laguette would easily prevail in the primary, so there would be no harm in going forward with it in order to placate the other pre-candidate.<sup>108</sup>

The main game in town for the PRI Chihuahuense in 2004 was the gubernatorial election. In 2004, the PRI once again faced a strong challenge from the PAN. By this

---

<sup>106</sup> "El PRI Vuelve a Ser el PRI." El Diario de Ciudad Juárez. (internet edition) . February 22, 2004.

Gómez Hernández, Norma. "Arrasa Martha Laguette 6 a 1," El Diario de Chihuahua (internet edition) March 22, 2004.

<sup>107</sup> "Laguette, Candidata: Declinan los Demás Aspirantes del PRI a la Alcaldía," El Heraldo de Chihuahua (internet edition). February 21, 2004.

<sup>108</sup> Ironically, despite using the more open selection method, Laguette lost her race to the PAN candidate. The PRI had won the municipal presidency in Chihuahua consistently since its sole loss in 1983.

time, Patricio Martínez was viewed as one of the strongest Priista governors in Mexico. If he so chose, he probably could have commandeered a “*delfin*” into the securing the PRI nomination.<sup>109</sup> More recently, Priista governors have seen their “delfines” receive the PRI nomination for governor through offering him as a unity candidate or having him nominated in a delegate convention. It is said that it is virtually impossible to defeat the favored candidate of a governor at a delegate convention. Despite the reality that Governor Martínez had the political power to push a favored candidate through a delegate convention; the PRI Chihuahuense utilized a party primary to select its gubernatorial candidate for the July 2004 gubernatorial election.

Perhaps three reasons can help explain why the PRI utilized the open primary to select its 2004 candidate. First, because of the symbolism of Chihuahua’s use of the open primary in 1998 and the success that followed, there existed an expectation that the party would once again utilize this mechanism. Two pre-candidates emerged to pursue the nomination. Perhaps more importantly, both pre-candidates, former Chihuahua City Mayor Jesús Reyes Baeza and the Priista leader in the local congress, Víctor Anchondo, were on good terms with Governor Martínez. Early on it was to a small degree perceived that Anchondo was Martínez’s candidate, as Anchondo would have never become the Priista leader in the local congress if he was not on very good terms with the governor. Reyes Baeza was a popular former municipal president who had recently become a federal deputy and was the nephew of former Governor Fernando Baeza. Being at the

---

<sup>109</sup> *Delfin* is the term utilized for the chosen successor of a president (previously) or governor (more currently).

top of the PRI's proportional representation list in the circumscription that included Chihuahua, he received a large amount of media attention just months prior to the start of the gubernatorial pre-campaign. It became fairly obvious even before the method of selection was chosen that Reyes Baeza was the more popular candidate with the militancy. At meetings of PRI's Consejo Político Estatal, it is said that Reyes Baeza was usually cheered loudly, and in contrast the applause was much weaker for Anchondo.<sup>110</sup> There is no real evidence that Anchondo was Martínez's favored candidate, as both were acceptable to him and what he really wanted was to have a Priista succeed him. Though it was clear that Reyes Baeza would win an open primary, Anchondo refused to step aside, so the PRI Chihuahuense held a primary in November 2003. By a fairly lopsided margin, Jesús Reyes Baeza beat Victor Anchondo.

Given the occurrence of a second primary, with the PRI in power this time, the evidence suggests that electoral competition was a force behind this reform. It was clear that if a Priista elite, in this case Anchondo, had enough clout within the party, he could demand that a more open method of candidate selection be held. Governor Martínez gave no indication that he preferred one candidate over the other, so the decision was left to the militancy. In the mid-2000s, it was rare that states with strong PRI governors utilized the open primary to select its gubernatorial candidate, so the case of Chihuahua in 2004 represented more of an aberration than a norm.

---

<sup>110</sup> Interview with Norma Gutiérrez González, Presidenta del Instituto de Capacitación y Desarrollo Político (ICADEP) Filial Chihuahua, Chihuahua City, June 30, 2003.

## **The Case of Yucatan**

Unlike Chihuahua, the PRI in Yucatan had little as reformist. Not surprisingly, Yucatan is a state where the PRI did not use a party primary to select its gubernatorial candidate in 2001. Going into 2001, losing was certainly a possibility for the PRI in Yucatan. It had lost the municipal presidency in Mérida (the largest city in the state and where 40 percent of the population resides) in 1990 and every other election for the post until very recently. Vicente Fox carried Yucatan in 2000 as well. The governor in Yucatan at the time was Victor Cervera Pacheco who was widely regarded as part of the PRI's old guard and often characterized as the epitome of a PRI "dinosaur" or "cacique." Despite a recommendation by the state party president to hold a primary, the PRI's gubernatorial candidate was selected in a closed internal process and a candidate very close to Governor Cervera was chosen.<sup>111</sup> It was fairly clear that Cervera was determined to ensure that one of his loyalists received the nomination. The candidate, Orlando Paredes Lara, was even referred to as Cervera's "bat boy" by one interviewee. Other pre-candidates who were perhaps more attractive candidates were dissatisfied with the outcome, and accusations were made that their factions did not work hard for the PRI's candidate in the general election. As a result of these party divisions and offering an unattractive candidate, the PRI lost the governor's office in Yucatan,<sup>112</sup> thereby paying the price for using traditional methods of candidate selection where loyalty to the

---

<sup>111</sup> Interview with Roberto Pinzon Álvarez, Presidente del Comité Directivo Estatal (PRI Yucateco), Mérida, December 10, 2002.

<sup>112</sup> Interview with José Luis Sierra Villareal, Professor of History at the Instituto Nacional de Antropología y Historia, Mérida, October 31, 2002.

governor and not electoral appeal was a determining factor in who garnered the nomination.

Open primaries were used in some cases for selecting candidates for the municipal presidencies in 2001, though most admit that the eventual candidates were Cervera loyalists. With local deputy nominations, however, Cervera loyalists were awarded most of the nominations without the use of open primaries. Despite the fact (or perhaps because of it) that Yucatan did not have a Priista governor after 2001, former Governor Cervera continued to exercise great influence in the state party. Cervera was much more than simply a former governor. He had been governor of the state on two different occasions,<sup>113</sup> as well as leading the CNC at the national level and having served in President Salinas' cabinet. During the 2004 mid-term elections in Yucatan, Cervera managed to secure the PRI nomination for the municipal presidency in Merida. There was no internal process used to select a candidate. Despite the existence of several pre-candidates, Cervera was named the PRI's unity candidate. Because of his stature, the other pre-candidates probably concluded that contesting Cervera's nomination would have been an impossible battle. Cervera was also on good terms with CEN president Roberto Madrazo, who according to some reports encouraged him to seek the post. Conceding that it would be very difficult to win in Merida under any circumstance, state party leaders (some of whom have not always been on the best terms with Cervera) agreed to offer Cervera as the PRI's unity candidate, despite the fact that there were

---

<sup>113</sup> Victor Cervera Pacheco was the interim governor of Yucatan from 1984 to 1988. Since he was not an elected governor, he was not bound by the no-reelection clause in the Mexican Constitution. He was elected in his own right in 1995, and served as the governor of Yucatan until 2001.

others willing to take the nomination. Not surprisingly, Cervera's main competitor of any stature, former governor Federico Granja Ricalde, was compensated for withdrawing by being put at the top of the PRI's proportional representation list for local congressional elections.

Cervera lost his race to become Merida's municipal president in 2004. He passed away later in 2004. Cervera's passing left a power void to be filled in the PRI Yucateco. Perhaps the PRI Yucateco under Cervera's leadership represented the epitome of the old style PRI, especially in those states in southern Mexico and/or those states with higher indigenous populations. It fits within my general argument that in Priista governed states candidate selection procedures will usually be more closed. Cervera's uniqueness as a political figure allowed him to retain great influence within the party until his passing.

### **The Case of the State of Mexico**

The state of Mexico is considered by most to be Mexico's most important state. It surrounds the Federal District (DF) on three sides and is home to many of the DF's suburbs. Due to high migration rates, it is often considered to be a microcosm of the nation. It was also home to one of the PRI's most influential political groups, the infamous "Grupo Atlacomulco."<sup>114</sup> For many years this informal group was led by Carlos "el profe" Hank Gonzalez.<sup>115</sup> It is said that up until his death in 2001, Hank and

---

<sup>114</sup> Atlacomulco is a small town north of the state capital Toluca. Despite its small size many prominent Priistas hail from Atlacomulco, including the former governors Arturo Montiel Rojas and Enrique Peña Nieto.

<sup>115</sup> Carlos Hank González served in many influential posts. He served as municipal president of Toluca; he was the regent for the Federal District, governor of the state of Mexico, and served in President Salinas' cabinet.

other elites within the Grupo Atlacomulco determined the candidates that the PRI Mexiquense<sup>116</sup> offered for public office.

Despite this history, the PRI Mexiquense did utilize an open primary to determine its gubernatorial candidate in 1999. Several reasons can help account for this decision. First, open primaries were new and in vogue in the PRI. The PRI in Chihuahua had successfully utilized the open primary to win back the state from the PAN the previous year. The PRI at the national level would later in the year utilize this mechanism to select the party's presidential candidate. Second, by 1999 the PRI was facing severe electoral competition in the state of Mexico. It had been losing ground electorally throughout the decade, especially around the DF where the PRI lost power in 1997. The open primary was still seen as a way in which the party's candidate could receive societal legitimacy. Last, most of the pre-candidates were acceptable to the governor and other important elites within the PRI Mexiquense. It was not surprising that the winner in 1999, Arturo Montiel Rojas, hails from Atlacomulco.

By 2003, Governor Montiel was widely considered one of the stronger possible candidates to receive the PRI nomination for President of the Republic in 2006. This reality certainly classified him as one of the strongest Priista governors in all of Mexico. Given this, one would expect that less open mechanisms would be used to select candidates in the state of Mexico. This assumption was somewhat tested during the March 2003 mid-term elections. In March 2003, the state of Mexico had state-level

---

<sup>116</sup> The word Mexiquense is used to describe someone or something from the state of Mexico.

elections for local deputies and municipal presidents.<sup>117</sup> The methods used to select these candidates were somewhat innovative, though they did not involve an open primary.

The PRI Mexiquense used a multi-layered process for candidate selection. Pre-candidates in each municipality and district had to attend various courses on subjects ranging from leadership to campaigning, party history, and the like. After completion of the courses, pre-candidates were required to take written examinations on the material. The party also had each major pre-candidate undergo psychological examinations. Simultaneously, the PRI hired a private polling firm to administer surveys in each district or municipality in order to gauge the popularity of each pre-candidate. Based on the results of the surveys, personal evaluations and written tests, the party leadership in the state selected the nominees.<sup>118</sup> It was said that usually, though not always, the candidate selected fared well on the public opinion surveys.

The PRI Mexiquense also entered into an alliance with the PVEM for these elections.<sup>119</sup> The alliance represented the first time in the post-2000 era that a unit of the PRI entered into an electoral alliance. The PRI Mexiquense sought the alliance as a means to help overcome its image problem. Party surveys revealed that the PRI was often viewed as a corrupt party. At the time, survey data also showed that the PVEM had the cleanest image of all Mexican political parties. The PVEM also had an image as a

---

<sup>117</sup> In 2000, the state of Mexico conducted its local elections on the same day as the federal elections, to the detriment of the PRI because of Fox's coattails in the state. State officials decided to hold the 2003 state-level elections before the federal ones to prevent national issues from impacting the state elections, as was the case in 2000.

<sup>118</sup> Interview with Héctor Karim Carvallo Delfín, Secretario Particular del Instituto de Capacitación y Desarrollo Político (ICADEP) Filial Estado de Mexico, Toluca, May 26, 2003.

<sup>119</sup> It was the PRI Mexiquense that first entered into alliance with the PVEM. It was upon the perceived success of this alliance that the PRI at the national level decided to enter into alliance with the PVEM for the federal deputy elections in July 2003.

young people's party, which contrasted with the PRI's image as a party of old political hacks. Despite the reasons for entering into the alliance, the alliance allowed the PRI Mexiquense to bypass party candidate selection statutes, as nowhere in the statutes in existence in 2003 was there mention of utilizing tests and surveys for purposes of candidate selection. Party leadership in the state felt that the methods that were employed to select candidates were preferable to using open primaries because in the past municipal presidents in particular were able to exert undue influence when primaries have been used.<sup>120</sup>

Though somewhat innovative, the methods used left the final decision up to party leaders. Allegedly the PRI CDE and the party's Internal Processes Commission made the final decisions. Some analysts admitted that the use of surveys<sup>121</sup> did make the candidate selection process a little more inclusive than usual.<sup>122</sup> Others insist that despite the window dressing, the *dedazo* of Governor Montiel was used to select the candidates.<sup>123</sup> Given that party leadership made the final decisions, such assertions cannot be entirely dismissed. The process utilized, however, was fairly labor intensive. It might not make good sense to use such a process if in the end the information gathered is not going to be utilized. Given the strong electoral competition that exists in the state of Mexico and the reality that the PRI candidate is not ensured victory, perhaps party leaders (the governor

---

<sup>120</sup> Interview with Isidro Pastor Medrano, Presidente del Comité Directivo Estatal (PRI Mexiquense), Toluca, June 10, 2003.

<sup>121</sup> The surveys were conducted for the PRI Mexiquense by Consulta Mitofsky

<sup>122</sup> Interview with Gabriel Corona Arementa, Profesor-Investigador en la Escuela Nacional de Estudios Profesionales Acatlán (UNAM), Naucalpan, Estado de Mexico, April 10, 2003.

<sup>123</sup> Interview with Alfonso Iracheta Cenecorta, Profesor-Investigador en el Colegio Mexiquense, Zinacantepec, Estado de Mexico, May 14, 2003.

included) wanted more information to make their decisions. It probably does not further the ambitions of the governor or other party elites if a party loyalist or friend is given a candidacy and then proceeds to lose. Therefore, even if in the end the dedazo was employed, it was a more modern and sophisticated dedazo.

When selecting the PRI Mexiquense candidate for governor in 2005, the outcome followed what would be expected of a state governed by a Priista with presidential ambitions. In late-2004, the PRI Mexiquense announced that it would “probably” employ an open primary to select its gubernatorial candidate. The usual call for candidates was issued and a multi-stage process was announced. First, the pre-candidates would tour as a group to conduct a series of issue forums. Then in January 2005 the pre-candidates were to be officially allowed to campaign. Lastly, on January 30 the primary was to be held. The issue of electoral alliance hung over the process however. If before mid-January the PRI decided to enter into electoral alliance with the PVEM (as was expected), there would be no primary.

Several pre-candidates lined up to run. One of the leading pre-candidates was Isidro Pastor Medrano. Pastor had been president of the PRI Mexiquense CDE for the past several years. Having spent those years traveling the state on behalf of the party, Pastor was seen as having at least a moderate chance at winning the primary. Pastor, however, had a falling out with Governor Montiel, and it became known that a Pastor candidacy was unacceptable to the governor. On fairly minor charges, Pastor quickly lost his rights as a Priista militant and was eventually kicked out of the party. Another strongly viewed pre-candidate was Carlos Hank Rhon, the eldest son of the legendary

“profe.” Hank faced the problem that he did not have enough years of official party militancy according to party statutes to be eligible to obtain the PRI’s nomination. He briefly held on in hopes that an alliance with the PVEM would come through, so he would then be eligible to be the alliance’s candidate, as party statutes would no longer be applicable.

Governor Montiel’s favorite pre-candidate was Enrique Peña Nieto, the Priista leader in the state congress. After Pastor and Hank were no longer part of the official process, the other pre-candidates were still reluctant to withdraw in favor of Peña, even after it was clear that Governor Montiel had a strong preference for his candidacy. Peña was not well known statewide and other pre-candidates argued that they could beat him in an open primary. As expected, in January 2005 the PRI formed an alliance with the PVEM. It did not take long for the PRI Mexiquense to announce that Enrique Peña Nieto was its unity candidate. In what was officially billed as a “political agreement” the other pre-candidates withdrew, and some of them took posts in the Peña campaign.

The results of the gubernatorial election in the state of Mexico were crucial to Governor Montiel’s presidential ambitions. By 2005, his chances to obtain the PRI’s nomination were mild at best. If he had any chance at all to obtain the nomination, the PRI had to maintain the governor’s office in the state of Mexico. He had to receive primary credit for the victory, and this would have been best accomplished if the PRI’s candidate was closely associated with him. It was widely known that CEN president Madrazo preferred Carlos Hank Rhon and that the two were close. Since Madrazo was Montiel’s primary competitor, Montiel nixed a potential Hank Rhon candidacy. Also,

Hank Rhon's profile was such that if he were the PRI's candidate, he would not have been seen as Montiel's understudy. Though Montiel had placed Isidro Pastor in his slot as CDE president, Pastor's style was at times overly confrontational and also controversial. If Pastor had ever been someone who Montiel felt might be gubernatorial material, such thoughts were long gone by the time the selection process started. It was for these reasons that Governor Montiel felt the need to more or less ensure that Peña was the PRI's unity candidate. By 2005, the trend of PRI governors seeing their favored candidates receive the PRI's nomination to succeed them was a common one.

### **The 2003-2006 Gubernatorial Election Cycle**

The fact that Mexico elects its state governors in an extremely staggered fashion means that several gubernatorial elections usually taking place each year. In 2003, there were six gubernatorial elections. In 2004, there were ten such elections, with 2005 seeing seven. Several general trends can be seen in how the PRI went about selecting its gubernatorial candidates (see Table 3.1). In 2003, the clear method of preference to select gubernatorial candidates was the open primary. In 2004 and 2005, the open primary became less common, with the preferred method becoming the delegate convention or the unity candidate. Several factors can explain this trend. First, PRI elites, especially Priista governors, can more easily influence the outcome with more closed methods of candidate selection. For that reason, Priista governors prefer these methods. Second, after the IFE levied the Pemexgate fine on the party, it had fewer resources at its disposal. Open primaries are the most expensive candidate selection mechanism. Third, by mid-decade, the PRI remained Mexico's most powerful political

party. It had not faded into oblivion like some thought it might after 2000. So the need to bestow legitimacy on its candidates through use of an open primary was no longer considered crucial. Lastly, and perhaps most crucial, is that Priistas have come to believe that the open primary is the most divisive of all candidate selection methods. Some evidence shows that losers in a primary more often bolt the PRI to obtain the nomination from a competitor than is the case when the party utilizes other methods. Priistas believe that these resulting divisions are a primary explanatory factor for its electoral losses. Moreover, Joy Langston argues persuasively in her examination of the PRI at the sub-national level that the PRI fares better electorally when it is united and does not suffer from major defections.<sup>124</sup>

In 2003, the open primary was the preferred method of gubernatorial candidate selection in the PRI. In five of the six states which held elections, the PRI used the open primary to select its gubernatorial candidate. Three of these states (Colima, San Luis Potosi, and Sonora) had Priista governors. The only two non-PRI governed states (Nuevo Leon and Queretaro) held primaries as well. The only state that selected a candidate through a delegate convention was Campeche. Indications were that in Campeche the Priista governor did not want to have a primary because he wanted to ensure that his favored candidate received the nomination.<sup>125</sup> In the two non-Priista governed states, the candidates that received the PRI nomination six years earlier and lost the general election ended up winning the primaries to receive the nominations once

---

<sup>124</sup> Langston, Joy. 2003. "Rising from the Ashes? Reorganizing and Unifying PRI's State Party Organizations after Electoral Defeat," *Comparative Political Studies*, 36:3. 293-318.

<sup>125</sup> Interview with Alejandro Moreno Cardenas, Coordinador Nacional del Frente Juvenil Revolucionario (PRI), Mexico City, February 19, 2003.

again. At the time these candidates were nominated (late-2002), the PRI had still not rebounded from 2000 and had lost most of the subsequent gubernatorial elections. The legitimacy issue still loomed large, along with the feeling that the statutes of the 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly, at least in spirit, mandated that more open selection methods be used. It was the PRI's relative success in the 2003 round of gubernatorial elections and those for Federal Deputies that began to lie to rest the emphasis on candidate legitimacy through the use of open primaries.

**Table 3.1**  
**PRI Gubernatorial Candidate Selection Mechanisms (2001-2006)**

	PRI Governed State	Non-PRI Governed State
Open Selection Process	Colima – 2003 San Luis Potosi – 2003 Sonora – 2003 Chihuahua – 2004 Quintana Roo – 2005 Coahuila - 2005 Tabasco – 2006	Nuevo Leon – 2003 Queretaro – 2003 Nayarit – 2005 Jalisco – 2006 Guanajuato – 2006 Morelos – 2006
Closed Selection Process	Michoacan – 2001 Yucatan – 2001 Campeche – 2003 Durango – 2004 Oaxaca – 2004 Puebla – 2004 Sinaloa – 2004 Tamaulipas – 2004 Veracruz – 2004 Guerrero – 2005 Hidalgo – 2005 Mexico – 2005	Baja California – 2001 Aguascalientes -2004 Tlaxcala – 2004 Zacatecas - 2004 Baja California Sur – 2005 Distrito Federal – 2006 Chiapas - 2006

Also, in two of the five states where the PRI held primaries to determine its 2003 nominee, losers defected from the PRI and ran as candidates for other parties. These defections signified a turning point in the party's willingness to utilize primaries.

Divisions when utilizing primaries were nothing new for the PRI. After the success of the 1998 primary in Chihuahua, the PRI also used primaries to select candidates in Tlaxcala and Zacatecas. Losing pre-candidates in both states bolted the party and received the nomination of the PRD. Both ex-Priistas ended up winning the general elections in their respective states. In 2003, the PRI ended up losing in one (San Luis Potosi) of the two states in which there were defections, though not at the hands of one of the defectors. There is now a legitimate exit option for disgruntled Priistas. Logically, the exit option should not be taken advantage of any more frequently with primaries than with the other methods available for candidate selection. Perhaps, primaries bring party divisions out in the open. Pre-candidates have greater hopes for victory and the humiliation of a loss is more painful because it is more public. With other methods of candidate selection, it is probably known at an earlier stage if the governor's favored candidate is going to emerge victorious. Therefore, the divisions and sentiments stay more private.

In 2004, the PRI moved almost entirely away from the open primary. As discussed above, Chihuahua was the only one of the ten states holding gubernatorial elections where the PRI utilized a primary to select its candidate. Six state PRIs selected their candidates in delegate conventions and in three others unity candidates were offered. Two (Oaxaca and Puebla) of the three states offering unity candidates were governed by Priistas. In Oaxaca, Governor José Murat was widely viewed as an old-style PRI cacique, and the PRI candidate was viewed as his protégée. In Puebla initially the PRI announced that it would select its candidate through an open primary. Little by little,

however, each of the ten pre-candidates withdrew until the governor's preferred candidate was then offered as the party's unity candidate.<sup>126</sup>

Four of the six states that utilized the delegate convention to select its candidate were governed by Priistas.<sup>127</sup> In three of those states, the governor's preferred candidate was victorious. In Tamaulipas, where former governor Tomás Yarrington had presidential ambitions of his own, his preferred candidate (Eugenio Hernández, former municipal president in Ciudad Victoria) won in the convention by an extremely lopsided margin over an opponent with a fairly high profile (Senator Oscar Luebbert). Only in Durango did it seem as if a preferred candidate of a Priista governor did not win. In this state, the final vote in the convention was close, but the candidate preferred by CEN president Roberto Madrazo received the nomination.

Though divisions did occur as a result of candidate selection in 2004, only in one such case did it perhaps cost the PRI victory. In Veracruz, former pre-candidate Miguel Ángel Yunes bolted the party, but did not receive the nomination of another party.<sup>128</sup> In Tlaxcala, pre-candidate Héctor Israel Ortiz Ortiz (a former municipal president in Tlaxcala city) demanded the party have an open primary. The state PRI eventually refused his request. After coming up short in the delegate convention to a candidate preferred by CEN president Madrazo, he received the PAN's gubernatorial nomination

---

<sup>126</sup> "Arrancan Endebles Campañas Electorales," *Reforma* (internet edition). May 2, 2004.

<sup>127</sup> The six states where the PRI utilized a delegate convention to select their gubernatorial candidate in 2004 were Durango, Sinaloa, Tamaulipas, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, and Zacatecas.

<sup>128</sup> Yunes was the PRI CEN's legal point man during the Pemexgate scandal. After leaving the PRI, he received a post in the Fox administration.

and won the general election.<sup>129</sup> The experience in Tlaxcala shows that significant divisions can occur when using mechanisms other than the open primary. But in each of these cases, the candidate preferred by party leadership received the nomination. In Veracruz, both Governor Miguel Alemán and the PRI CEN preferred the eventual recipient, Senator Fidel Herrera, and in Tlaxcala it was clear that Roberto Madrazo preferred Mariano González to Hector Ortiz. This follows the general trend of the CEN having more influence over candidate selection in non-Priista governed states.

In 2005, the PRI selected its candidate for six of the seven gubernatorial elections early in the year. In one state (Mexico) the PRI had a unity candidate (which was discussed above). Two states (both PRI governed) used delegate conventions where the favored candidate of the governor emerged victorious. Two other states (Nayarit and Quintana Roo) utilized open primaries which caused defections. In Quintana Roo, a federal senator defected to the PAN after saying that the Priista governor manipulated the primary for his favored candidate. Nayarit represented a case where national ambitions were being played out on a local stage in the absence of a PRI governor. In the primary, CEN President Madrazo's preferred candidate, Ney González Sánchez, won the primary amid substantial accusations of voting irregularities. The losing candidate was Senator Miguel Ángel Navarro, who was the preferred candidate of the PRI leader in the Mexican Senate Enrique Jackson<sup>130</sup> (one of Madrazo's principal opponents for the Priista nomination in 2006). Navarro bolted the party after he lost the primary, and he obtained

---

<sup>129</sup> Ortiz Ortiz is known to be close to former Tlaxcala governor Beatriz Paredes. Paredes is the person who CEN president Roberto Madrazo defeated to become president of the CEN.

<sup>130</sup> Part of Jackson's strategy to position himself to win the PRI nomination in 2006 was to see as many Priista senators be elected governor as possible, with the supposition that they would support him in 2006.

the gubernatorial nomination of the PRD.<sup>131</sup> These two cases probably only confirmed the feeling in the PRI that open primaries are the most divisive method of candidate selection.

Gubernatorial elections in late-2005 and 2006 represented a swan song of sorts for the use of open primaries to select candidates by the PRI. Again, the lesson derived was that they are divisive. Out of the seven gubernatorial selection processes, five utilized an open method. Two of those processes saw the PRI select a candidate that led the party to victory. In Coahuila in late-2005 and in Tabasco in 2006 the PRI used an open primary to select its candidate. The winning candidates won their primaries fairly easily and went on to carry those elections for the PRI. Both winning candidates were the perceived favorites of the Priista governor that governed the state. In January 2006 in Jalisco, the party used a primary to select its gubernatorial candidate. The winning candidate won with little controversy, but was not able to carry the state for the PRI in the general election. In Guanajuato the PRI selected its candidate through use of an open primary which Wintilo Vega Murillo easily won in February 2006. He would resign his candidacy weeks later after the CEN did not nominate his preferred candidate for the Mexican Senate in that state. The CEN then nominated Miguel Ángel Chico Herrera as an emergency replacement.<sup>132</sup> The PRI lost big in Guanajuato in 2006, but being one of its weakest states, the divisions and turmoil within the state party probably had little to do

---

<sup>131</sup> Raul Monge. "Nayarit: Guerra de Compadres," Proceso. March 20, 2005. 14-16.

<sup>132</sup> Martin Diego Rodriguez. "Wintilo Vega Renuncia a Candidatura del PRI al Gobierno de Guanajuato." La Jornada (internet edition). March 22, 2006.

Juan Arvizu Arrijoja. "Sustituye Chico Herrera a Wintilo Vega en Guanajuato." El Universal (internet edition). March 22, 2006.

with its loss. In both Jalisco and Guanajuato, the PAN was in power, so there was no Priista governor to influence the process. Given what occurred in Guanajuato with the Senate nomination, we can see evidence of the CEN playing a greater role in a non-PRI governed state.

In the Distrito Federal (DF) and Chiapas “unity” candidates were nominated. During the 2000-2006 time frame, the PRI was almost dead in the DF. One could argue that Mexico City was and remains the PRI’s weakest geographic locale. The CEN toyed around with the idea of having Beatriz Paredes running for “Jefe de Gobierno” or the governor/mayor of the federal district. She lost a close race to Roberto Madrazo for the party presidency in 2002 and had been the PRI’s leader in the Mexican Chamber of Deputies from 2000-2003. She was seen by those close to Madrazo as having the type of profile that might appeal to those in the DF. It would be almost impossible for the PRI to win in Mexico City, but if anyone had a chance, it would be Paredes.<sup>133</sup> Therefore, she was given the nomination with little controversy. She would go on to lose by a fairly substantial margin. In Chiapas the PRI nominated a unity candidate that really was not a unity candidate. First, the party said it would use a primary to nominate its candidate, but then changed its mind in April and announced a unity candidate, Juan Antonio Aguilar Bodegas. Other potential candidates complained, as some tried to register for the then cancelled primary and others sent letters to the CEN leadership in Mexico City. One of the potential primary participants who was left out in the cold, Juan Sabinas Guerrero,

---

<sup>133</sup> Interview with Pedro Saez Williams, Secretario Particular al Secretario General del CNOP, Mexico City, February 25, 2003.

resigned from the party and became the PRD's candidate for governor.<sup>134</sup> He went on to win the election. Chiapas was a good illustration of a non-PRI governed state where the CEN tried to impose a candidate and it backfired. However, the overall lesson follows a general pattern: a divided PRI is a PRI that loses. The PRI learned from the Chiapas case that unity candidates had to be selected with more care and could not be imposed at the last minute, especially when there are numerous elite Priistas who might want the nomination. A further lesson is that the open primary is certainly not the only method of candidate selection that can lead to party divisions.

Perhaps the best illustration in 2006 of how the use of an open primary can lead to party divisions and turmoil is the case of the state of Morelos. Several prominent Priistas expressed interest in the nomination, ex-interim governor Jorge Morales Barud and the PRI's losing nominee in 2000 Juan Salgado Brito among them. There was talk that the candidate might be selected through a series of public opinion surveys. In the end, the party decided to go with the primary. Some of the pre-candidates balked at this option, as one candidate's (Marisela Sanchez Cortes) spouse was the president of the state CDE. Therefore, they felt the process would not be fair. Morales Barud withdrew his candidacy and took a slot in the cabinet of the Panista governor of the state.<sup>135</sup> Juan Salgado Brito was Sanchez Cortes' main competitor in the primary. Despite the fact that

---

<sup>134</sup> Angeles Mariscal. "Renuncia Juan Sabinas al PRI; Podría Ser el Abanderado del PRD en Chiapas." La Jornada (internet edition). April 26, 2006.

<sup>135</sup> After he withdrew from the primary and went to work for the Panista governor of the state, there was some talk of kicking Jorge Morales Barud out of the PRI, but nothing came of it. Morales Barud would remain a party member despite the fact that he served in numerous posts in Panista administrations in Morelos. He was the PRI's nominee for the municipal presidency of Cuernavaca in 2012. He won that election.

Salgado Brito had worked closely with Madrazo, Sanchez won the primary. Salgado contested the process to no avail. Salgado Brito left the PRI and became Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador's campaign coordinator for the state of Morelos. With one major pre-candidate working for the PRD and another serving in a Panista administration, it was no surprise that Marisela Sanchez lost her race for governor. Not only did the open primary foster a zero sum game for the nomination, fights occurred out in the open.

Between 2000 and 2006, there was a significant amount of experimentation with candidate selection at the sub-national level. It was a dynamic, new experience for the party. Priista governors tried to control the process when possible. Sometimes the candidate selection process in the states was essentially a proxy war for competing party elites trying to further their own ambitions. As time passed, however, it was evident that in many states Priistas saw open primaries as fostering divisions rather than awarding legitimacy to their candidates. As a result, open primaries were utilized much less after 2006. As 2006 approached, the end goal for candidate selection reform and all other party reform was in sight: returning a Priista to Los Pinos. It is this battle for the party's nomination for the presidency in 2006 that is examined in the next chapter.

## **Chapter 4 - Selecting the 2006 Presidential Candidate**

The big prize for the most ambitious Priistas was the party's nomination for the Presidency of the Republic in 2006. It was the first time that the PRI had nominated a presidential candidate without a Priista residing in Los Pinos. The results of the process clearly support my arguments. Numerous party elites wanted the nomination, so a unity candidate was out of the question. The PRI utilized an open primary hoping it would bestow legitimacy on its candidate. The primary process, however, ended up making the party look bad and led to divisions.

The PRI had barely lost national power when several party politicians started to try to better position themselves to obtain the 2006 nomination. Questions eventually arose as to which mechanism the party would use to select its candidate. The leading candidate without a doubt was CEN President Roberto Madrazo. After failing to obtain the party's nomination for the 2000 election, he sought and obtained the CEN presidency in early-2002. His strategy was to use the CEN presidency to better position himself to obtain the 2006 nomination. Previously, the position of the CEN presidency was of moderate value only. Without a Priista in Los Pinos and thus no cabinet level positions open to party members, it seemed as if the CEN presidency would perhaps be the most valuable position available to party members. As CEN president, Madrazo traveled all over the country establishing links with party members. He helped influence who was placed in state-level party positions in locales where there was not a Priista governor. The party's electoral fortunes began to improve starting in 2002, and Madrazo was certainly willing to take the credit.

Many other party members, especially the party's governors, looked in the mirror and also saw a presidential candidate. Therefore, there were many who were not going to lay down and let Madrazo walk away with the nomination. Many potential candidates saw Madrazo as an unattractive candidate who would certainly lead the party to defeat in 2006. The governors with the highest levels of presidential ambitions also happened to have backed Madrazo's opponent, Beatriz Paredes, during the battle for the CEN presidency in 2002. As a result, relations between the CEN and Priista governors were quite frequently tense between 2002 and 2005. The governors often accused Madrazo of using his party position to further his ambitions.

As 2005 approached, it was unclear what mechanism the party would use to select its candidate. As mentioned, party statutes allowed for different mechanisms: a primary or a delegate's convention being the most prominent. Of course if only one person puts in his papers for the nomination, the party could in theory have fielded a "unity" candidate. Madrazo would have favored such a scenario, and as the PRI made gains in the 2003 mid-terms and won many gubernatorial elections, he hoped others would recognize his strengths and put away their hopes of challenging him. Madrazo verbally dismissed the ambitions of his challengers by arguing that it was he who put the party back together again after 2000. He likened the party to a bride who was once a mess. We washed her face and fixed her up he claimed. Now that the bride is beautiful, everyone wants to be with her. But where were they when the bride was a mess?<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> Ginger Thompson. "Mexico's Fallen Party Plans Its Revival With a New Star." New York Times (internet edition). February 6, 2005.

The Priista governors who had backed Paredes in 2002 were strongly opposed to a delegate's convention. Given the time Madrazo spent traveling the country and influencing the party structure in non-PRI governed states, they felt that the deck would be stacked in Madrazo's favor. Those governors had enough collective strength to force a party primary. Overall, the PRI had not yet come to the definitive conclusion that primaries were counter-productive, though they were getting there by 2005. Most Priistas wanted the perceived legitimacy that a primary could provide their candidate going into 2006. But most importantly for the party elites, many wanted the nomination for themselves.

By 2005, those who opposed Madrazo and had presidential ambitions of their own came to the conclusion that they could not defeat him separately. In an open primary where Madrazo faced off against several Priista governors, Madrazo would win, as the others would divide the anti-Madrazo vote. Given this reality, they united in 2005. The Mexican media took to calling them TUCOM (Todos Unidos Contra Madrazo), or All United Against Madrazo. They called themselves Democratic Unity. TUCOM consisted of four prominent Priista governors and a prominent senator. The most prominent of the governors was Arturo Montiel of the state of Mexico. Other governors included Enrique Martínez of Coahuila, ex-governor of Tamaulipas Tomás Yarrington, and former governor of Hidalgo Manuel Ángel Nuñez. Viewed as Montiel's main competitor in TUCOM was the PRI's leader in the Mexican Senate, Enrique Jackson. They decided that they would choose one among them to challenge Madrazo in the PRI's

presidential primary. The others would abide by the results and back the winning candidate.

TUCOM came up with an innovative mechanism to choose its candidate. It included a weighted average of public opinion polls using several well-known polling firms, a survey of political elites gaging who they thought would be the best candidate, and a poll amongst the five contenders. When the results were announced in August 2005, the winner was Arturo Montiel. Enrique Jackson reportedly came in second. It then seemed as if the PRI primary would be a battle of the titans between Madrazo and Montiel.

Earlier in 2005 the PRI had decided to use a party primary to choose its presidential candidate. The primary was scheduled to be held on November 13. On paper the PRI had three candidates. As the candidates officially registered in October, a little known Priista named Everardo Moreno filed along with Madrazo and Montiel. Once the filing deadline passed, accusations of corruption were leveled against Arturo Montiel. It was said that the Mexican government was investigating \$3.2 million in bank deposits to accounts belonging to the Montiel family while Montiel was governor of state of Mexico. Also at issue was whether Montiel had bought several luxury properties in Acapulco, Valle de Bravo and other locales with ill-gotten gains. Montiel at first denied the allegations, but he would withdraw from the primary within a few weeks of these allegations becoming public.<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>137</sup> Hector Tobar. "In Mexico, PRI's Montiel Ends His Presidential Bid." Los Angeles Times (internet edition). October 21, 2005.

It was widely believed that the Madrazo campaign was the source of the allegations against Montiel. It was suggested that the information was released to the Mexican media after the registration deadline had passed specifically to make it impossible for TUCOM to field another candidate against him. With Moreno in the race, Madrazo at least had a nominal opponent, and thus could claim that he had won a majority of votes from Priistas and PRI sympathizers to garner the nomination. Not surprisingly Madrazo went on to easily best Moreno in the PRI's primary to become the party's presidential candidate. For remaining in the race to be Madrazo's sacrificial lamb, Moreno was rewarded with a slot on the party's proportional representation list for the Mexican Senate.

Roberto Madrazo would go on to lose the Mexican presidential election in July 2006. He finished a distant third behind the PAN's Felipe Calderón and the PRD's Andrés Manuel López Obrador. Madrazo ended up with a mere 22% of the vote. He later claimed many in the party abandoned him. Priista governors (especially those aligned with TUCOM), he argued, secretly supported Calderon.<sup>138</sup> Madrazo only had himself to blame for pushing his one-time General Secretary, Elba Esther Gordillo, out of the party. She became the guiding force behind the creation of the Nueva Alianza party, and was rumored to have offered the party's presidential support to Calderón. The push toward internal democracy through the use of party primaries and delegate conventions was supposed to help restore the party's legitimacy. Instead of being chosen through the

---

<sup>138</sup>Madrazo, Roberto. 2007. La Traición. Mexico: Editorial Planeta Mexicana.

“dedazo,” candidates would be chosen by the militancy. This was supposed to put the PRI into a position to win in 2006. Instead the PRI finished well out of the running.

Given the experience of the 2006 presidential elections, Priistas concluded that open primaries led to division. The fight between Madrazo and Montiel was out in the open and led to further bad blood. The accusations against Montiel not only led to his withdrawal from the race, but made the PRI look like the same old corrupt party of yesteryear. The lesson that the PRI learned was unity at all costs. Primaries may be more transparent, but they don't lead to better candidates. After the experience of 2006, the PRI would seek to avoid primaries and look for the “unity candidate.”

## Chapter 5 - Conclusions

The PRI did not regain national power in 2006. The primary goal in reforming its candidate selection procedures was not achieved. This should not suggest that the process was without value. One could argue that the 2000-2006 period was one in which the party engaged in valuable experimentation. After reflecting on the experience, the PRI concluded that party unity and not internal democracy was the key to winning elections. Open primaries, or delegate conventions for that matter, have seldom been used to select candidates since 2006. After losing a battle for the CEN presidency in 2002 against Roberto Madrazo, Beatriz Paredes bested Enrique Jackson in 2007 to become the PRI's president. Under Paredes's leadership, the PRI sought out unity candidates whenever possible.<sup>139</sup>

Between 2006 and 2012, unity candidates were offered as the PRI's gubernatorial candidates in all of my case study states. In Yucatan in 2007, the PRI selected Senator Ivonne Ortega as its unity candidate. The party utilized a public opinion survey administered by a professional polling firm to conclude that she was the most electable candidate. The use of public opinion surveys to help select candidates was something the PRI toyed with before 2006 and has become standard practice since. By using polling data, the party concluded that it could gauge what its militancy and the general public wanted without the use of divisive and expensive primaries. Not surprisingly, Priista governors continued to exert influence over the candidate selection process. In Chihuahua, former Congressman César Duarte was nominated as a unity candidate in

---

<sup>139</sup> Paredes was CEN president from 2007 until 2011.

2010. This was done despite the fact that the PRI in Chihuahua had utilized an open primary the previous two electoral cycles with great success. In the state of Mexico, after some speculation in regard to whom Enrique Peña Nieto might prefer, former mayor of Ecatepec Eruviel Avila Villegas was selected as a unity candidate. No analysis suggested that anybody but Peña Nieto made the choice of candidate. All three candidates went on to win their elections by comfortable margins, even in Yucatan where the PRI had lost power in 2001 and the party seemed down and out for a few years after. Not everyone in the party was happy with the unity candidates, but no major defections occurred.<sup>140</sup> Moreover, the PRI continued to govern most Mexican states in the 2006-2012 time frame. On the surface, it seemed like unity candidates were working out well for the party.

When it came time to select its candidate for the 2012 presidential election, the PRI offered a unity candidate in Enrique Peña Nieto. Several PRI elites had expressed interest in the nomination. Other than Peña Nieto, CEN President Beatriz Paredes was a rumored candidate. The PRI's leader in the Senate, Manlio Fabio Beltrones, had presidential ambitions and, of course, a few of the PRI's other governors still saw a future president when they looked in the mirror.

Peña Nieto was the leading candidate early on, and he maintained his lead in the polls throughout. He was young, attractive, and made few major errors while governing the state of Mexico. Common wisdom suggested the race was his to lose. The strategy

---

<sup>140</sup> Former CEN President and interim Governor Dulce Maria Sauri was upset by the closed process utilized in Yucatan, as she had gubernatorial ambitions of her own. But she did not bolt the party and ended up publically supporting Ortega.

of the other PRI elites who wanted the nomination was to hope that Peña Nieto slipped up. Short of that, nobody in the party was going to directly challenge him given his popularity.<sup>141</sup> The PRI did announce that it tentatively planned to hold an open primary in late-2011 to select its candidate. It was widely assumed, however, that nobody would challenge Peña Nieto and the party was not seriously considering having a primary. For a time, Manlio Fabio Beltrones toyed with the idea of entering the primary. He was running well behind Peña Nieto in all polls, so as the date approached to register, Beltrones indicated he would not run. The PRI had its unity candidate, and there was no need to go ahead with the primary. It had widely been assumed that Peña Nieto gave the PRI its best chance to win, and he had no major enemies in the party. The PRI's strategy of grooming him as a unity candidate paid off; especially given the reality he won the presidential election in July 2012. Unity at all costs proved to be an effective strategy.

I started off this thesis asking why the PRI embarked on a reform process in regard to candidate selection, and why the reform/transformation process took the direction that it did. Clearly the electoral competition it was exposed to in the 1980s and 1990s and then the electoral loss it experienced in 2000 spurred this process. Many Priistas perceived that the party had lost legitimacy in the eyes of society. The loss of the national presidency in 2000 made candidate selection reform unavoidable. It forced new actors to make the important party decisions that the President of the Republic once made. At the national level, CEN officials, members of the Mexican Congress, and state

---

<sup>141</sup> Information that could have hindered Peña Nieto's campaign did not become public until he was already the PRI's official nominee. For example, he fathered children out of wedlock when married to his first wife.

governors competed for influence. In those states that were still governed by the PRI, governors to a large degree assumed the all-encompassing role that the national president once played, but within the state party structure. In non-PRI governed states, CEN and CDE leaders were much more likely to influence party affairs.

In Chapter 2, I explained how the PRI regrouped at the 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly in 2001. Open primaries were encouraged as a means to help the party restore its legitimacy. The 2003 mid-term elections showed internal democracy in action, but it also showed the dynamics of competition among the new elites of the PRI in trying to use the new regulations to their advantage. CEN leaders tried to fill the void left by the departure of the President of the Republic, but they were somewhat unsuccessful. They had to share party power with the governors and members of the Mexican Congress. In Chapter 3, the new power of the Priista governor is clearly illustrated. As the decade progressed, open primaries became less common to select candidates. PRI governors generally preferred other mechanisms to select candidates, ones they could control better. Also working against more open processes within the party was the perception (and partial reality) that they caused divisions that ended up harming the PRI in the electoral arena.

As explained in Chapter 4, after the PRI came in third place in 2006 with Roberto Madrazo as its standard bearer, the party concluded that it really did not matter what mechanisms were used to select candidates. What mattered were party unity and quality of candidate. Party primaries often worked against party unity, as competition became a zero sum game in many ways. It became harder to compensate the losers when using more democratic selection methods, as the sting of loss was much more public. As a

result, after utilizing party primaries quite a bit between 2000 and 2006, such mechanisms for candidate and party leadership selection have been used much less frequently after 2006. The goal of a political party is to win elections. Internal democracy might be a laudable goal, but what good is it if it does not help the party win. The PRI concluded that unity candidates should be pursued where possible. Open primaries and delegate conventions would only be used if absolutely necessary.

My findings on candidate selection reform support the general literature in the area. Rogelio Hernández discusses the expanded post-2000 role of the Mexican governor, and I illustrate how the Priista governor has expanded his role in the state PRI. Joy Langston argued for a new found importance of party rules in a post-hegemonic PRI. My findings support hers to a degree, but I show how party elites can use party statutes to further their own interests, and how rules (such as ones that allow for electoral alliances) can be used to get around other rules (rules on how to select candidates). Tun-Jeng Cheng illustrates the role political entrepreneurship plays in the post-hegemonic PRI. I support and further his illustration of Roberto Madrazo as a post-2000 political entrepreneur, as well as introducing others such as Arturo Montiel.

This thesis supports and expands existing literature, but its greatest contribution is that it provides an in-depth look at the party's internal politics during a very dynamic period. The 2000-2006 period was one in which PRI party politics were in flux. Its candidate selection methods were in flux. Before 2000, the President of the Republic played the major role in candidate selection. Post-2006, the party seeks out a "unity" candidate. The period in-between was one of much experimentation and variation, and

this thesis captures that. Moreover, another contribution of this thesis is the in-depth field research that it is based on. Numerous interviews were conducted with all types of party officials, both in Mexico City and in three Mexican states. Though some great studies have been conducted on sub-national politics in Mexico, not as many have been undertaken as the subject warrants. This study rectifies that reality only to a very small degree. As Enrique Peña Nieto is on the verge of taking the presidential reigns in Mexico, this thesis examines the PRI in his home state at the time of his rise to prominence.

From a comparative standpoint, the post-2000 experience of the PRI can be compared to the experience of the post-2000 KMT in Taiwan, as Tun-Jeng Cheng does. The KMT was also a hegemonic party that ruled for many years before losing power in 2000. Like the PRI in Mexico, the KMT transformed to regain power in 2008. The PRI's experience can perhaps be compared to that of the former communist parties of Eastern Europe. Most of those parties had to transform to survive, but few have come close to achieving significant power again. Also, the Colorado Party in Paraguay is a former hegemonic party that recently lost power after having held it for many years. It may be interesting to take a look at how it has adjusted to its new circumstances.

Given that the PRI now generally seeks out unity candidates for executive level positions (such as governor and president), it might be interesting and useful if we could identify the dynamics of that process. For example, how is conflict avoided when picking a unity candidate? How are elites who might also want the nomination but don't get it compensated? How does it differ from the days when the President of the Republic

selected the PRI's "unity" candidate? And under what conditions might it be useful for a party such as the PRI to use open primaries in the future?

In Dale Story's classic study of the PRI, he argued that the party has always been a pragmatic and flexible one. Its experiences after losing power in 2000 show that the modern PRI did not leave that pragmatism and flexibility in the past. That pragmatism and flexibility helped it regain power.

## Appendix – Interview List

**Interview 1 – José Luis Sierra Villarreal.** Professor of History at the Instituto Nacional de Antropología y Historia (INAH). Husband of Dulce María Sauri Riancho. Interviewed at his Merida (INAH) office on October 31, 2002. Follow up conversation # 1 on November 28, 2002 at his INAH office. Follow up conversation #2 on December 13, 2002 at his INAH office.

**Interview 2 – Gabriel González Gamboa.** Secretario Particular to Presidente Estatal Roberto Pinzón Álvarez (Yucatan). Professor of Chemistry at la Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán. Interviewed at PRI headquarters (Yucatan) (La Casa del Pueblo) on November 18, 2002.

**Interview 3 – Rodrigo Valencia Arana.** Presidente del Instituto de Capacitación y Desarrollo Político (PRI Yucatan state party apparatus). Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo) on November 19, 2002. Several informal follow up conversations. The most substantial follow up conversation occurred on December 10, 2002 at La Casa del Pueblo, the new ICADEP office, and Elidíos restaurant.

**Interview 4 – Juan Duran Flores.** Secretario de Operación y Acción Política (PRI Yucatan state party apparatus). Retired Professor of Public Health. Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo) on November 21, 2002. Follow up conversation on December 10, 2002 at La Casa del Pueblo.

**Interview 5 – Arturo Guilbot Taddei.** Secretario de Administración y Finanzas (PRI Yucatan state party apparatus). Member of the Comité Directivo Estatal (CDE). Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo) on November 26, 2002.

**Interview 6 – Miguel Ruiz Ayuso.** Secretario de Organización (PRI Yucatan state party apparatus). Member of the Comité Directivo Estatal (CDE). Research Engineer at Instituto Tecnológico de Mérida. Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo) on November 26, 2002.

**Interview 7 – Cleominio Zoreda Novelo.** Diputado Estatal (Yucatan); Leader of the PRI faction in the Congreso del Estado de Yucatán; Member of the national PRI's Comisión Política Permanente; Former state Secretario de Gobernación in the Cervera Administration. Interviewed at his office in the Congreso del Estado de Yucatan building on November 28, 2002.

**Interview 8 – Lourdes Caballero Negrón.** Secretaria de Acción y Gestión Social (PRI Yucatan state party apparatus). Member of the Comité Directivo Estatal (CDE). Director of a local kinder. Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo) on December 2, 2002.

**Interview 9 – Víctor Caballero Duran.** Presidente del Comité Municipal (PRI Mérida). Ex-Regidor de Ayuntamiento de Mérida. Lawyer in Mérida. Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo), Mérida Office, on December 3, 2002.

**Interview 10 – Efraín Aguilar Góngora.** Coordinador de Asuntos Jurídicos (PRI Yucatan state party apparatus); Delegate to the PRI's 18<sup>th</sup> National Assembly in November 2001. Lawyer in Mérida. Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo) on December 5, 2002.

**Interview 11 – Antonio Morales Balderas.** Secretario de Acción Electoral (PRI Yucatan state party apparatus). Member of the Comité Directivo Estatal (CDE). Regidor de Ayuntamiento de Mérida (2001-2004). Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo) on December 5, 2002.

**Interview 12 – Luis Antonio Hevia Jiménez.** Diputado Estatal (PRI; Yucatan). Leader of CNOP (Popular Sector) in Yucatan. Interviewed at his office in the Congreso del Estado de Yucatán building on December 6, 2002.

**Interview 13 – Orlando Paredes Lara.** Senador Federal por Yucatán (2000-2006). PRI gubernatorial candidate in Yucatan (2001); PRI mayoral candidate in Mérida (1993); Former leader of the CNOP in Yucatan; Former Secretario de Gobernación in Yucatan. Interviewed at his Mérida office on December 7, 2002.

**Interview 14 – Efraín Poot Capetillo.** Coordinador de la Unidad de Ciencias Sociales/Centro de Investigaciones Regionales, Dr. Hideo Noguchi en la Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán. Interviewed at his office at UADY on December 9, 2002.

**Interview 15 – Carlos Sobrino Sierra.** Presidente Estatal del PRI Yucateco (2003-2006). He was a candidate for the PRI presidency in Yucatan at the time of the interview; Federal Senator (91-97); Diputado Federal (97-2000); Former Coordinator of the PRI's National Territorial Movement. Interviewed at his campaign headquarters in Mérida on December 9, 2002.

**Interview 16 - José Luis Novelo Ayuso.** Presidente de la Comisión Estatal de Procesos Internos de Yucatán. Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo) on December 10, 2002.

**Interview 17 – Roberto Pinzón Álvarez.** Presidente Estatal del PRI en Yucatán (2000-2003) (Presidente del CDE). Former Diputado Estatal en Yucatán. Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo) on December 10, 2002.

**Interview 18 – Othon Baños Ramírez (Ph.D.).** Profesor Investigador Titular at Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, Centro de Investigaciones Regionales/Unidad de Ciencias Sociales. Interviewed at his office at UDAY on December 12, 2002.

**Interview 19 – Rubén Valdez.** Secretario de Elecciones (PRI Mérida). A PRIista joven (22 years old) Interviewed at PRI headquarters in Yucatan (La Casa del Pueblo), Mérida office, on December 12, 2002.

**Interview 20 - Laura Ocampo Gutiérrez.** Coordinadora de Mujeres Emetistas (national party apparatus). Vicepresidenta en el Organismo Nacional de Mujeres PRIistas por parte del Movimiento Territorial. Member of the national PRI's Comisión Política Permanente; Position #12 Propietario in the fourth circumscription on the proportional representation list for the 2003 federal diputado elections. Former Presidenta Estatal del PRI en Morelos. Interviewed at the national headquarters of the PRI's Territorial Movement in Mexico City on February 6, 2003.

**Interview 21 – Samuel Aguilar Solís.** Secretario Técnico de la Presidencia (national party apparatus). Member of the national PRI's Comisión Política Permanente; Diputado Federal (2000-2003). Senador Federal from Durango (1994-2000). Presidente del Congreso del Estado de Durango (1992-1994). Interviewed at the PRI's (CEN) national headquarters in Mexico City on February 11, 2003. Follow up interview at the PRI's (CEN) national headquarters on March 17, 2003.

**Interview 21B – Samuel Aguilar Solís and Hugo Andrés Araujo.** Araujo is the Presidente de la Comisión de Agricultura del Consejo Político Nacional. Senador Federal de Tamaulipas (1994-2000); Diputado Federal (1991-1994). Interviewed at the PRI's (CEN) national headquarters in Mexico City on February 12, 2003.

**Interview 22 – Cánek Vázquez Góngora.** Secretario General por el Juventud Popular Revolucionaria Comité Ejecutivo Nacional (PRI). Interviewed at the national headquarters of the PRI's Popular Sector (CNOP) in Mexico City on February 13, 2003. Follow up conversation Number 1 in the lobby of the PRI's Frente Juvenil's offices at the PRI's (CEN) national headquarters in Mexico City on February 19, 2003. Follow up conversation Number 2 at the national headquarters of the PRI's Popular Sector (CNOP) in Mexico City on March 31, 2003. Follow up conversation Number 3 at the national headquarters of the CNOP in Mexico City on April 9, 2003. Follow up conversation Number 4 at the national headquarters of the CNOP in Mexico City on May 8, 2003.

**Interview 23 – Omar Bazán Flores.** Secretario de la Programa de Acción y Gestión Social (PRI national party apparatus). Member of PRI's Comité Ejecutivo Nacional (CEN); Member of the PRI's Comisión Política Permanente; Ex-federal diputado from Chihuahua. Position #1 Suplente in the second circumscription on the proportional

representation list for the 2003 federal diputado elections. Interviewed at the PRI's (CEN) national headquarters in Mexico City on February 14, 2003.

**Interview 24 – Efraín Morales Ayón.** Coordinador de Enlace con los Subsecretarios de la Secretaria de Programa de Acción y Gestión Social (national level apparatus). Interviewed at the PRI's (CEN) national headquarters in Mexico City on February 17, 2003. Follow up conversation at the PRI's (CEN) national headquarters in Mexico City on April 1, 2003.

**Interview 25 – Federico Madrazo Rojas.** Subsecretario de Organización de la Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Populares (CNOP) (PRI national party apparatus); Son of the PRI's national president Roberto Madrazo. Position #9 Suplente in the third circumscription on the proportional representation list for the 2003 federal diputado elections. Interviewed at the national headquarters of the PRI's Popular Sector (CNOP) in Mexico City on February 18, 2003.

**Interview 26 – Alejandro Moreno Cárdenas.** Coordinador Nacional del Frente Juvenil Revolucionario (PRI). Member of the PRI's Comité Ejecutivo Nacional (CEN); Member of the PRI's Comisión Política Permanente. Position #7 Propietario in the third circumscription on the proportional representation list for the 2003 federal diputado elections. Diputado Federal (2003-2006). Interviewed at Café Miro in Mexico City on February 19, 2003.

**Interview 27 – Juan Salgado Brito (Ph.D.).** Secretario de Organización de la Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Populares (CNOP) (PRI national party apparatus); PRI gubernatorial candidate in Morelos in 2000. Interviewed at the national headquarters of the PRI's Popular Sector (CNOP) in Mexico City on February 19, 2003.

**Interview 28 – Víctor Manuel Saucedo Perdomo.** Coordinador de Legalidad y Transparencia en la Comisión Nacional de Procesos Internos (PRI). Interviewed at the PRI's (CEN) National Headquarters in Mexico City on February 20, 2003.

**Interview 29 – Araceli García Rico.** Secretaria de Mujeres Jóvenes en el Organismo Nacional de Mujeres PRIistas. Position #19 Propietario in the fourth circumscription on the proportional representation list for the 2003 federal diputado elections. Interviewed at the PRI's (CEN) National Headquarters in Mexico City on February 20, 2003.

**Interview 30 – Pedro Sáez Williams.** Secretario Particular Interino to the Secretario General del CNOP (national party apparatus) Manlio Fabio Beltrones. Position #10 Suplente in the fourth circumscription on the proportional representation list for the 2003 diputado elections. Informal conversation at the national headquarters of the PRI's Popular Sector (CNOP) in Mexico City on February 25, 2003. Follow up conversation #1 at the national headquarters of the CNOP on March 18, 2003. Follow up conversation

#2 at the national headquarters of the CNOP on April 7, 2003. Follow up conversation  
#3 at the national headquarters of the CNOP on April 11, 2003. Follow up conversation  
#4 at the national headquarters of the CNOP on April 30, 2003. Follow up conversation  
#5 at the national headquarters of the CNOP on June 3, 2003.

**Interview 31 – Martha Palafox Gutiérrez and Rubén Reséndiz.** Secretaria de Atención a Grupos Vulnerables in the CNOP. Position #9 in the fourth circumscription on the proportional representation list for the 2003 diputado elections. Diputada Federal (2003-2006). Ex-Presidenta del Organismo Nacional de Mujeres PRIistas (2001); Ex-Vicepresidenta por CNOP en ONMPRI (Vicepresidenta de Jefas de Familia). Reséndiz is the Asesor a Martha Palafox en la Secretaria de Atención a Grupos Vulnerables. Interviewed at the national headquarters of the PRI's Popular Sector (CNOP) in Mexico City on February 25, 2003.

**Interview 32 – Carlos Reta Martínez.** Secretario General Adjunto (Secretaria General's office of the CEN). Interviewed at the PRI's (CEN) National Headquarters in Mexico City on February 26, 2003.

**Interview 33 – Jesús Esquinca Gurrusquieta.** Presidente de la Alianza Nacional Revolucionaria. Retired Army General; former PRI Diputado Federal (94-97). Interviewed at the headquarters of the Alianza Nacional Revolucionaria in the CNOP building in Mexico City on March 5, 2003.

**Interview 34 – Carlos Guerrero.** Secretario Particular del Coordinador Nacional Editorial y de Divulgación del CEN PRI (Samuel Palma Cesar). Interviewed at the PRI's (CEN) National Headquarters in Mexico City on March 11, 2003.

**Interview 35 – Juan Alberto Antolín Flores.** Subsecretario Coordinador de Comités Estatales en la Confederación Nacional de Organizaciones Populares (CNOP); Diputado Local en la Asamblea Legislativa del Distrito Federal (2000-2003). Interviewed at the national headquarters of the PRI's Popular Sector (CNOP) in Mexico City on March 11, 2003.

**Interview 36 - Cesar Camacho Quiroz.** Senador Federal por el Estado de México (2000-2006). Former Governor of the Estado de México (1995-1999); Former Presidente Municipal de Metepec (Estado de México). Interviewed at the Mexican Senate building in Mexico City on March 14, 2003.

**Interview 37 – Angelina Téllez Sánchez.** Coordinadora de la Unidad Seguimiento del Grupo Parlamentario del PRI. She has had several positions within the Chihuahua State PRI including Secretaria de Finanzas, Controlaría del Partido, Presidenta de Planeación, and Coordinadora de Profesionales y Técnicos en el CNOP de Chihuahua. She is close to Beatriz Paredes. Informal conversation at the Camara de Diputados Building in Mexico

City on March 17, 2003. Follow up conversation at the Cámara de Diputados building in Mexico City on March 27, 2003. Formal interview (in place of Beatriz Paredes) at the Cámara de Diputados building in Mexico City on June 6, 2003.

**Interview 38 – Federico Granja Ricalde.** Diputado Federal (2000-2003); Coordinador de la Diputación Federal por el Estado de Yucatán. Former Governor of Yucatan (1994-1995). Interviewed at the Camara de Diputados building in Mexico City on March 18, 2003.

**Interview 39 – José Feliciano Moo y Can.** Diputado Federal por Yucatán (Distrito 2) (2000-2003). Interviewed at the Camara de Diputados building in Mexico City on March 18, 2003.

**Interview 40 – Cesar Duarte Jaquez .** Diputado Federal (2000-2003); Coordinador del Confederación Nacional Campesina (CNC) in the State of Chihuahua. Interviewed at the Cámara de Diputados building in Mexico City on March 18, 2003.

**Interview 41 – Dulce María Sauri Riancho.** Senadora Federal (2000-2006). Ex-Presidenta del PRI Nacional (1999-2002); Ex-Gobernadora del Estado de Yucatán (1991-1993). Interviewed at the Mexican Senate building in Mexico City on March 26, 2003.

**Interview 42 – Enrique Martínez Orta.** Diputado Federal por el Estado de México (Distrito 36) (2000-2003). Coordinador de la Diputación Federal por el Estado de Mexico. Interviewed at the Camara de Diputados building in Mexico City on March 27, 2003.

**Interview 43 - Carlos Flores Rico.** Secretario General del Movimiento Territorial del PRI (national party apparatus). Member of the PRI's Comité Ejecutivo Nacional (CEN); Member of the PRI's Comisión Política Permanente; Titular de la Comisión de Criterios Generales de Campana del PRI (2003). Position #5 Propietario in the second circumscription on the proportional representation list for the 2003 diputado elections. Diputado Federal (2003- ). Interviewed at the national headquarters of the PRI's Territorial Movement in Mexico City on March 28, 2003.

**Interview 44 - Eric Rubio Barthell.** Senador Federal por Yucatán (2000-2006). Former Secretario de Gobernación in Yucatán in the Cervera Pacheco Administration. Interviewed at the Mexican Senate building in Mexico City on April 2, 2003.

**Interview 45 – Laura Pavón Jaramillo.** Diputada Federal (2000-2003). Consejera del CEN (PRI Nacional); Consejera del CDE del Estado de México. Interviewed at the Camara de Diputados building in Mexico City on April 3, 2003.

**Interview 46 – Mauricio Rossell Abitia** (Ph.D.). Secretario General Adjunto (Secretaria General's office of the CEN). Position # 13 Propietario in the fourth circumscription on the proportional representation list for the 2003 diputado elections. Former PRI Diputado Federal. His columns regularly appear in the newspaper El Universal. Interviewed at the PRI's (CEN) National Headquarters in Mexico City on April 3, 2003.

**Interview 47 – Jaime Vazquez Castillo.** Diputado Federal por el Estado de México (Distrito 35) (2000-2003). Vicepresidente de la Mesa Directiva. Ex- Presidente del PRI en el Estado de México (Camacho and Montiel Administrations); Ex-Secretario de Gobernación en el Estado de México (Camacho Administration); Leader of the state congress in the Estado de México (1994-1997 Congress). Interviewed at the Camara de Diputados Building in Mexico City on April 8, 2003.

**Interview 48 – Khemvirg Puente Martínez.** Secretario Particular to Diputado Jaime Vázquez Castillo. Worked on Beatriz Paredes' campaign for the PRI party presidency in 2002; Worked on Francisco Labastida's campaign for the national presidency in 2000. Interviewed at the Cámara de Diputados building in Mexico City on April 8, 2003. Follow up conversation # 1 at the Camara de Diputados building in Mexico City on May 12, 2003.

**Interview 49 – Gabriel Corona Armenta** (Ph.D.). Profesor-Investigador en la Escuela Nacional de Estudios Profesionales Acatlán (UNAM Acatlan campus); Consejero del Instituto Electoral del Estado de México. Interviewed at the UNAM Acatlan campus in Naucalpan on April 10, 2003.

**Interview 50 – José Ramírez Gamero.** Diputado Federal (2000-2003). Secretario de Educación, Capacitación y Adiestramiento de la Confederación de Trabajadores (CTM); Ex-Gobernador del Estado de Durango (1986-1992). Former federal senator and has been a federal diputado on several occasions. Interviewed at the national headquarters of the Confederación de Trabajadores Mexicanos (CTM) on April 10, 2003.

**Interview 51 – Norma González González.** (Ph.D.) Profesora-Investigadora en la Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (Sociology/Public Health). Consejera del Instituto Electoral del Estado de Mexico. Interviewed at la Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México in Toluca on May 13, 2003.

**Interview 52- Alfonso Iracheta Cenecorta.** (Ph.D.) Profesor-Investigador en el Colegio Mexiquense. Interviewed at el Colegio Mexiquense in Zinacantepec, Estado de México on May 14, 2003.

**Interview 53 – Eulogio Carpio Mejía.** Secretario de Acción Electoral (PRI Mexiquense state apparatus). Member of the Comité Directivo Estatal (CDE) del PRI Mexiquense. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Mexiquense in Toluca on May 21, 2003.

**Interview 54 – Guadalupe Moncerrath Mucino Garcés.** Auxiliar del Subsecretario de Educacion del Estado de Mexico (Rogelio Tinoco). Licenciada en Ciencias Políticas y Administración Pública de la Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México (thesis on politics in the Estado de México). Interviewed at the Palacio de Gobierno del Estado de México in Toluca on May 23, 2003.

**Interview 55 - Yessika Sobrino Palacios.** Encargada de la Subsecretaria de Información y Análisis Político (PRI Mexiquense state apparatus). Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Mexiquense in Toluca on May 26, 2003.

**Interview 56 – Héctor Karim Carvalho Delfín.** Secretario Particular del Instituto de Capacitación y Desarrollo Político (ICADEP), A.C. Filial Estado de México (PRI Mexiquense state apparatus). Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Mexiquense in Toluca on May 26, 2003.

**Interview 57 – Rodolfo Becceril Traffon.** (Ph.D.) Asesor del Grupo Parlamentario del PRI en la Cámara de Diputados. Ex- Diputado Federal (1991-1994); Ex-Senador Federal (1994-2000); Losing pre-candidate for the PRI gubernatorial candidacy nomination in Morelos in 2000. Interviewed at the Camara de Diputados building in Mexico City on May 28, 2003.

**Interview 58 – Hazel Suarez Bastida.** Presidenta Suplente de la Comisión Estatal de Procesos Internos (PRI Mexiquense state apparatus). Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Mexiquense in Toluca on June 10, 2003.

**Interview 59 – Isidro Pastor Medrano.** Presidente Estatal del PRI Mexiquense (2002-2005) (Presidente del CDE). Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Mexiquense in Toluca on June 10, 2003.

**Interview 60 – Rogelio Tinoco García.** Sub-Secretario del Educación en el Estado de México (educación básica y normal). Former Jefe de la Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Administración Pública en la Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México. Worked on Arturo Montiel's gubernatorial campaign in the Estado de México during 1999. Interviewed at the Palacio de Gobierno del Estado de México in Toluca on June 11, 2003.

**Interview 61 – José Luis Barajas Soria.** Secretario Técnico de la Coordinación General de la Vinculación con la Sociedad (PRI Mexiquense state apparatus). Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Mexiquense in Toluca on June 12 and 13, 2003.

**Interview 62 – René García Castellanos.** Asesor al Organismo Estatal de Mujeres PRIistas (PRI Mexiquense state apparatus). Profesor en la Universidad Autónoma del

Estado de México. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Mexiquense in Toluca on June 13, 2003.

**Interview 63 – Pablo Espinoza Flores.** Secretario General del PRI Chihuahuense. Member of the Comité Directivo Estatal (CDE) del PRI Chihuahuense. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Chihuahuense in Chihuahua City on June 26, 2003.

**Interview 64 – Norma Gutiérrez González.** Presidenta del Instituto de Capacitación y Desarrollo Político (ICADEP) Filial Chihuahua. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Chihuahuense in Chihuahua City on June 30, 2003.

**Interview 65 – Carlos Ávila Sánchez.** Delegado del Comité Ejecutivo Nacional (CEN) al Secretario de Acción Electoral del PRI Chihuahuense. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Chihuahuense in Chihuahua City on July 3, 2003.

**Interview 66 – Graciela Ortiz González.** Presidenta del PRI Chihuahuense (2003-2004). (Presidenta del CDE). Ex-Secretario del Educación en Chihuahua (Martínez García administration). Ex-Diputada local en Chihuahua. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Chihuahuense in Chihuahua City on July 3, 2003.

**Interview 67 – Xochitl Reyes Castro.** Coordinadora Ejecutiva Estatal del Movimiento Territorial (PRI Chihuahuense). Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Chihuahuense in Chihuahua City on July 4, 2003.

**Interview 68 – Juan Ramón Flores Gutiérrez.** Asesor del Coordinador de Prensa del Comité Ejecutivo Nacional (CEN) del PRI. Ex-Diputado Federal (1997-2000). Ex-Secretario General del Frente Juvenil Revolucionario (PRI) en el estado de Chihuahua. Interviewed at Dega restaurant in Chihuahua City on July 5, 2003.

**Interview 69 – Austrebertha López Jiménez.** Presidenta Estatal del Organismo de Mujeres del PRI en Chihuahua. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Chihuahuense in Chihuahua City on July 7, 2003.

**Interview 70 – Omar Venegas Quintana.** Asesor al Instituto de Capacitación y Desarrollo Político (ICADEP) Filial Chihuahua. Precandidato a dirigir el Frente Juvenil Revolucionario del PRI en Chihuahua. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Chihuahuense in Chihuahua City on July 8, 2003.

**Interview 71 – Kenny Arroyo González.** Secretaria General del PRI Municipal en la Ciudad de Chihuahua. Member del Comité Directivo Municipal (PRI) en la Ciudad de Chihuahua. Suplente a Diputada Federal Martha Laguette (2003-2006) (Distrito 8 en Chihuahua). Interviewed at the headquarters of the PRI municipal in Chihuahua City on July 10, 2003.

**Interview 72 – José Silveyra Hinojos.** Sub-secretario al Secretario General del PRI Chihuahuense. Ex Diputado local. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Chihuahuense in Chihuahua City on July 11, 2003.

**Interview 73 – Víctor Manuel Vásquez Muñoz.** Secretario de Programa de Acción y Gestión Social del PRI Chihuahuense. Interviewed at the state headquarters of the PRI Chihuahuense in Chihuahua City on July 11, 2003.

## Works Cited

### Books and Journal Articles

- Amezcuca, Adriana and Juan E. Pardinás. 1997. Todos Los Gobernadores del Presidente: Cuando el Dedo de Uno Aplasta el Voto Popular. Mexico D.F.: Grijalbo.
- Burgess, Katrina and Steven Levitsky. 2003. "Explaining Populist Party Adaptation in Latin America: Environmental and Organizational Determinants of Party Change in Argentina, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela," Comparative Political Studies. 36:8, 881-911.
- Camp, Roderic Ai. 1999. Politics in Mexico: The Decline of Authoritarianism. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Carpizo, Jorge. 1978. El Presidencialismo Mexicano. Mexico D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Castañeda, Jorge. 2000. Perpetuating Power: How Mexican Presidents Were Chosen. New York: The New Press.
- Centeno, Miguel Angel. 1994. Democracy Within Reason: Technocratic Revolution in Mexico. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Cheng, Tun-jen. 2008. "Embracing Defeat: The KMT and the PRI After 2000," in Joseph Wong and Edward Friedman (eds.). Political Transitions in Dominant Party Systems. New York: Routledge.
- Cline, Howard F. 1965. The U.S. and Mexico. New York: Atheneum.
- Crespo, José Antonio. 1998. ¿Tiene Futuro el PRI? Mexico D.F.: Grijalbo.
- Diamond, Larry. 1999. Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hernández Rodríguez, Rogelio. 1998. "The Partido Revolucionario Institucional," in Governing Mexico: Political Parties and Elections. Monica Serrano (ed.). London: The Institute of Latin American Studies, University of London.
- Hernández Rodríguez, Rogelio. 2003. "The Renovation of Old Institutions: State Governors and the Political Transition in Mexico," Latin American Politics and Society. 45:4, 97-127.

- Huntington, Samuel. 1993. The Third Wave of Democracy: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Langston, Joy. 2001. "Why Rules Matter: Changes in Candidate Selection in Mexico's PRI, 1988-2000," Journal of Latin American Studies. 33: 485-511.
- Langston, Joy. 2003. "Rising from the Ashes? Reorganizing and Unifying PRI's State Party Organizations after Electoral Defeat," Comparative Political Studies. 36:3. 293-318.
- Lawson, Chappell. 2000. "Mexico's Unfinished Transition: Democratization and Authoritarian Enclaves," Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos. 16:2, 267-287.
- Linz, Juan J. and Alfred Stepan. 1996. Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lomelí Vanegas, Leonardo. 2000. "La Presidencia de Carlos A. Madrazo," in El Partido de la Revolución: Institución y conflicto (1928-1999). Miguel González Compean and Leonardo Lomelí (eds.). Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Madrazo, Roberto. 2007. La Traición. Mexico: Editorial Planeta Mexicana.
- McCann, James A. 2004. "Primary Priming," in Mexico's Pivotal Democratic Election: Candidates, Voters, and the Presidential Campaign of 2000. Jorge I. Domínguez and Chappell Lawson (eds.). Stanford and La Jolla, CA: Stanford University Press and the Center for U.S.-Mexico Studies, UCSD.
- Partido Revolucionario Institucional. 2002. Documentos Básicos. Edición Septiembre 2002.
- Preston, Julia and Samuel Dillon. 2004. Opening Mexico: The Making of a Democracy. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1976. Parties and Party Systems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shirk, David A. 2005. Mexico's New Politics: The PAN and Democratic Change. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Smith, Peter. 1979. Labyrinths of Power: Political Recruitment in Twentieth Century Mexico. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Story, Dale. 1986. The Mexican Ruling Party: Stability and Authority. New York: Praeger.

Vieyra, Alberto. 2002. La Noche Priste del 2000. Mexico D.F.: Costa-Amic Editores, S.A.

### **Newspaper Articles**

“Arrancan Endebles Campañas Electorales,” Reforma (internet edition). 2 May 2004.

Arvizu Arriola Juan. “Sustituye Chico Herrera a Wintilo Vega en Guanajuato.” El Universal (internet edition). 22 March 2006.

Cruz Sáenz, César. “Abre PRI Elección a Alcaldes,” El Diario de Chihuahua (internet edition). 11 February 2004.

“El PRI Vuelve a Ser el PRI.” El Diario de Ciudad Juárez. (internet edition). 22 February 2004.

Gómez, Enrique. “Define PRI Mexiquense Candidatos a Diputados,” Reforma. 6 April 2003, 6A.

Gómez Hernández, Norma. “Arrasa Martha Laguette 6 a 1,” El Diario de Chihuahua (internet edition). 22 March 2004.

Guerrero, Claudia. “Consuman PRI-PVEM Alianza con Riesgos,” Reforma. 2 March 2003, 6A.

Guerrero, Claudia. “Buscan 544 en el Tricolor Candidatura,” Reforma. 13 March 2003, 13A.

“Laguette, Candidata: Declinan los Demás Aspirantes del PRI a la Alcaldía,” El Heraldo de Chihuahua (internet edition). 21 February 2004.

Maguey, Carlos. “Pierden la CNC y el Sector Obrero,” Reforma. 25 February 2003. 8A.

Mariscal, Angeles. “Renuncia Juan Sabinas al PRI; Podría Ser el Abanderado del PRD en Chiapas.” La Jornada (internet edition). 26 April 2006.

Minjares, Gabriela. “Suplirá a Valencia Diputado Federal,” El Diario de Ciudad Juarez (internet edition). 10 February 2004.

- Monge, Raul. "Nayarit: Guerra de Compadres," Proceso. 20 March 2005. 14-16.
- Rodriguez, Martin Diego. "Wintilo Vega Renuncia a Candidatura del PRI al Gobierno de Guanajuato." La Jornada (internet edition). 22 March 2006.
- Thompson, Ginger. "Mexico's Fallen Party Plans Its Revival With a New Star." New York Times (internet edition). 6 February 2005.
- Tobar, Hector. "In Mexico, PRI's Montiel Ends His Presidential Bid." Los Angeles Times (internet edition). 21 October 2005.
- Velasco, Carlos. "Advertencia de la CTM al PRI si le Niega Candidaturas," El Universal. 26 February 2003. A8.