

and George Soros ally, Manuel Camacho Solís. But Luis Donaldo Colosio was selected as the PRI Presidential candidate instead—and was shot dead in the middle of his campaign, in March 1994.

Despite every effort by Camacho to replace the conveniently departed Colosio as the PRI's Presidential candidate, Zedillo was named instead, and he was inaugurated as President of Mexico in December 1994.

At first, the British hoped to use Zedillo to finish off their project, or, to at least look the other way and allow the Salinas machine to keep running the country for them. But Zedillo apparently had a different agenda, as did Bill Clinton, and things began to turn sour for the Bush-Salinas cartel, as the following highlighted events indicate.

February 1995: Raúl Salinas de Gortari, the former President's older brother, was arrested and charged with murdering a former head of the PRI party.

March 1995: After weeks of histrionics, including a purported "hunger strike," Carlos Salinas fled the country in disgrace, taking up residence in Havana, Cuba, and eventually Dublin, Ireland.

November 1995: A major international scandal erupted over evidence of Raúl Salinas's laundering of hundreds of millions of dollars of drug money into Swiss and other secret bank accounts.

January 1996: The Zedillo government captured Gulf Cartel capo Juan García Abrego, and within hours expelled him to the United States, where he was wanted for drug-running crimes. On Oct. 16, 1996, he was convicted on 22 counts of trafficking, and sentenced to life in prison without parole.

February 1996: Carlos Salinas flew in from Cuba to meet in the Bahamas with his old partner in crime, George Bush, and Bush's former treasury secretary, Nicholas Brady.

May 1996: Carlos Salinas met in his Dublin home with old ally Manuel Camacho, and PRI-basher Jorge Castañeda (see below), to map out their joint political comeback in Mexico, with U.S. support.

August 1996: The *San Jose Mercury News* printed an exposé of Contra cocaine running in the United States, which rapidly became a national scandal, involving George Bush's direct oversight of the operation.

October 1996: Zedillo said "no" to a central element of London's economic strategy for Mexico: the full privatization of the petrochemical sector.

December 1996: Zedillo said "no" to a central element of London's political strategy for Mexico: the granting of "indigenist autonomy" to the Zapatistas, which would have shattered Mexico as a unified nation, and which Zedillo rightly denounced as "segregationist."

January-February-March 1997: All hell breaks loose, orchestrated by London, to topple the Zedillo government and sink Washington into a Mexican quagmire.

Meet London's (bilingual) mouth: Jorge Castañeda, Jr.

by Gretchen Small

Less than 48 hours after President Clinton announced the certification of Mexico, the *Washington Post* was publishing a diatribe against the decision, in its Sunday, March 2 "Commentary" section. The author was Jorge Castañeda, Jr., a former Mexican Communist Party member who now serves as spokesman and tactician for Fidel Castro's continental Jacobin gang, the São Paulo Forum.

"There they go again," Castañeda complained. "By certifying that Mexico is fully cooperating with the U.S. on drug enforcement, the Clinton administration has shown that it intends to pursue long-standing American policy toward Mexico, no matter how obsolete. Given the choice of propping up the PRI regime, whatever the cost or consequence, or risking a transition which would put an end to the PRI's 75 years of one-party rule, Washington will always choose the first option."

Since the January 1994 Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, in particular, Castañeda has become a familiar name in the international media, regularly trotted out as a leading "authority" on Mexican events. In 1996, the "leftist" Castañeda was catapulted into prominence in the debate over U.S. policy toward Mexico, by the New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the American branch of Britain's Royal Institute of International Affairs. The July/August 1996 issue of the CFR's *Foreign Affairs* magazine, the banking establishment's flagship journal, published an article by Castañeda, "Mexico's Circle of Misery," which elaborated the shift in United States policy toward Mexico advocated by these London circles, to wit: that the United States abandon the view that Mexico's stability is a matter of its own national security, and, instead, adopt the policy that chaos in Mexico is not only tolerable, but, in fact, necessary, to bring about "reforms" there.

Castañeda's *Foreign Affairs* piece was built around three basic arguments.

First, that a solution to Mexico's dire economic and political crisis requires the replacement of its "authoritarian political system" with a "new order" and "reworked social contract." Few specifics are given as to the shape of this proposed new order, other than that it must include "a draconian birth control program" and a "comprehensive political opening" for "civil society" (indigenous, civic groups, etc.). Castañeda

readily acknowledges that this “would undoubtedly unleash centrifugal forces that the central government would be hard-pressed to control.”

The problem he identifies, however, is that an insufficient number of Mexicans currently wish to overthrow their political system and government, a situation which will likely continue, he frets, as long as relations with the United States, and the U.S. economy, continue to hold out some hope of change. Thus, he poses the urgency of breaking U.S.-Mexican ties:

“The segments of Mexican society linked to the United States include key constituencies and power centers, and their indifference to the course of events in Mexico weakens the chances of meaningful reform. . . . A nationwide social explosion, such as the Revolution of 1910, is virtually impossible while such a large, regionally well-distributed, broadly based segment of the population is thriving.”

With the key to change identified as lying outside Mexico proper, Castañeda proposes that a consensus be formed around inducing revolution in Mexico:

Reform “requires Mexico’s elites and the United States to be tolerant of the upheaval that it will inevitably bring. . . . Washington will have no attractive options should a future Mexican crisis arise. Rejecting another Mexican plea for help would certainly generate unpleasant circumstances. But while not devoid of dangers and repercussions, waiting out the next debacle from the sidelines seems a wiser course than again saving the PRI and friends in exchange for cautious reforms. Mexico needs new leadership . . . and it will not flower as long as the old cliques remain in place,” he concludes.

What is Castañeda?

Castañeda is a second-generation British agent-of-influence. His father, former Mexican Foreign Minister Jorge Castañeda, Sr., is an international law expert and long-time United Nations bureaucrat who worked closely with the International Law Association, whose Canadian head, Maj. Louis M. Bloomfield, was a founder of the British intelligence front, Permindex, implicated in the assassination of John F. Kennedy, and numerous attempts against such other industrial world leaders as France’s Charles de Gaulle and Italy’s Enrico Mattei.

Castañeda, Jr. worked the radical track in politics, for the same international financial interests for which his father had promoted a more “centrist” line. Trained at Princeton University and the University of Paris, Castañeda, Jr. was a militant in the French and Mexican Communist Parties. But that didn’t stop him from maintaining his “respectable” connections in the United States: By the 1990s, Castañeda, Jr. had taught at the University of California and at Princeton, was a syndicated columnist for the *Los Angeles Times* and *Newsweek International*, and had co-authored a book with the Carter Center’s leading Ibero-American expert, Robert Pastor.

With the advent of the post-Cold War era in the 1990s, Cas-

tañeda, Jr. joined Fidel Castro’s São Paulo Forum, the continental association of narco-terrorist forces and “left” political parties founded in 1990 by the Cuban Communist Party and Brazil’s Workers Party (PT). Inside Mexico, Castañeda became a spokesman for, and adviser to, the São Paulo Forum’s major force in Mexico, the Revolutionary Democratic Party (PRD) of Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas. Enjoying an aura of importance from his U.S. connections, Castañeda today runs errands for the São Paulo Forum throughout Ibero-America, coordinating meetings of the political side of the operation, and promoting the group’s strategies through such fora as his syndicated column in the Montonero-run Argentine daily, *Página 12*. On Jan. 16, 1994, *Página 12* published a call by Castañeda for the Zapatista narco-terrorist insurgency to “put off any beginning of talks, or at least any substantive negotiations, until they had demonstrated a greater military capacity.” The Zapatistas, Castañeda wrote suggestively, should “have no other agenda than “democracy, even if through bullets.”

In early 1996, Castañeda wrote in the same newspaper: “The political support of the White House kept a dying political system and governing class intact [in Mexico]. . . . Let’s hope that 1996 brings in its wake struggles, protests and ruptures up and down the length of Mexico, the only recipe for a change which is possible, desirable, and appropriate.”

Castañeda’s prime sponsor in the United States is the Inter-American Dialogue, London’s leading British policy channel into Washington on Ibero-American affairs, and the architects of every major feature of George Bush’s foreign policy toward the area (see below). In September 1993, the Alfred A. Knopf company published Castañeda’s magnum opus, *Utopia Unarmed, The Latin American Left After the Cold War*, a book touted in the Western world as *the* word on Ibero-America and its immediate political future. The Inter-American Dialogue hosted a big reception in Washington, D.C., to present the book’s author, a Nov. 4, 1993 shindig which catapulted Castañeda into the ranks of established “authority” on Ibero-American affairs.

The book, after presenting his version of the history of the left in the region in the twentieth century, outlines a strategy for how, even after the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the left can maintain itself as a central actor in hemispheric politics, and even project itself into new positions of power.

If the “left” is to come to power, Castañeda argues, it must accept the reality of globalization; if it wants to govern, it must do so with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. He endorses international speculator George Soros’s favorite economist, Harvard’s idiotic Jeffrey Sachs, as the kind of reform-minded economist whose policies must be listened to by those who would rule. After all, the central crisis facing the region is a financial one, he intones: How will the resources be raised to pay the foreign debt, once the privatization “fire sales” of state properties reach their limits, and stock exchanges stabilize? “Drug-dealing was by defini-



Jorge Castañeda, Sr., British agent-of-influence, at a press conference on the Caribbean Basin in New York, 1982. His son, Jorge Castañeda, Jr., is following London's marching orders, in his father's footsteps.

tion a highly profitable but untaxable economic activity," he notes coyly. There is great wealth in the region, but without a social explosion, no government will have the political force to extract it at the levels required.

The political strategy proposed to extract that wealth, is what he later proposed for Mexico in his 1996 *Foreign Affairs* article. For Mexico, it is a call to have a re-run of the bloody 1910 Revolution, which led to a decade of chaos and war in which more than 1 million Mexicans died. For Ibero-America as a whole, Castañeda names Peru's Pol Pot-allied Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso) narco-terrorists, as the means to extract debt payments. In his chapter on "A Grand Bargain for the Millennium," Castañeda writes:

"Thus the condition for the renewed viability of reformism in Latin America . . . lies inevitably in the threat of something worse. Since it cannot be revolution as such—the way Cuba was for nearly twenty years—it must be different, yet terrifying nonetheless. This is the syndrome of Sendero Luminoso. . . . The social disintegration of which Sendero, the violence in Rio, military unrest in Venezuela, and the drug trade in Colombia represent nothing more than symptoms, is the new greater evil that might make reformism a going concern again in Latin America. Without the fear inspired by the prospect of losing everything, the wealthy and middle class will prefer to lose nothing."

Or, as Castañeda repeated in his Jan. 6, 1997 contribution

to Argentina's *Página 12* newspaper: Either Castañeda's cronies are brought to power through elections, or, by the end of the century, Che Guevara, the infamous theoretician of revolutionary guerrilla warfare, may prove to have been correct.

A Salinas agent, after all

The publication of Castañeda's *Foreign Affairs* piece led to a quantum leap in his access to the media in the United States—and those of Castañeda's perpetual sidekick, Alonso Aguilar Zinser, currently a federal congressman, and formerly campaign spokesman for Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas's PRD party. From the House of Morgan's *New York Times*, to CBS's 60 Minutes, to Katherine Graham's *Washington Post*, Castañeda and Aguilar Zinser have been held up as champions of the battle against corruption, and purported opponents of Mexico's corrupt former President, Carlos Salinas de Gortari.

What the U.S. media have chosen not to report, however, is that their anti-corruption heroes, Castañeda and Aguilar Zinser, are busy coordinating their "overthrow the PRI" strategy, not only with the Wall Street and London power centers which had put Salinas in power, but with George Bush's own Carlos Salinas himself—to this day.

That coordination became a matter of major national scandal in Mexico in mid-1996, when the news broke that on May 6, Jorge Castañeda, Jr., Manuel Camacho, and Carlos Salinas had held a closed-door pow-wow in Dublin, Ireland, where Salinas lives in self-imposed exile, fearing prosecution for his multitude of crimes, should he return to Mexico. The secretive meeting had been arranged by Castañeda, with some help from Aguilar Zinser who, while reportedly not there himself, had been in Europe at the time with Castañeda.

The subject of the meeting was reportedly the coordination of strategy between the political machines controlled by Salinas, Camacho, and Cardenas's PRD (represented by Castañeda), for the overthrow of President Zedillo.

Within days of the meeting, well-orchestrated rumors swept Mexico and the international press, that Ernesto Zedillo would not last out his term, but would be forced out of office early by Mexico's "dinosaurs," as the "anti-reform" nationalist current in Mexico's PRI and Army are often dubbed. Mexican government sources were quick to point the finger at the Salinas machine as the source of the rumors. According to one Mexican press account, Aguilar Zinser used the May 14 National Congress of Book Publishers and Distributors in Cancún, Mexico, to make sure that the rumor took off. Then, on July 4, he used his position as secretary of a congressional commission investigating financial irregularities, to try to "Watergate" President Zedillo, charging him with having authorized an illegal payment of \$6 million to the Maseca Industrial Group, back when he was Minister of Programming and Budget. Aguilar Zinser's attack on Zedillo was then picked up and given international play on July 5 by the *New York Times*.

Inside the United States, the rumor that Zedillo wouldn't last out his term was promoted by Cardenas's U.S.-based neo-conservative economics adviser, Christopher Whalen, who

published articles in the London *Economist*-owned *Journal of Commerce* and the *Houston Chronicle*, retailing the line that Zedillo was about to be overthrown. Whalen additionally argued that Zedillo's only hope for beating the "dinosaurs" was to devalue the peso—a good recipe for setting off international capital flight from Mexico, and thus igniting a full-blown crisis.

Castañeda family agents in Mexico's diplomatic corps lost their jobs over the Dublin pow-wow. Mexico's ambassador to Ireland, Gutiérrez Canet, a close friend of the Castañeda family, was fired in June; Castañeda's step-brother, Andrés Rozenthal, Mexico's ambassador to the Court of St. James, was also summarily dumped shortly thereafter.

The 'Rallying around the Revolution' thesis

What was lead news in Mexico, however, did not disrupt the British drive to push the Clinton administration into a Mexican quagmire. Publication of Castañeda's argument in the magazine of the Council on Foreign Relations signaled that the chaos strategy had been placed on the table for review within the Anglophile establishment more broadly.

That campaign has crossed all the so-called ideological boundaries. On Aug. 18, 1996, the leading neo-conservative outlet in the U.S. capital, the *Washington Times*, the voice of George Bush's Moonie cult bankrollers, endorsed the revolution strategy promoted by Castañeda, by name, in its lead editorial. It hailed Castañeda as a leading expert on Mexico, and parroted each of his arguments, point for point: Mexico is wrong to reject the "Asian model" in favor of a "socialist-oriented, corruption-plagued, vehemently nationalistic, highly protectionist, import substitution strategy." Mexico is a "narco-state" developing along the U.S. border; the Clinton administration should have decertified Mexico in the war on drugs a year ago; and Clinton ought to listen to Castañeda's warnings, that political reform and political stability are failing in Mexico.

Castañeda is right, the Moonie *Times* concluded: "The American-provided net has allowed Mexico's authorities to fail miserably yet remain in power. . . . Waiting out the next debacle from the sidelines seems a wiser course than again saving the PRI and its friends in exchange for cautious reforms."

The Mont Pelerin Society's networks in the Heritage Foundation have also lined up behind "the Castañeda thesis," albeit with less publicity: They don't want to be blamed for blowing up the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), a spokesman confided. (The Heritage Foundation was described by one of its own staff members as "an outpost for British intelligence in the United States.") Washington should be "criticized for having maintained a policy of stability-at-all-costs in Mexico, since that has contributed to a lot of what we're seeing in Mexico today," including drug corruption, a Heritage spokesman explained privately. Despite "ideological" differences, "I agree with Jorge Castañeda on that point."

What is good enough for London's neo-conservative think-tanks, is good enough for London's liberal media. The *New York Times*, for example, editorialized on March 12, "Congress and the Clinton administration appear headed for a collision over Mexico. Just weeks before President Clinton is scheduled to visit Mexico, Congress is moving to override the administration's disingenuous certification [of Mexico]. . . . A successful override would invite a diplomatic confrontation with Mexico. But the crisis would be worth enduring if it led Washington to a more realistic appreciation of Mexico's problems and of President Ernesto Zedillo's failure to address them with sufficient resolve."

And what are the problems which the *Times* argues must be addressed? That the PRI has ruled the country for nearly seven decades, by fraud and patronage, and is an obstacle to democracy.

The *Times* also opened its pages on March 11 to an op-ed by Juan Enríquez Cabot, a Mexican member of Boston's treasonous Cabot Lodge family, who is now based at Harvard's Center for International Affairs. Enríquez Cabot has long been an ally of Mexico's would-be President and most renowned destabilizer, Manuel Camacho (see below). Said Enríquez Cabot: The PRI "is incompatible with economic stability and democratic governance. . . . The PRI is increasingly unable to govern. The system is so corrupt that even the best and the brightest politicians cannot fix it, no matter how honest they are. . . . As long as the PRI is in power, it is hard to imagine that things will get better in Mexico. . . . The U.S. should support Mexico, not the PRI. It should share its information on the economy and the drug trade with a multi-party group from the Mexican Congress. . . . Although an opposition coalition seems unlikely in the near future, it may be the sole way to avoid what seems like Mexico's path toward more chaos and violence."

It is these hackneyed British arguments—even including many of the same phrases—which issued forth from the mouths of numerous U.S. congressmen in the recent debates on overriding Clinton's certification of Mexico. Perhaps most dangerous, because of the angry reaction they understandably provoked in Mexico, were the March 6 remarks of Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.), who urged the U.S. government to "create a crisis down there. . . . We've got the wrong friends. . . . And the only way I know to get the right friends down [there] is to get rid of that PRI."

Various Mexican newspapers were quick to report on Hollings's remarks as a provocation to Mexico, noting the unity of their political effect with the operation run by Castañeda, Aguilar Zínser, et al. For example, *El Financiero* alleged that Hollings "has a close friendship with Jorge Castañeda and Adolfo Aguilar Zínser. . . . [This] is all part of a strategy unleashed in Mexico by the ineffable Camacho Solís . . . [who is] betting on the destabilization of Mexico." Although *EIR* cannot confirm the reported friendship, nor speak to Hollings's motives otherwise, the Mexican paper is correct in its analysis of the political purposes served.