ELECTORAL COMPETITION AND THE NEW PARTY SYSTEM IN MEXICO

Joseph L. Klesner

Department of Political Science
Kenyon College
Gambier, Ohio 43022 USA

klesner@kenyon.edu
tel: 1.740.427.5311
fax: 1.740.427.5306

Paper prepared for the 2001 Meeting of the Latin American Studies Association, Washington, DC, September 6-8, 2001.

ELECTORAL COMPETITION AND THE NEW PARTY SYSTEM IN MEXICO

Joseph L. Klesner

Kenyon College

ABSTRACT

Mexico's party system looks profoundly different than it did in 1985. No longer a hegemonic party system, only by ignoring important regional concentrations of electoral support for the parties can it be called a three-party system. In most of the nation, the competition remains bipartite, no longer the monopoly of the PRI, but not a genuine tripartite struggle either. Multivariate analysis of municipal-level aggregate data show that in the north, the center-west and a few other isolated areas, the PRI and the PAN compete against each other while in the south the PRD and the PAN contest for electoral victories. Analysis of vote-switching and party loyalists based on exit poll data suggest that these competitions create contests of ins versus outs and effectively overlap with a fifteen-year-old cleavage in the electorate based on pro-regime and anti-regime sentiments. The parties' strategies and even their ideologies have adapted to this form of competition. Each party now has catch-all characteristics and those party leaders or party nominees who have been most eclectic in campaign message and campaign style have proved to be the most successful, Vicente Fox serving as the archetype.

ELECTORAL COMPETITION AND THE NEW PARTY SYSTEM IN MEXICO[*]

[*]I would like to thank James McCann, Alejandro Moreno, Nancy Belden, Roderic Camp, and Leopoldo Gómez for sharing much of the data upon which the analysis in this paper is based. Some of the polling data for 2000 is drawn from Mexico 2000 Panel Study, coordinated by Miguel Basáñez, Roderic Camp, Wayne Cornelius, Jorge Domínguez, Federico Estévez, Joseph Klesner, Chappell Lawson, Beatriz Magaloni, James McCann, Alejandro Moreno, Pablo Parás,

Joseph L. Klesner

Kenyon College

No recent transition to democracy has come by a more protracted process than Mexico's. The demise of the one-party or hegemonic party system by which Mexicans were ruled had roots stretching back to 1968 when the repression of the student movement just prior to the Mexico City Olympic Games unveiled the authoritarian character of a regime once regarded as a one-party democracy. Small parties of opposition emerged or grew in popularity after 1968 and made strong although mainly local electoral challenges to the ruling party in the 1980s. In 1988, an unexpected challenge to the Institutional Revolutionary Party's (*Partido Revolucionario Institucional*, or PRI) by one of its former leaders, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas, presidential candidate of the National Democratic Front (*Frente Democrático Nacional*, or FDN), seemed to threaten the PRI's future. However, after defeating Cárdenas in the strongly contested 1988 election, the PRI made a major rebound in 1991 and no end to the party's hegemony seemed in sight. Perhaps because Mexico was ruled by the "perfect dictatorship," in Mario Vargas Llosa's famous description, or as near to perfect as we witnessed in the twentieth century, Mexicans' efforts to democratize their regime called for a persistence that few other peoples have required.

In spite of that earlier judgment about the regime's likely longevity, in the aftermath of the historic presidential election of Vicente Fox in July 2000, Mexico's political party system and the dynamics of its electoral process bear little resemblance to their counterparts of fifteen and twenty years ago. Then a hegemonic party system structured the political participation of the Mexican people, reinforcing the electoral advantages held by the PRI by offering voters little

---

and Alejandro Poiré. Support for the Mexico 2000 Panel Study was provided by the National Science Foundation (SES-9905703) and *Reforma* newspaper. I would also like to gratefully acknowledge the support of a research grant from the American Political Science Association and a Kenyon College Summer Stipend.

in the way of effective choice at the ballot box. As late as 1985, the PRI took as much as two thirds of the votes in federal congressional elections. Opposition parties there were, but only the National Action Party (*Partido Acción Nacional*, or PAN) governed a major municipality and no opposition legislators had significant impact on debate in the congress or on the public policy that the congress legislated at the president's behest.

However, in the nearly twenty years that have passed since economic crisis engulfed Mexico in the early-to-mid 1980s, two vigorous opposition parties have emerged to contest the PRI's hegemony: the PAN, usually placed by political analysts on the center-right of the ideological spectrum, and the Party of the Democratic Revolution (*Partido de la Revolución Democrática*, or PRD) on the center-left. While the opposition parties controlled not one state government and only a handful of municipalities in the 1980s, by the mid 1990s PAN and PRD mayors governed a majority of the population at the municipal level. The PRI surrendered its majority in the Chamber of Deputies, the lower house of congress, to a combination of the PAN, the PRD, and two much smaller parties of opposition in 1997, and of course, the PAN's Fox ended the PRI's monopoly on the presidency in 2000. Very few electoral positions go uncontested today, so now the voter has real choice when casting a ballot. In short, the hegemonic party system has expired even while the formerly hegemonic party remains a large vote-getter.

Mexico's political parties may have roots that stretch back to the 1930s and before, but the foregoing comments suggest that Mexico's party system is but a dozen years old. Between 1988 and 1991, the PRI and the PAN, founded in 1929 and 1939, respectively, were joined by the PRD to form Mexico's contemporary party system. And, although the new party system thus may appear to be a three-party system, in practice it truly operates as a three-party system in only about a quarter of the nation. In about two thirds of the country, the party system would be more accurately described as two-party, with only the former ruling party, the PRI, represented across

the nation. In about one fifth of Mexican federal electoral districts, Vicente Fox's winning Alliance for Change coalition (the PAN plus the Green Ecological Party–*Partido Verde Ecológico de México,* or PVEM) remained weakly represented while the Alliance for Mexico coalition (the PRD plus several smaller parties of the left) was strongly represented in only two fifths of the districts.[1]

What are the main features of the new Mexican party system? This paper will seek to describe the new party system in terms of the degree of competition that has emerged across the country and the social bases of support for the parties. In addition, it will examine the electoral dynamics that have been at work in Mexico since 1988, striving to explain how electoral incentives have modified the character of the parties in terms of strategy and ideology. My principal argument will be that there exist ideological and interest-based sources of support for the parties even while the main axis of contention in Mexican politics has been oriented around regime issues–whether the PRI's rule should be continued or ended. Policy failures in the 1980s and 1990s accelerated the defection of PRI supporters. The two opposition parties made gains in the 1990s when they subordinated ideological concerns and instead devised strategies to harvest the discontent of voters with one-party rule, not with particular policy issues. In Mexico, it was not the economy, but the regime that oriented voters. However, in the aftermath of the PRI's fall, the new party system must now find ways of representing the diverse convictions of the electorate because that former orienting principle is no more. An electoral sociology of Mexico in 2000 would suggest the bases of a new alignment of voters in which the PAN represents

[1]Although Fox was supported by the Alliance for Change coalition (the PAN and the Mexican Ecological Green Party) in 2000, I will usually refer to the PAN alone when alluding to the partisan basis of his candidacy since the Alliance for Change is likely to be a short-lived coalition and the PAN is by far the larger and more important of the coalition partners. Similarly, rather than confuse readers by referring continually to Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas's Alliance for Mexico (the PRD and several smaller parties of the left), I will normally mention the PRD only because it too was by far the largest of the coalition partners.

modern Mexico, the PRI represents a more traditional Mexico, and the PRD struggles to find a place in the new party system.

The Expanded Party System and Electoral Competitiveness

Before 1988, the PRI had never lost a presidential, gubernatorial, or federal senatorial race it had contested since it was founded as the National Revolutionary Party (*Partido Nacional Revoluctionario,* or PNR) in 1929. The PRI seldom won less than 98 percent of the federal deputy seats open each three years, even though the constitution's no re-election clause meant that PRI candidates enjoyed no incumbency effect. Opposition party candidates infrequently contested and rarely won municipal elections. Political scientists felt comfortable in the 1960s and 1970s calling Mexico a hegemonic party system, distinguishing it from the single party states of the former Soviet bloc because opposition parties could and did exist legally and politically, but also recognizing by using the term "hegemonic" that opposition parties posed no genuine challenge to the PRI (Sartori 1976; Craig and Cornelius 1995).

PRI hegemony owed much to the party's revolutionary heritage as the party built by the victorious revolutionaries and as the party that had brought land reform to the *campesinos*, labor rights to the working class, and economic development to Mexico as a whole. PRI hegemony was also due to its corporatist structure that channeled the electoral and other political participation of Mexico's peasantry and unionized workers and to a vast clientelistic network through which the ruling elite materially rewarded those ambitious politicians who sought social mobility through politics and those social groups the same politicians claimed to represent (Hernández Rodríguez 1998:74). The PRI's monopoly on the elected executive positions at the federal, state, and local levels gave PRI leaders access to the governmental resources that made clientelism easy, particularly in a state with an extensive bureaucracy and a tendency toward intervention in the economy (Purcell and Purcell 1976). Opposition parties' failure to gain any

executive positions made them unable to challenge the PRI electorally because they had nothing with which to reward their supporters.**Table 1 about here**

Table 1 displays the extent of PRI domination of the electoral arena prior to 1988. Economic modernization did produce gradual erosion of the PRI's commanding position electorally, but the emphasis must be on the *gradual* character of that erosion–about 2 percent in each federal election. Opposition parties did markedly better in urban and industrial areas where the population had greater access to education and the mass media (Ames 1970; Klesner 1993). In the vastness of rural Mexico, where the opposition feared to show itself, the PRI's vote totals sometimes reached numbers above the registered electorate. Whether such large numbers of campesinos voted enthusiastically for the PRI to reward it for giving them land or had their votes cast for them by rural bosses was unknown in individual districts because the urban press was no more willing to venture into such rural areas than were oppositionists. Endemic political corruption and electoral fraud ensured large vote tallies for the PRI, but even without them, the PRI would likely have been hegemonic because Mexican public policy in the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and even into the 1970s produced rapid economic development for which the electorate rewarded the PRI, and because opposition parties presented no real alternatives to PRI governance or to the PRI development strategy.

Nevertheless, PRI hegemony did erode. How has Mexican electoral politics changed? What is the new shape of the party system? To begin, we can assess the competitiveness of the party system by measuring the number of effective parties across the nation. Juan Molinar's NP index (Molinar 1991b) provides a useful measure of competitiveness that has been employed by other studies of Mexico (Pacheco Méndez, 1997; Klesner 1997b). To measure the increase in competitiveness in the party system, I have grouped the 300 federal deputy election districts[2] into

[2]Mexico was reapportioned for lower house seats after a 1977 electoral reform increased the number of districts to 300. No new reapportionment was conducted until after the 1994

four categories, following the procedure used by Guadalupe Pacheco Méndez (1997): *hegemonic* refers to districts in which a single party dominates (NP = 1.0 to 1.5);

- *pure bipartism* (or two-party) refers to districts where two parties compete (NP = 1.5 to 2.0);
- *plural bipartism* (elsewhere labeled a two-and-a-half party system) refers to districts in which two parties compete and are joined by a third which is weaker (NP = 2.0 to 2.5); and
- in *tripartism* (or multipartism), three (or more) parties effectively compete (NP greater than 2.5).

Table 2 about here

Table 2 shows how the 300 electoral districts fell into those four categories in federal deputy elections over the past twenty-one years.[3] It indicates that most electoral districts were hegemonic even as late as 1991; in 1979, fully five-sixths of the districts were hegemonic. The growth of competition came gradually until very recently, and in its earliest phases, competition existed only in urban and northern border settings. For example, in 1982, of the 95 non-hegemonic districts, all were in the largest metropolitan areas (greater Mexico City, Guadalajara, and Monterrey) and urban regions in the north and border states of Baja California, Sonora, Chihuahua (especially in Ciudad Juárez), Coahuila, and Tamaulipas (but only in Nuevo Laredo and Matamoros), as well as the city of Mérida in the distant Yucatán. However, by 1997 fewer than 10 percent of the districts fell into the hegemonic category and six of the 25 cases were won

---

elections. Hence, the same districts were used from 1979 until 1994 and a new apportionment was made for the 1997 and 2000 districts.

[3]The electoral results used to calculate the number of parties hence come from the federal deputy races, even in presidential years. In most presidential election years in the past, the parties' share of the votes in congressional elections has closely mirrored those in the presidential race, but a gap appeared in the 2000 election, with Vicente Fox performing considerably better in his contest than Alliance for Change congressional candidates.

by opposition parties. In 2000, the number of hegemonic districts rose to 29, but 19 of those were won by the Alliance for Change, i.e., the PAN. Overall, then, that over 90 percent of the Mexican federal electoral districts are now competitive among two or more parties marks a profound change from the 1980s and before.

Table 3 about here

However, it is also important to recognize that less than 25 percent (70 of 300 in 2000) of the electoral districts fall into the tripartism category. Mexico may have a three-party system in the congress and at the national level, but at the district level most competition is between two of the three parties. More specifically, that competition is between the PRI and one of the other two major parties. Table 3 provides a disaggregation of the districts for the congressional elections in the 1990s and 2000. The extent to which the district contests pitted one or the other "opposition" party against the PRI became very apparent by 1997. In that election, in slightly over one-third of the districts (110 of 300), the PRI and the PAN squared off, the PAN winning 52 and the PRI 58 of those districts. Again in slightly over one-third of the districts (114), the PRI and the PRD competed, the PRI again taking 58 and the PRD 56 seats each (see the third column of Table 3). In the election of 2000, the number of districts with effectively two-party competition remained almost exactly the same (224 in 1997 compared to 220 in 2000), but the PAN's success behind Fox meant that the distribution of those districts swung to the PAN from the PRD and that the PAN won 107 of the 170 districts in which it went head-to-head with the PRI. The foregoing evidence suggests that Mexico is less a three-party system than a pair of two-party systems that *may be* evolving to genuine three-party competition across the nation (the number of tripartite districts grew steadily in the 1990s), although perhaps not.

The last point would be less remarkable if the districts in which two-party competition were not geographically concentrated. The vast majority of districts in which the PRI and the PRD compete is in the deep south. Meanwhile, most of the districts in which the PAN and the

PRI struggle mainly against each other are in the north and the center-west region that is north and west of the capital.[4] Only the greater Mexico City area (here defined as the Federal District and the surrounding Estado de México) can be labeled tripartite or multipartite. Tables A1 to A3 in the appendix provide a breakdown of the regional distribution of competition among the parties in the elections of 1994, 1997, and 2000. Figure 1 illustrates the regional distribution of competition more graphically, although it is a cruder indicator because it remains at the level of the 32 Mexican states rather than the 300 electoral districts.

Figure 1 about here

These data suggest that the PRI is still the only party with a strong national presence and that the PRD and the PAN, while becoming increasingly competitive across the nation, still have strong regional bases. To what extent are these regional bases merely reflective of the different socioeconomic characteristics of the regions–which differ dramatically, as any observer of Mexico will quickly report? To what extent might they reflect the difficulties for a new party in

[4]The center-west is sometimes referred to as the Bajío, although the Bajío is only the heart of that center-west region.

The regional distribution of the states used in this paper is as follows:
North: Baja California, Baja California Sur, Coahuila, Chihuahua, Durango, Nuevo León, San Luis Potosí, Sinaloa, Sonora, Tamaulipas, Zacatecas.
Center-West: Aguascalientes, Colima, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Michoacán, Nayarit, Querétaro.
Center: Hidalgo, Morelos, Puebla, Tlaxcala.
Mexico City area: Federal District, Estado de México.
South: Campeche, Chiapas, Guerrero, Oaxaca, Quintana Roo, Tabasco, Veracruz, Yucatán.

These categories are obviously somewhat crude. Much of the territory of the Estado de México should be grouped with the center states, but the bulk of the population is located in the greater Mexico City area, so for convenience I have included the whole state with the Mexico City area. Some of Michoacán is in the center-west, while other parts might be usefully grouped with the south, but again I chose not to split the state. As general rules, I have attempted (1) to limit the number of regions to five to simplify the analysis and (2) to not split states across regions.

building a party organization and gathering electoral support across a nation as large and diverse as Mexico? The following sections will attempt to provide some answers to these questions.

From Where Do the Parties' Supporters Come?

To explore the first of the questions just mentioned–whether the regional bases of party support simply reflect socioeconomic differences that are concentrated in regions–we can undertake a multivariate regression analysis of the predictors of the parties' vote, using socioeconomic, demographic, and regional factors as the explanatory variables. If the regional variables prove to be statistically insignificant, that would indicate they have no independent explanatory power *controlling for* socioeconomic and demographic factors. Past studies of Mexican voting behavior using aggregate data at the state level (Ames 1970; Klesner 1987) and the district level (Molinar Horcasitas and Weldon 1990; Klesner 1993, 1994, 1995) have found that urbanization, industrialization, and education are among the most powerful predictors of the percentage of the vote received by the PRI or its opposition in federal elections. Here I use aggregate data gathered at the level of the *municipio,* the Mexican equivalent of the U.S. county, to explore the relationship among electoral, socioeconomic, demographic, and regional variables. Table 4 reports the results for the four federal deputy elections held in the 1990s and 2000.

Table 4 about here

As in other studies conducted with aggregate data (cf. Klesner 1993), measures of urbanization (here measured by the percent of the population living in localities of greater than 20,000) and industrialization (percent of the population employed in manufacturing) prove to be significant predictors of the direction of the vote. Likewise, education (here measured by the literacy rate) is also a significant explanatory variable, as it has been in earlier studies with data aggregated at a higher level. In terms of these social structural variables, the PRI does well in

municipios which are more rural and in which literacy is relatively low. In 1991 it finished worse in areas that were more industrial but in the other elections it performed slightly better in industrial areas, controlling for other factors (such as urbanization and literacy). This profile conforms with the broad understanding that the PRI performs best where the population is uneducated and vulnerable because of its lack of education, its lack of access to urban-based media, and its economic marginality in the countryside. But controlling for other factors, the PRI does slightly better in areas with a large part of the labor force in manufacturing, perhaps because of its longstanding corporatist relationship with organized labor.

In contrast, the PAN's best performances are in *municipios* that are more urban and more industrialized. Likewise, except for the 1991 election, the PAN did better in districts with higher literacy rates, as earlier studies had also suggested. Again, this fits with past descriptions of the PAN as a party with an urban, educated, middle-class base (Barraza and Bizberg 1991).

The PRD's electoral base is less easy to describe in terms of these measures of socioeconomic modernization (note that the R^2 for the PRD equations is generally lower than for the PRI or the PAN). On the one hand, it has become a party of non-industrial areas, as the negative coefficients for the industrialization measure indicate. On the other hand, however, until the most recent election, the PRD finished better in areas where the literacy rate is high, unlike the PRI and more like the PAN. This suggests that the PRI does well in rural areas where the population is less educated while the PRD does better in all areas (rural and urban–note that the urbanization variable's coefficient equals nearly zero) where the manufacturing base is weak but the population is better educated.

One other variable proves to provide significant explanatory power–the percent of the population that is Catholic. Of course, this variable does not measure the religiosity of the population, simply the percentage that declares itself Catholic to census takers. However, because the level of aggregation here is relatively low, there is greater variance in this variable

than has been available to those conducting ecological analyses of Mexican elections with district or state-level data. As would be hypothesized given the PAN's history of close identification with the church and its social Christian message (Mabry 1974), the PAN performs well in *municipios* with a higher percentage of Catholics. In contrast, the PRD and the PRI, both strongly secular in their ideology, perform more poorly in districts with higher concentrations of Catholics.

While these demographic, socioeconomic, and religious variables prove to be significant explanatory factors for predicting the percentage of the vote going to the PRI, the PAN, and the PRD, they only contribute about half of the explanatory power of the models displayed in Table 4. Factoring in regional variables greatly improves the explanatory power of the models. Table 5 reports the standardized regression coefficients for the equations estimated in Table 4. Standardized regression coefficients (often called beta weights) serve to indicate the relative weights of the explanatory variables in predicting the actual (as opposed to the estimated) values of the dependent variables (here, the percentages of the vote to the parties). Higher absolute values for the standardized regression coefficents indicate that those variables contribute relatively more to the overall explanatory power of the model. As Table 5 shows, regional variables add much predictive power to each equation.[5] Because this is a multiple regression model, we must remember that region continues to explain much of the variance in the vote *even controlling for socioeconomic, demographic, education, and religious variables.*

[5]The coefficients reported for the PRI in 1994 and the overall low explanatory power of the model for the PRI in 1994 seem to be outliers or anomalous given the otherwise satisfactory performance of this model for explaining electoral results. In particular, the coefficients for the regions are unusually high for the PRI in that year. The explanation is that the regional coefficients are set in relation to a base region, in this case, the four center states not distributed into the other four regions, *viz*., Hidalgo, Morelos, Puebla, and Tlaxcala, three of which (Hidalgo, Puebla, and Tlaxcala) have typically had strong PRI apparatuses and strong PRI performances even beyond their relatively non-modern characteristics. However, in 1994, the PRI did not perform so well in those four states, thereby bringing the constant down to a level about half of its normal size and causing the other regional variables to increase in size considerably.

Table 5 about here

In Table 4, how much region matters to the vote for the parties is indicated by the regression coefficients. In these models, the constant indicates the share of the vote that would go to the party in question *if the values of all of the other variables were zero* in the central region–i.e., in the states surrounding the greater Mexico City area but not including the capital city and its environs (Hidalgo, Morelos, Puebla, and Tlaxcala). The regression coeffient for each regional variable indicates what must be added to the constant to obtain that region's intercept.[6] In effect, it indicates the percentage of the vote that the party gains or loses over the base case (the central region) by being in that particular region.

So, for example, in the north in 1997, the PAN performed 9 percent better than the base case. In the center-west, the PAN performed 12 percent above the base case, while in the greater Mexico City area it performed 7 percent below the base case. Looking at the four elections together, one can say that, controlling for other factors, the PAN regularly overperforms in the center-west and underperforms in Mexico City. Until the most recent election of 2000, it also overperformed in the north. The PAN generally modestly underperforms in the south.

Conversely, controlling for other explanatory factors, the PRD often finishes by as much as 8-10 percent below the base case in the north. However, it overperforms in the southern states, most recently by about 4 percent. In greater Mexico City, the PRD finishes as much as 9-12 percent above the base case. In the center-west, the PRD has a strength in the state of Michoacán, a state once governed by PRD leader Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas and by his father, ex-President Lázaro Cárdenas before him. Thus, the PRD sometimes does better in the center-west than would otherwise be expected. Regionally, then, the PRD's strengths are the converse of the PAN's.

[6]Each regional variable is a dichotomous variable scored 1 if the *municipio* falls into that region and 0 if it does not.

We should also note that the size of the regression coefficients for region declined for the election of 2000. This outcome reflects the nationalization of the PAN's campaign efforts under Vicente Fox. More effectively than earlier candidates, Fox's vigorous campaign and his use of television allowed him to reach a national audience and to score important gains for the PAN throughout the country. This result may threaten the PRD's position as one of three major national parties if the PAN can make itself the second party in some of the center and southern states where the PRD had made progress in the 1990s. Indeed, as Table 6 indicates, Fox led the PRD's Cárdenas in all regions of the country in the July 2000 election. Fox's coattails, of course, may have been especially long and the possibility remains that the PRD might recoup some of the states and districts it had won in 1997 but lost to the PAN in 2000. However, overcoming the PAN challenge to the PRD will be considerable and of vital importance to the PRD's future.

Table 6 about here

This multiple regression analysis thus supports the argument that Mexico's party system has regional dimensions even beyond what would be expected given the already considerable differences of the regions on the standard measures of socioeconomic modernization and religion. In the 1990s the two major parties of opposition became more competitive and thereby raised the degree of contestation in Mexico's electoral system. However, the analyses displayed in Tables 4 and 5 indicate that the parties have divided the labor of creating competitiveness along regional lines. The result is thus less three-party contestation in each part of the country than many examples of two-party competition with the PRI present everywhere.

Two-party competition can have important consequences for party strategies. As scholars of party systems have often noted, where two parties compete to claim single prizes–governorships, city halls, or congressional seats in winner-take-all districts, for example–those parties must strive to win majorities, and thus they must appeal to a broad middle of the electorate. Hence, there are centripetal forces at work in such situations, encouraging the parties

to cast their campaign appeals and ideology in more moderate terms that will appeal to those voters who sit in the middle of the ideological spectrum (Duverger 1954; Downs 1957; Sartori 1976). Indeed, to the extent that the competition becomes localized, centering on state and local government, the terms of the competition may begin to turn on issues of experience and capacity to govern rather than ideology or national policy issues. Furthermore, once two-party competition with a local and/or state-level dimension has been consolidated, other parties find it difficult to make gains in the electoral arena. Such two-party electoral dynamics seem to be at work in much of Mexico today, with important consequences for the parties' strategies.

Has the Mexican Electorate Been Realigned?

Do the analyses presented in Tables 2 through 6 above indicate that the Mexican electorate has been realigned? Has the old, hegemonic party system in which the PRI claimed the allegiance of most voters, but especially of the poor, rural, and less well-educated been replaced by a new, competitive party system in which each of the three major parties takes a distinctive portion of the electorate? Does the electorate now divide itself into three parts, with an urban, educated, relatively wealthy and more Catholic Mexico of the north and the center-west supporting the PAN; a poorer, less educated, more rural Mexico voting for the PRI, especially outside of the huge Mexico City metropolis; and a poorer and more rural Mexico of the south and the better educated of the Mexico City area sustaining the PRD?

A decade ago, in the aftermath of the 1988 election, scholars debated whether the electorate had been realigned or merely dealigned. Dealignment would suggest that significant social groups had ceased to support any party, thereby increasing the portion of the electorate available to serve as swing-voters and potentially responsive to campaign messages (cf. Dalton, Flanagan, and Beck 1984). In contrast, realignment generally means "a significant shift in the group bases of party coalitions, and usually in the distribution of popular support among the parties as a result." (Dalton, Flanagan, and Beck 1984: 13) The debate then centered around how

to characterize a realignment. Certainly a realignment of social groups in the electorate so that there was firm support of particular groups for each of the two opposition parties had not occurred by the early 1990s. Hence, some studies based on aggregate electoral data concluded that because of the urbanization and other aspects of socioeconomic modernization of the post-war period, a decoupling of the electorate from overwhelming support for the PRI had taken place (Craig and Cornelius 1995). However, that secular decline in support for the PRI did not imply that a realignment to support for other parties could be identified (Klesner 1993, 1994). Others argued that analysts had to conceptualize the cleavage structure of Mexico not in conventional, socioeconomic terms but rather in terms of pro-regime and anti-regime camps (Molinar 1989). If one defined realignment as the development of a bloc of anti-regime (hence, anti-PRI) voters, then 1988 might be taken as a critical (or realigning) election (Molinar Horcasitas and Weldon 1990).

Table 7 about here

One relatively useful measure of partisan alignment comes from the responses to questions posed by survey researchers to potential voters: with which party do you most sympathize?[7] Table 7 presents the responses from six separate polls conducted in Mexico over the past fifteen years. By 1997, the portion of the electorate willing to express PRI partisanship had declined by about one third from where it had been only three years earlier, from over 45 percent (48 percent in 1994) to 30 percent.[8] PRI partisanship remained at relatively lower levels (in the mid 30s) throughout the 2000 campaign before dipping again after the PRI took its loss in

[7]In practice, the question often varies slightly from this simple formulation, but modestly enough to make comparisons across time viable.

[8]Because the 1997 ITAM survey was conducted after the election in which the PRI lost its majority in congress, we might assume that the percentage of the respondents willing to express PRI partisanship may well have declined somewhat from where it was before the election.

July 2000.[9] However, PAN and (especially) PRD partisanship has been rather unstable, fluctuating back and forth over the last decade along with the fortunes of those two parties. Currently, PAN partisanship exceeds PRI partisanship while PRD partisan identity has declined precipitously. Perhaps equally notable is the large percentage of voters that remains independent, not identifying with any party or unwilling or unable to express a partisan identity. That figure (the sum of "none" and "don't know/no answer") has varied from around 23 to 35 percent of the electorate (ignoring the 1988 figures that seem anomalous in this series), a large enough body of voters to swing an election now that the PRI's partisan identifiers have declined to about a third of the electorate. Certainly a movement of the electorate from the PRI to the other two parties has taken place, although whether the opposition voters who most recently supported the PAN and Vicente Fox remain firmly in that camp remains to be seen. In addition, there seems to have been no further dealignment of the electorate since the mid 1980s.[10]

Yet, there remain enough unattached voters and oppositionists willing to cast what may be strategic ballots to have made a difference in Fox's campaign to seize the presidency and end one-party dominance. Indeed, the uncertainty of the electorate made the prediction of the campaign's outcome very difficult for pollsters and pundits. As late as early June, fully 30 percent of respondents to the third round of the Mexico 2000 Panel Survey claimed that they had not decided how they would vote.[11] There turned out to be plenty of voters who behaved differently than they had in the recent past. Of the Fox voters among the respondents to the Mitofsky/Consulta Exit Poll (commissioned by Televisa network) who could remember and would report their 1997 congressional vote, 38.8 percent had not voted in 1997, 11.7 percent had

[9]Mexico 2000 Panel Study, First, Second, Third and Fourth Waves (February, May, June and July 2000).

[10]We cannot determine with any precision the size of the independent or non-aligned segment of the electorate before 1986 because no national polls were conducted prior to then.

[11]Mexico 2000 Panel Study, Third Wave, June 2-14, 2000.

voted for the PRI, and 7.7 percent had voted for the PRD in the most recent election. Only 40.7 percent of the respondents to that poll who voted for Fox had voted for the PAN in 1997. In contrast, of the voters who supported the PRI's Francisco Labastida in 2000, 61.6 percent had voted for the PRI in 1997 and 32.5 percent had not voted in the last congressional election. Fully 37.9 percent of those who chose Cárdenas in 2000 had not voted in 1997, but only 4.4 percent of his votes came from those who supported the PAN in 1997. Of the 3.5 percent of total 2000 voters who switched between the PAN and the PRD, 2.9 percent moved to the PAN while only 0.6 percent went to the PRD. So there is much fluidity in the electorate, especially because of the large number of new voters and the return to the polling places of those who have recently abstained, and thus effective campaigners (Cárdenas and the PRD in 1997, Fox in 2000) can win them over.

Table 8 about here

Table 8 offers another perspective on vote-switching and partisan loyalty in 2000. As the table indicates, Fox gained nearly a majority of those who did not vote or could not remember their 1997 vote (46.7 percent) and he similarly won the ballots of a near majority of the same categories of voters from 1994 (45.9 percent). PAN voters from 1994 and 1997 were more loyal to their party than were PRI or PRD voters, with former PRD voters being the most likely to switch to the PAN. This evidence suggests that the "opposition" vote–that for the PAN and the PRD–may to some extent have been a strategic vote of those seeking to oust the PRI by casting votes for whichever of the two parties of opposition they saw as most likely to defeat the former ruling party. Late in the 2000 presidential campaign, Fox explicitly appealed to this opposition vote, urging voters who opposed the continuation of PRI rule to cast a *voto útil*, a useful or strategic vote, for him even if they sympathized with Cárdenas and the PRD.

Some additional evidence for this inference can be found in Table 9. Among those voters who were defectors from either the PRD or the PRI to the PAN, large majorities report that they

usually switch votes. Defectors from the PRD to the PAN are more likely to report PAN partisanship than PRD partisan identity, hinting that their 1997 voting behavior was strategic too.[12] Interestingly, in the important category of those who did not go the polls in 1997 but voted for Fox in 2000, almost a majority report PRD partisanship and over one third claim to be independent. A majority of this last category did not vote in the 1994 presidential election either, probably because of their youth (see Table 10, where their mean age is nearly five years younger than any of the other categories reported in Tables 9 and 10), and almost none of those who did vote in 1994 chose the PAN's Diego Fernández de Cevallos. In short, this nearly 15 percent of 2000 voters were newly won to the PAN by Fox. An important question for the future is whether this election will have been a critical or realigning election that serves to cement these voters to the PAN.[13]

Table 9 tells about partisan alignment as well as vote switching. For example, PRI loyalists account for 20 percent of the electorate, and this seems to be a hardcore 20 percent since almost none claim partisanship in another party or having voted for another party's presidential candidate in 1994. PAN and PRD stand-patters are more willing to admit voting for other parties and being willing to vote for other parties. However, the PAN and PRD loyalists together account for about the same share of the electorate (21.4 percent) as the PRI loyalists. Together, the loyalists form less than half of the votes cast in the 2000 election.

[12]The data in Table 9 come from an exit poll, hence voters would not have known the electoral results at the time they were surveyed. Consequently, a high incidence of changing one's partisanship so as to be on the winning side, a common problem in post-election polls, should not plague these data.

[13]Additional evidence of strategic behavior on the part of opposition voters can be gleaned by comparing the results in the 2000 congressional elections (see Table 1) with those from the presidential race. Whereas the PAN/PVEM coalition took 39.1 percent of the congressional votes, Fox won 42.5 percent of the presidential ballots. In contrast, the PRD-led Alliance for Mexico coalition received 19.1 percent of federal deputy votes but Cárdenas only yielded 16.6 percent.

Table 10 about here

Who falls into the categories of loyalists, defectors, and new PAN voters? Table 10 provides indications of the social bases of these groups. First, PRI loyalists are older, more likely to be female, poorer, less well-educated, and more likely to live in rural locales than other voters. These data confirm the ecological evidence about PRI voting shown in Tables 4 and 5. Second, PAN loyalists, in contrast, are younger, more likely to be male, wealthier, better educated, and much more likely to live in urban abodes than other citizens. Again, this evidence supports the ecological findings reported earlier. PRD loyalists are also more likely to live in rural areas and to be poorer than PAN loyalists, but in contrast to PRI loyalists they are better educated, somewhat younger, and more male.

Comparing PRI and PRD loyalists to 1997 PRI and PRD voters who switched to the PAN, we see that PRI defectors are younger, more likely to be male, wealthier, much better educated, and more likely to live in urban areas than PRI loyalists. Similarly, PRD defectors are much more likely to be male, wealthier, more likely to live in urban areas, and especially, much better educated than PRD loyalists. Indeed, over 60 percent of PRD defectors have preparatory or university educations. In short, Fox and his Alliance for Change coalition won over those intellectuals who had supported the PRD in 1997 and in general those most able to exercise political choice–citizens having greater access to information because of their higher levels of education, their higher incomes, and their urban residence.

Finally, in the critical category of 1997 non-voters who chose Fox in 2000, we see that this group's profile looks very similar to PRI and PRD stand-patters except for its youth. This again raises a critical question for future elections, namely, whether Fox has won over to the PAN a group of younger voters, the majority of them female, who would have voted for the PRI or the PRD and perhaps have become PRI or PRD partisans had they come into the electorate in 1988 or before. The evidence remains somewhat inconclusive on this generational matter,

however. That Fox and the PAN did much better with younger voters than with older voters is clear, as an examination of Table 11 will show. However, they did not do significantly better with newest cohort of voters than with those who are up to 50 years of age. Table 11 divides the electorate into (1) those who came of age before the events of 1968 that tarnished the PRI-ruled regime's image, (2) those who came into the electorate after 1968 but before the onset of the economic crisis in 1982, (3) those who became 18 during the worst of the economic downturn of the 1980s under Miguel de la Madrid's presidency, (4) those who first voted when Carlos Salinas was restructuring the economy, and (5) those who came of political age during the democratizing reforms of Ernesto Zedillo. In terms of voting behavior in 2000, Table 11 clearly indicates that the critical generational divide came in 1968. However, if we look at partisan identity, the picture is less clear. Certainly 1968 is a critical divide for PRI partisan identity and independents–respondents who came of age before 1968 are more likely to express affinity with the PRI and less likely to be independent. PRI partisanship does tend to grow in a direct relationship with age. PAN partisanship, in contrast, declines with age, and 1988 (the Salinas election) presents an important divide for PAN identifiers, with those who became eligible to vote after 1988 being more likely to be PAN partisans than those of older age cohorts.

Table 11 about here

That generational replacement may be reshaping Mexican partisan alignment can complement arguments that conclude that the main line of division in the electorate has had to do with regime issues rather than class or ethnic divisions (Molinar 1989; Moreno 1998). A number of indications of the extent to which a cleavage divides those in favor of retaining the status quo (PRI hegemony) versus those advocating change in the regime can be found in survey data. First, when asked to create a left-right map of the Mexican party system, respondents to survey researchers do not place the parties in the ideological locations that political analysts and the parties themselves have generally put them–the PRI in the center, flanked by the PAN on the

right and the PRD on the left. Respondents do place the PRD on the left, but they place the PRI the most to the right, with the PAN in the center (Moreno 1998). This mapping of the party system suggests that the underlying political dimension being mapped by respondents is not preferences on socioeconomic policy or church-state relations or ethic politics, as we often find in other nations, but pro-regime (right) versus anti-regime (left) attitudes or orientations in favor of the status quo (right) and change (left).[14]

Second, when asked to provide the principal reason for their presidential vote in 2000, over half of Fox voters (53.4 percent) listed "change" as their reason for choosing the Alliance for Change candidate. "Change" was also the most often chosen reason for voting for the PRD's Cárdenas (29.0 percent). In contrast, 23.3 percent of voters for PRI candidate Labastida said they chose him following their "custom" (the modal answer), and amazingly enough, 7 percent did not know why they voted for Labastida. Overall, almost one third of the electorate (31.3 percent) in July 2000 cast their votes for "change."[15] These data certainly support the notion that a pro-regime versus anti-regime cleavage has run through the electorate in the recent past, on up through Fox's election. That cleavage has age and education dimensions to it. Older voters are more likely to say that they always support the same party or that they voted so that the PRI would win whereas voters under 50 were more likely to report that they voted for "change" in July 2000. Younger voters were also more likely to have chosen their candidate on the basis of his proposals, as were those with higher levels of education. The less well-educated were more

[14]On a scale of 0-10, with 0 being extreme left and 10 extreme right, Mexicans placed themselves at about 6.5 during the 2000 campaign; they placed the PRI at about 6.8, the PAN at 5.8, and the PRD at 3.9 (these are the averages of the responses to the four waves of the Mexico 2000 Panel Study). I should note that the evaluation of PAN rose from 5.5 to 6.2 during the course of the campaign, perhaps in response to PRD and PRI campaign efforts to place the PAN on the right.

[15]Mexico 2000 Panel Study, Fourth Wave, July 2000.

likely to report always voting for the same party while the better educated were more likely to say that they voted for "change."

What the preceding analysis sums up to in terms of patterns of alignment in the Mexican party system is the following: Up through the election of 2000, Molinar's argument that the primary cleavage in Mexican politics revolved around regime issues can be supported by survey data (see also Moreno 1998). In terms of the social characteristics of those falling on either side of the pro-regime versus anti-regime divide, regime supporters (or those seeking to maintain the political status quo) were older and less well-educated than regime opponents. These characteristics happen to parallel some of the social attributes of those who have supported the PRI and the PAN. In addition, however, there are some other social factors that explain PAN, PRI, and PRD voting. Besides being younger and better educated than PRI voters, PAN supporters are wealthier, more urban, and more likely to be from the north and center-west and from areas with higher proportions of the population professing Catholicism. PRI supporters are the converse. These are not new divisions; they characterized the social bases of the parties twenty years ago (Klesner 1987). What has happened in the interval is that the PAN has made deeper inroads into those social groups or, what is effectively the same thing, the PRI has lost further ground among those groups.

That said, Vicente Fox made important gains in his 2000 campaign by drawing on younger, formerly non-voting members of the social groups that otherwise support the PRI and by winning voters from the PRD in those social groups that often support the PAN. The latter include the change-oriented citizens who have fallen on the anti-regime side of the regime cleavage. If Fox can successfully govern and reward those who put him in the presidency, he has a chance to break the old social alignments in Mexico, which would likely lead the nation to a party system revolving around catch-all parties, of which the PAN might be the strongest.

Ideology and Strategy as Reflective of Electoral Incentives

The electoral competition and the social bases of Mexico's main political parties described in preceding sections go a long way toward explaining the evolution of those parties in the past dozen years. The party system's shape and character might be summarized as follows: A three- party system at the national level, the party system functions as a pair of two-party systems outside the greater Mexico City area. The dynamics of two-party systems create incentives for those parties to operate as catch-all parties. However, the PAN and the PRD did not have their origins as catch-all parties and they continue to attract both activists and voters based on their ideological placement (following the conventional left-right scale based on class and socioeconomic issues). Consequently, those two parties have suffered internal tensions based on the challenge of accommodating differences among party elites about ideology and strategy. The PRI, too, has confronted internal struggles based on strategic and ideological conflicts, especially since its electoral fortunes have plummeted in the late 1990s. Examining each party's evolution in the past dozen years can provide a clearer view of the current dimensions of the party system and illustrate how the electoral competition described in earlier sections has shaped the parties' recent development.

The PAN: Traditionalists and Barbarians, Responsible Opposition or Contender for Power?

Founded by a group of Catholic activists, businessmen, and professionals whose principal grievances against the regime were the loss of the Church's rights, the struggle for religious liberty, including freedom for Catholics to educate their children in parochial schools, and the move by the Mexican state toward socialism under Lázaro Cárdenas (Mabry 1974; Loaeza 1999), the PAN was the strongest opposition party from its origins in 1939 until Fox unseated the PRI from the presidency. Yet for decades it remained largely a loyal opposition, represented by a handful (at most) of deputies in congress, debating within itself how to influence those in power, how to educate the Mexican citizenry about democracy and social Christian political

philosophy, and whether participating in the electoral arena was conducive to accomplishing its objectives or simply an accommodation to those who ruled. The nationalization of the banks under Jóse López Portillo in 1982 and the onset of economic crisis in the mid 1980s gave new life to a party unsure of its future when many infuriated businessmen and members of the middle-class flocked to it as the most efficacious alternative to a PRI that they saw as too populist and too overbearing (Mizrahi 1994). The new constituents and militants of the PAN–often called "barbarians of the north" because so many of the new militants came from the northern states–quickly brought both a much-needed electoral energy to the party and concerns among some traditional leaders that they would lead the party away from its roots.

Although the object of PRI-engineered electoral fraud in the north in 1985 and 1986, which led PAN leaders to organize massive demonstrations and hunger strikes in defense of the vote (Molinar Horcasitas 1991a), in terms of its usual approach the PAN must be recognized as the party of legal and gradual reform that it has been since its founding (Mabry 1974). The influx of middle-class and business militants into the party in the early 1980s may have made the PAN seem more stridently opposed to state intervention in the economy (Bartra 1983; Mizrahi 1994), but the PAN has always stood for constraints on state power (Mabry 1974). In short, ideologically and attitudinally, the PAN has changed less over the past twenty years than many have suggested. Salinas's accession to power and the Cárdenas surge presented both Salinas and the PAN leadership with good reasons to seek accommodation in the early 1990s: Salinas proposed to curtail state power and to initiate policy changes in directions favored by the PAN for decades, for which he needed the legislative help of the PAN; the PAN sought to avoid falling into obscurity as the result of the *cardenista* phenomenon and could accomplish that if Salinas recognized the PAN's victories when they occurred.

This PRI-PAN accommodation proved highly successful for each (Morris 1995: 90). The PAN won the gubernatorial races in Baja California and Chihuahua in 1989 and 1992

respectively, and saw Salinas force the resignation of PRI candidates for governor after blatantly fraudulent elections in Guanajuato and San Luis Potosí in 1991; Salinas then appointed a PAN member to be governor of Guanajuato. Salinas was able to point to PAN victories as evidence of political opening. The PAN achieved some electoral changes it sought through the electoral reform process while the PRD was left looking intransigent on this issue (Klesner, 1997a). After Zedillo took office in 1994, the PAN won the governorships of Jalisco, Guanajuato, Querétaro, Nuevo León, and Aguascalientes and many of the most important city halls in the nation.

Because the PRI under Salinas and Zedillo moved toward a preference for market-based economic policies, the PAN could work with those administrations to accomplish its policy objectives. Cooperating with the Salinas and Zedillo administrations allowed the PAN to make political gains too. However, with PRI moving into its ideological space on economic issues, the PAN faced marginalization. Indeed, a recent study of the Mexican parties' deputies showed the PRI and the PAN to be very close on economic policy issues on a standard measure of ideological distance (Martínez Rodríguez 1998: 61). Perhaps for that reason, when it comes time to campaign the PAN has tended to emphasize democracy and throwing its sometime legislative ally out of office. Fox in particular shaped his campaign into a referendum on the continuation of PRI rule, equating democracy with change, his main campaign theme (Bruhn, forthcoming).

More locally, PAN campaigns have tended to stress that PAN candidates will bring honest and competent government to cities and states that have suffered under PRI corruption, cronyism, and mismanagement. In places where the PAN has now governed, especially in the north and center-west, state and local politics take an ins-versus-outs (PAN versus PRI) quality which reinforces two-party competition. Indeed, recognizing that the party could better promote an image as an alternative government to that offered by the PRI, from the early 1990s the PAN consciously followed a "creeping federalist" strategy, seeking first to win in local and state-level elections and thereby to build its support base incrementally (Lujambio 1995; Mizrahi 1998;

Shirk 2000). This strategy contrasts to the more confrontational, national-level approach followed by the PRD before 1997.

Within the PAN there exist divisions, as there have since the political humanist current of the party was challenged by a more free-market oriented group in the mid 1970s (Craig and Cornelius, 1995: 269-70). In part, these divisions stem from the evolution of the party from an organization strictly on the outside, with little hope of taking office, to one that has governed in several states and many localities, whose members of congress have votes that really matter, and now whose standard-bearer has taken the presidency. In making this transition, one current within the PAN has wrestled with what they characterize as the dilemma of how to make the change from an opposition party to a governing party without losing its sense of identity, as former party president Felipe Calderón aptly put it (Mizrahi 1998: 110). This current of the party, associated with Calderón and the late Carlos Castillo Peraza (the PAN's 1997 candidate for regent of the Federal District) and strongly represented in the PAN's national party leadership organs, descends directly from many of the social Christian party leaders of the 1960s and 1970s and places a relatively heavy emphasis on ideological clarity. Such party traditionalists have been very skeptical of those they consider "the barbarians of the north," Fox above all, because they worry that the political pragmatism of Fox and others like him will cause the party to place coming to power above all other considerations.

A catch-all party is not the traditionalists' vision of the PAN, but in 1990s the party became exactly that. The cleavage in the electorate around the regime, the need to distinguish itself from a PRI that had come to share its perspective on socioeconomic development, and the success of the creeping federalist strategy have all pushed the PAN toward a catch-all character. Yet traditionalists have sometimes won the party's nominations for important elected posts, most recently, Castillo Peraza's candidacy to govern Mexico City in 1997. Sensing that the traditionalists would seek to stymie his presidential ambitions, Fox created a parallel

organization called Friends of Fox that helped to finance his campaign for the PAN nomination and that effectively discouraged any other PAN leader from putting forward his name as an alternative to Fox. Seeing the need to be a real alternative to the PRI, Fox campaigned not as a loyal oppositionist but as an outsider seeking the change that could end the one-party regime. Recognizing that not all Mexicans orient themselves around the pro-regime–anti-regime cleavage, Fox also touted his success as governor of Guanajuato. Policy differences between the Fox and the PRI's Labastida did not become central to the campaign.

Reflecting its origins and the social bases of its electorate, the PAN remains a Catholic and business-oriented party. However, many of its leaders may be more to the right ideologically than its electorate (cf. Martínez Rodríguez 1998; Moreno 1998; Bruhn, forthcoming). Fox, though, is not, which may explain both the suspicion held of him by party traditionalists and his victory in July 2000.

The PRD: Alternative on the Left or Party of Frustrated PRI Aspirants?

Cárdenas's presidential campaign in 1988 had been postulated by a wide range of independent and collaborationist parties of the left under the umbrella of the National Democratic Front (*Frente Democrático Nacional*, or FDN), each of which maintained its separate legal identity while advancing Cárdenas as its presidential candidate (Valdés 1994). When Cárdenas proposed a united party of the left in the fall of 1988 to consolidate and channel the gains of 1988, three collaborationist parties (the *Partido Auténtico de la Revolución Mexicana*, or PARM; the *Partido Popular Socialista*, or PPS; and the *Partido Frente Cardenista de Reconstrucción Nacional*, or PFCRN) left the FDN. Eventually, the remnants of the FDN converted the registration of the Mexican Socialist Party (*Partido Mexicano Socialista*, or PMS) into the new PRD (Valdés 1994; Bruhn 1997). But the PRD has been divided internally over ideological and strategic issues as well as personal differences among leaders.

Revolutionary nationalism motivates most PRD members, but most also recognize that economic nationalism and import-substituting industrialization will not bring Mexico out of economic crisis or would be nearly impossible to implement at this point. Yet the PRD provides the most articulate critique of the neoliberal development strategy within the party system. As a party fused from former socialist parties and former PRI members and seeking to recruit members and leaders of popular organizations to its fold, the PRD incorporates a number of perspectives on socioeconomic policy. In recent years, two major contending currents within the party have been a more social democratic wing headed by former party president Porfirio Muñoz Ledo (who left the party in 2000) which seeks to attract a more middle class constituency from among progressive PRI voters and a more radical wing associated with current party president Andrés Manuel Obrador (currently Mexico City regent) which looks for support from "popular" sectors, the urban poor, workers, and peasants (Bruhn 1998).

PRD militants have held very bad feelings toward the PRI as the fallout of the 1988 election, the repression the party felt under Salinas, and the fact that so many new adherents to the party are former PRI members who left the party when their aspirations to be PRI nominees to elected posts were not fulfilled. Consequently, the party has rejected compromise with the PRI and the government over electoral results and legislative proposals for electoral reform. This strategic intransigence may have satisfied the PRD hardliners, but it probably gained the party few independent voters in its first six or eight years of struggle for power (Bruhn 1998). In addition, individual PRD leaders continue to try to reward those PRD members who have supported them over the decades at the expense of their fellow partisans who came to the party by other routes. Squabbles among leaders result, and the press reports them, contributing little to the party's public image. These internal weaknesses have made the consolidation of the PRD as the party of the left somewhat disappointing to those who saw bright opportunity in the 1988 *cardenista* campaign. At the same time, the PRD works to make a virtue of its internal democracy and the transparency of its internal differences, comparing them to the monolithic

PRI that most PRD supporters see to be corrupt and authoritarian. In 1999, however, an internal election for PRD party president became a debacle when charges of fraud caused the election to be nullified, badly damaging the PRD's image.

During the Salinas administration, the PRD faced an equally difficult external challenge: the unwillingness of the PRI and the government to recognize its successes (Gilly 1990). Because of the strength of the Cárdenas performance in 1988 and the PRD's ardent opposition to neoliberalism, the Salinas government felt more threatened by the PRD than by the PAN. Also, to PRI militants, Cárdenas, Muñoz Ledo and other PRD leaders were, quite simply, traitors and hated for their betrayal of the PRI. While PAN triumphs in gubernatorial races were recognized by Salinas, when the PRD claimed victory, electoral authorities more often published results indicating PRI wins. In the states of Michoacán and México in 1989 and 1990, state and local elections produced intense conflicts between the PRD and the PRI, and the government sided with the PRI (Gómez Tagle 1994; Mastretta 1990). The PRD may have exaggerated its performance, but it seems clear that the government permitted extensive fraud by the PRI.

In federal elections in both 1991 and 1994, the PRD finished third (see Table 1). Compared with the historical performance of the independent left, however, the PRD's 1994 finish indicated a significant advance. In the six years between 1988 and 1994, the PRD elbowed the collaborationist left out of the electoral arena; the PARM, the PPS, and the PFCRN all fell below 1.5 percent of the vote. Riding on Cárdenas's coattails in the 1997 Mexico City regent's race, the PRD moved to second among all parties in the 1997 midterm congressional elections, thereby approaching the 1988 FDN finish. For all intents and purposes, the PRD is now the electoral left in Mexico. Importantly, the PRD has consolidated the second position electorally in many states in the center and the south, especially Chiapas, Guerrero, Michoacán, Morelos (until 2000), Oaxaca, Tabasco and Veracruz. In those states of the south where the effects of

economic liberalization have been harsh for many campesinos, the PRD has offered a voice of opposition.

After its failures to make significant gains against the PRI (as opposed to other segments of the left) nationally in the early 1990s, the PRD made advances in the last half of the 1990s by pursuing something akin to the PAN's federalist strategy. Especially after the PRD win in Mexico City in 1997 had improved the image of the party and suggested that the PRD could run a relatively non-ideological campaign, the party began to take advantage of tensions within the PRI at the state level. Several frustrated candidates for PRI gubernatorial nominations sought the support of "independent" coalitions that had the PRD at their center. Thus the PRD came to displace the PRI from the governorships of Zacatecas and Tlaxcala in 1998 and Baja California Sur in 1999. In coalition with the PAN (but taking a greater role), the PRD won in Nayarit in 1999 and Chiapas in 2000, again postulating former PRI members as the gubernatorial candidates. Finally, in the hard-fought gubernatorial succession in Tabasco, a former PRI member running as the PRD's candidate lost a close election (twice) in 2000 and 2001.

By this strategy the PRD has sought to take advantage of internal struggles within the PRI. It has little to do with ideological differences between the PRI and the PRD but has served to create a type of two-party competition in several states where the PRI had previously ruled without challenge and the PAN had made no inroads. Yet, this strategy of integrating failed PRI aspirants and their clientelistic networks into the party sometimes created internal divisions in the PRD which caused it to lose ground, for example in Puebla and Veracruz in 1998. In many parts of Mexico, especially in the south, the PRD is composed in large part of ex-PRI members and clienteles. Hence, while there are differences between the PRD and the other parties ideologically (there is greater distance between the PRD and the other two parties than between the PRI and the PAN), again an ins-versus-outs divide has come to characterize these state and local-level struggles.

What both the PAN creeping federalist strategy and the PRD's willingness to incorporate frustrated PRI aspirants into its folds amount to are efforts to capitalize on the regime-based cleavage at a local level. Thus they have created two-party system (ins-versus-outs) dynamics in more localized settings. As such they have permitted the two "opposition" parties to more effectively vie for the ballots of the non-partisans and new voters. These efforts run much at variance to any effort to maintain ideological clarity. It comes as no surprise, then, to find that in comparative perspective the ideological distances in the Mexican party system are quite narrow (Martínez Rodríguez 1998: 61). Moreover, in 2000 the PAN and the PRI presented party platforms at the national level that moved them closer to each other while the PRI moved to the right of either (Bruhn forthcoming).

The PRI: The Failure to Find a Strategy to Stay in Power

For the PRI, ideology has long ceased to matter or to provide coherence. Indeed, although forty years ago scholars shoe-horned Mexico into the democracies' camp by discussing the divisions between left (followers of Lázaro Cárdenas) and right (Miguel Alemán's disciples) and postulating a pendulum theory of movement of the presidency back and forth between left and right, others recognized that the most important operative principle in the PRI was the *camarrilla*, or political group, based on recruitment and personal loyalty rather than ideology (Johnson 1971; Smith 1979; Camp 1980). Furthermore, the PRI was never conceptualized as a party that would compete for power. Rather, as Lorenzo Meyer described it,

> The PRI . . . was created to complement the institutional structure of the new regime, not to do battle with its political adversaries at the polls. It provides the forum for internal negotiations among the governing elite, for the distribution of political patronage awards, and for recruiting (fewer and fewer) and socializing new members. During electoral campaigns it acquaints the populace with its soon-to-be-elected officials, and it mobilizes specific sectors of society as needed for the preservation of the system. Between

> elections--excepting those occasions when government leadership needs limited mass mobilization--the official party practically disappears. Its activities are determined almost exclusively by the president and by the electoral calendar, not by grassroots interests or demands (1989: 335).

Real political power was centered in the presidency, the key political institution in Mexico (Brandenburg 1964; Garrido 1989). Increasingly, recruitment to the executive departments controlled by the presidency practically by-passed the party. However, electoral positions remained important as the patronage distributed by the party to sectoral groups whose votes the PRI counted on to produce electoral victories (Pacheco Méndez and Reyes del Campillo 1989).

The economic strategies pursued by de la Madrid and Salinas created a gulf between the upper level of the political elite and the sectors of the party because the members of the labor and peasant sectors did not benefit from neoliberalism (Teichman 1995). In many ways the sectoral organization of the PRI created by Lázaro Cárdenas in the 1930s simply did not fit the Mexico of the 1980s and 1990s, a Mexico less rural, more educated, and more mobile than a half century ago. Increasingly, the sectors could only produce the votes needed for PRI victories though coercion or vote buying, or outright fraud. In this situation, elections did not legitimate the rule of the political elite but rather delegitimated that rule because they were so clearly fraudulent (Molinar Horcasitas 1991a).

In this context, Salinas made efforts to reform the party, and after Zedillo distanced himself from direction of the party at the beginning of his term, PRI leaders made other attempts to modernize the party. One aspect of modernization under Salinas involved creating a more democratic image for the party, an image much tarnished by the massive fraud committed by the PRI in its contests with the PAN in northern states from 1985 forward and against the Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas in 1988. The more democratic PRI would use internal primaries to select its candidates for office and it would recognize its losses when they occurred. Moreover, it

would replace its sectoral organization and the bloc affiliation associated with the sectors with individual affiliation and geographical organization, similar to the organization of parties in the U.S. (Dresser 1994). These efforts failed for the most part. Internal primaries were used sparingly; they tended to exacerbate divisions already existing in state and local party organizations and the president was unwilling to completely give up the opportunities for distributing patronage offered by the more traditional presidential designation of PRI nominees (Garrido 1994). Opposition victories in state and local elections were recognized, but selectively, and often despite local PRI unwillingness to admit its defeats. Salinas had to use presidential power to get PRI candidates to resign after they claimed victory in gubernatorial races marked by electoral fraud. And, threatened by the demonstrated strength of the left in 1988, Salinas permitted the PRI to use fraud and intimidation against the PRD even while encouraging the PRI to recognize PAN victories (Morris 1995: 98-100). Another, more successful aspect of PRI modernization involved the introduction of more sophisticated campaigning tools: computers, polls, and better organization of the campaign. These efforts produced results in 1991 (see Table 1), but the political unrest of 1994 and policy failures early in the Zedillo administration put the PRI back on the ropes.

Second, recognizing the social costs to the Mexican people and the political risk to the PRI of economic restructuring, upon entering office Salinas immediately created the National Solidarity Program (*Programa Nacional de la Solidaridad*, or PRONASOL), a large and complex program aimed at ameliorating the burdens associated with economic restructuring in those areas in which poverty and costs associated with the economic crisis are the worst (Cornelius, Craig, and Fox 1994). In the process, not only were poor people benefitted materially, but they were organized for, among other things, voting for the ruling party. PRONASOL allowed the PRI to distribute from the pork barrel to those it felt it had to reclaim for the party, for the distribution of PRONASOL funds went disproportionately to areas where

Cárdenas did well in 1988. Results in the 1991 elections suggest PRI success was at least partially explained by PRONASOL spending (Molinar Horcasitas and Weldon 1994).

For many years in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, the PRI's most coherent argument for its rule had been that it was the party of the majority that could bring together "revolutionaries" of all sorts. Given the tremendous change in the policy direction of the nation under de la Madrid and Salinas, some of those revolutionaries were bound to be upset, as were Cárdenas and his followers who exited the PRI in 1987-88. In addition, as a party run by the state elite, especially the president, for their purposes, advancement in the PRI depended greatly on presidential discretion. The schism that produced the PRD was the first and largest example of aspiring PRI leaders taking the exit option when they found their promotion blocked by those above them. When Zedillo chose not to take as active a role in the party after 1994, and especially after the PRI lost its control of the Chamber of Deputies in 1997, the party discipline that had been based on the combination of one-party rule and presidential domination of that party came unraveled. The party's ability to guarantee victory to its nominees had disappeared. The president's capacity (and even willingness) to reward supporters with electoral victories similarly eroded. Thus, in a more competitive electoral environment with a president unwilling and in many ways unable to appoint electoral victors, who would designate PRI nominees to important elected positions, and how? And, what philosophy would hold together a party that had come to stand for little more than being in power and being experienced at governing?

Ideologically, the implementation of neoliberal economic policies under Salinas and Zedillo meant the abandonment of revolutionary nationalism by the party that invented that ideology. Some PRI leaders argued that the party had to pay greater attention to the social needs of those groups that had historically been the PRI's principal sources of votes–peasants and workers. Others, more associated with the technocratic wing of the party, remained strong supporters of market-based economic policies, including the 2000 presidential nominee,

Labastida. In the absence of consensus on socioeconomic development strategy, the element of the PRI's doctrine that has come to the fore is its emphasis on law and order, political authority, and state power (Bruhn, forthcoming). In 1994 the party manipulated the population's fear of disorder by suggesting that only its candidate and its team had the capacity to govern a society at the verge of falling into chaos (as manifested by the Chiapas and other rural rebellions and political assassinations in that year). In 2000, the PRI sought to play on that theme again, but without success. Again, this theme, which essentially can be summarized as the capacity to govern, can play well in a context in which electoral dynamics condense to ins-versus-outs.

Strategically, the PRI has sought to resolve its internal struggles about nomination of candidates by introducing the party primary. Thus far, the party's experience with primaries has been mixed. In some cases at the state level, the use of party primaries has led to the selection of more popular candidates for governor and success in the eventual general election. In others, denunciations of fraud have led to internal divisions. For the 2000 presidential election, the PRI's use of a primary to select its candidate may not have hurt the party (McCann, forthcoming), but it clearly did not lead to the emergence of a winning candidate either. In the aftermath of its unprecedented loss in July 2000, the struggle for the leadership of the PRI has been intense, but the future direction of the party remains unresolved.

Conclusions

Mexico's party system looks profoundly different than it did in 1985. No longer a hegemonic party system, only by ignoring important regional concentrations of electoral support for the parties can it be called a three-party system. In most of the nation, the competition remains bipartite, no longer the monopoly of the PRI, but not a genuine tripartite struggle either. In the north, the center-west and a few other isolated areas (such as the Yucatán peninsula), the PRI and the PAN compete against each other while in the south the PRD and the PAN contest for electoral victories. These competitions create contests of ins versus outs and effectively

overlap with a fifteen-year-old cleavage in the electorate based on pro-regime and anti-regime sentiments. The parties' strategies and even their ideologies have adapted to this form of competition. Each party now has catch-all characteristics and those party leaders or party nominees who have been most eclectic in campaign message and campaign style have proved to be the most successful, Vicente Fox serving as the archetype. Whether all three parties can maintain such an approach to electoral competition remains to be proven.

WORKS CITED

Ames, Barry. 1970. "Bases of Support for Mexico's Dominant Party." *American Political Science Review*, 64, 1 (March): 153-67.

Barraza, Leticia and Ilán Bizberg. 1991. "El Partido Acción Nacional y el règimen político méxicano." *Foro Internacional*, 31, 3 (January-March): 418-4.

Bartra, Roger. 1983. "Viaje al centro de la derecha." *Nexos*, no. 83: 15-23.

Brandenburg, Frank. 1964. *The Making of Modern Mexico*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Bruhn, Kathleen. 1997. *Taking on Goliath: The Emergence of a New Left Party and the Struggle for Democracy in Mexico*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Bruhn, Kathleen. 1998. "The Partido de la Revolución Democrática: Diverging Approaches to Competition." In *Governing Mexico: Political Parties and Elections*, ed. Mónica Serrano. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

Bruhn, Kathleen. Forthcoming. "The Making of the President, 2000: Race to *Los Pinos*." In *Mexico 2000: Voting Behavior, Campaign Effects, and Democratization in Mexico*, ed. Jorge I. Domínguez and Chappell Lawson.

Camp, Roderic Ai. 1980. *Mexico's Leaders: Their Education and Recruitment*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Cornelius, Wayne A., Ann L Craig, and Jonathan Fox. Eds. 1994. *Transforming State-Society Relations in Mexico: The National Solidarity Strategy*. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California at San Diego.

Craig, Ann L. and Wayne A. Cornelius. 1995. "Houses Divided: Parties and Political Reform in Mexico." In *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*, ed. Scott Mainwaring and Timothy R. Scully. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dalton, Russell J., Scott C. Flanagan, and Paul Allen Beck. Eds. 1984. *Electoral Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.

Dresser, Denise. 1994. "Embellishment, Empowerment, or Euthanasia of the PRI? Neoliberalism and Party Reform in Mexico." In *Politics of Economic Restructuring: State-Society Relations and Regime Change in Mexico*, ed. Maria Lorena Cook, Kevin Middlebrook, and Juan Molinar. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California at San Diego.

Duverger, Maurice. 1954. *Political Parties*. New York: Wiley.

Garrido, Luis Javier. 1989. "The Crisis of Presidencialismo." In *Mexico's Alternative Political Futures*, ed. Wayne A. Cornelius, Judith Gentleman, and Peter H. Smith. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California at San Diego.

Garrido, Luis Javier. 1994. "Reform of the PRI: Rhetoric and Reality." In *Party Politics in "An Uncommon Democracy:" Political Parties and Elections in Mexico,* ed. Neil Harvey and Mónica Serrano. London: Institute of Latin Amerian Studies.

Gilly, Adolfo. "El perfil del PRD." *Nexos*, no. 152 (August): 61-71.

Gómez Tagle, Silvia. 1994. "Electoral Violence and Negotiations, 1988-1991." In *Governing Mexico: Political Parties and Elections,* ed. Mónica Serrano. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

Hernández Rodríguez, Rogelio. 1998. "The *Partido Revolucionario Institucional*." In *Governing Mexico: Political Parties and Elections,* ed. Mónica Serrano. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

Johnson, Kenneth F. 1971. *Mexican Democracy: A Critical View.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Klesner, Joseph L. 1987. "Changing Patterns of Electoral Participation and Official Party Support in Mexico." In *Mexican Politics in Transition,* edited by Judith Gentleman. Boulder: Westview.

Klesner, Joseph L. 1993. "Modernization, Economic Crisis, and Electoral Alignment in Mexico," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos*, 9, 2 (Summer): 187-223.

Klesner, Joseph L. 1994. "Realignment or Dealignment? Consequences of Economic Crisis and Restructuring for the Mexican Party System." In *Politics of Economic Restructuring: State-Society Relations and Regime Change in Mexico,* ed. Maria Lorena Cook, Kevin Middlebrook, and Juan Molinar. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California at San Diego.

Klesner, Joseph L. 1995. "The 1994 Mexican Elections: Manifestation of a Divided Society?" *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos*, 11, 1 (Winter), pp. 137-149.

Klesner, Joseph L. 1997a "Electoral Reform in Mexico's Hegemonic Party System: Perpetuation of Privilege or Democratic Advance?" Paper presented at the 1997 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August 28-31.

Klesner, Joseph L. 1997b. "Dissolving Hegemony: Electoral Competition and the Decline of Mexico's One-Party Dominant Regime." Paper presented at the 1997 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August 28-31.

Loaeza, Soledad. 1999. *El Partido Acción Nacional: La larga marcha, 1939-1994, Oposición leal y partido de protesta*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Lujambio, Alonso. 1995. "De la hegemonia a las alternativas: diseños institucionales y el futuro de los partidos políticos en México." *Política y Gobierno,* 1, 1: 43-71.

Mabry, Donald J. 1974. *Mexico's Acción Nacional: A Catholic Alternative to Revolution.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Martínez Rodríguez, Antonia. 1998. "Parliamentary Elites and the Polarization of the Party System in Mexico." In *Governing Mexico: Political Parties and Elections,* ed. Mónica Serrano. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

Mastretta, Sergio. 1990. "La cuenca cardenista." *Nexos,* no. 154 (October): 47-64.

McCann, James A. Forthcoming. "Primary Priming: The Case of Mexico's 2000 Presidential Election." In *Mexico 2000: Voting Behavior, Campaign Effects, and Democratization in Mexico*, ed. Jorge I. Domínguez and Chappell Lawson.

Meyer, Lorenzo. 1989. "Democratization of the PRI: Mission Impossible?" In *Mexico's Alternative Political Futures*, ed. Wayne A. Cornelius, Judith Gentleman, and Peter H. Smith. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.

Middlebrook, Kevin. 1986. "Political Liberalization in an Authoritarian Regime: The Case of Mexico." In *Elections and Democratization in Latin America, 1980-85*, ed. by Paul Drake and Eduardo Silva. LaJolla: Center for Iberian and Latin American Studies, Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, and Institute of the Americas, University of California at San Diego.

Mizrahi, Yemile. 1994. "Rebels Without a Cause? The Politics of Entrepreneurs in Chihuahua." *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 26, 1: 137-58.

Mizrahi, Yemile. 1998. "The Costs of Electoral Success: The *Partido Acción Nacional* in Mexico." In *Governing Mexico: Political Parties and Elections,* ed. Mónica Serrano. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

Molinar Horcasitas, Juan. 1989. "The Future of the Electoral System." In *Mexico's Alternative Political Futures*, ed. Wayne A. Cornelius, Judith Gentleman, and Peter H. Smith. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California at San Diego.

Molinar Horcasitas, Juan. 1991a. *El tiempo de la legitimidad: Elecciones, autoritarismo y democracia en México*. Mexico City: Cal y Arena.

Molinar, Juan. 1991b. "Counting the Number of Parties: An Alternative Index," *American Political Science Review,* 85, 4 (December), pp. 1383-92.

Molinar Horcasitas, Juan and Jeffrey A. Weldon. 1990. "Elecciones de 1988 en México: crisis del autoritarismo." *Revista Mexicana de Sociología,* 52, 4 (October-December): 229-62.

Molinar Horcasitas, Juan and Jeffrey A. Weldon. 1994. "Electoral Determinants and Consequences of National Solidarity." In *Transforming State-Society Relations in Mexico: The National Solidarity Strategy*, ed. Wayne A. Cornelius, Ann L. Craig, and Jonathan Fox. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.

Moreno, Alejandro. 1998. "Party Competition and the Issue of Democracy: Ideological Space in Mexican Elections." In *Governing Mexico: Political Parties and Elections*, ed. Mónica Serrano. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

Morris, Stephen D. 1995. *Political Reformism in Mexico: An Overview of Contemporary Mexican Politics.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Pacheco Méndez, Guadalupe. 1997. "Un caleidoscopio electoral: ciudades y elecciones en México, 1988-1994," *Estudios Sociológicos*, 15, no. 44, pp. 319-350.
Pacheco Méndez, Guadalupe, and Juan Reyes del Campillo. 1989. "La estructura sectorial del PRI y las elecciones federales de diputados 1979-1988." *Sociológia* (September-December): 59-74.

Purcell, John F.H., and Susan Kaufman Purcell. 1976. "Machine Politics and Socio-economic Change in Mexico." In *Contemporary Mexico: Papers of the IV International Congress on Mexican History*, ed. by James W. Wilkie, Michael C. Meyer, and Edna Monzón de Wilkie. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1976. *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shirk, David A. 2000. "Vicente Fox and the Rise of the PAN." *Journal of Democracy*, 11, 4: 25-32.

Smith, Peter H. 1979. *Labyrinths of Power: Political Recruitment in Twentieth-Century Mexico*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Teichman, Judith A. 1995. *Privatization and Political Change in Mexico*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Valdés, Leonardo. 1994. "Partido de la Revolución Democrática: The Third Option in Mexico." In *Party Politics in "An Uncommon Democracy:" Political Parties and Elections in Mexico*, ed. Neil Harvey and Mónica Serrano. London: Institute of Latin Amerian Studies.

APPENDIX

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTORAL COMPETITION

Table A1

Districts Categorized by Number of Parties and Principal Competitors, 1994

Type of District	*National*	*North*	*Center-West*	*Metro Area*	*Center*	*South*
PRI Hegemonic	**73**	**26**	**10**	**3**	**14**	**20**
PRI-PAN Competition	**134**	**49**	**32**	**33**	**9**	**11**
PRI Wins Two-Party District	53	24	14	4	4	7
PRI Wins 2 ½ Party District	67	22	9	28	5	3
PAN Wins Two-Party District	6	2	3	0	0	1
PAN Wins 2½ Party District	8	1	6	1	0	0
PRI-PRD Competition	**60**	**4**	**11**	**9**	**2**	**34**
PRI Wins Two-Party District	29	3	3	1	2	20
PRI Wins 2 ½ Party District	26	1	6	8	0	11
PRD Wins Two-Party District	1	0	0	0	0	1
PRD Wins 2½ Party District	4	0	2	0	0	2
Multipartism	**33**	**0**	**3**	**29**	**1**	**0**
PRI Wins	29	0	2	26	1	0
PAN Wins	4	0	1	3	0	0
Total	**300**	**79**	**56**	**74**	**26**	**65**

Source: electoral data acquired from Instituto Federal Electoral.

Table A2

Districts Categorized by Number of Parties and Principal Competitors, 1997

Type of District	*National*	*North*	*Bajío*	*Metro Area*	*Center*	*South*
PRI Hegemonic	***19***	**1**	**0**	**2**	**7**	**9**
PRI-PAN Competition	***110***	**59**	**30**	**3**	**7**	**11**
PRI Wins Two-Party District	33	22	3	1	3	4
PRI Wins 2 ½ Party District	25	13	4	1	3	4
PAN Hegemonic	5	1	4	0	0	0
PAN Wins Two-Party District	18	9	7	0	0	2
PAN Wins 2½ Party District	29	14	12	1	1	1
PRI-PRD Competition	***114***	**7**	**9**	**42**	**10**	**46**
PRI Wins Two-Party District	33	2	1	4	2	24
PRI Wins 2 ½ Party District	25	2	2	0	5	16
PRD Hegemonic	1	0	0	1	0	0
PRD Wins Two-Party District	23	2	2	18	0	1
PRD Wins 2½ Party District	32	1	4	19	3	5
Multipartism	***56***	**7**	**20**	**19**	**5**	**5**
PRI Wins	29	5	8	8	5	3
PAN Wins	13	1	7	5	0	0
PRD Wins	14	1	5	6	0	2
Other: PT Wins	*1*	1	0	0	0	0
Total	***300***	**75**	**59**	**66**	**29**	**71**

Source: electoral data acquired from Instituto Federal Electoral.

Table A3

Districts Categorized by Number of Parties and Principal Competitors, 2000

Type of District	*National*	*North*	*Center-West*	*Metro Area*	*Center*	*South*
PRI Hegemonic	**10**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3**
PRI-PAN Competition	**170**	**58**	**45**	**24**	**19**	**24**
PRI Wins Two-Party District	30	14	2	2	7	5
PRI Wins 2 ½ Party District	33	11	6	3	4	9
PAN Hegemonic	19	3	9	3	1	3
PAN Wins Two-Party District	52	20	16	6	5	5
PAN Wins 2½ Party District	36	10	12	10	2	2
PRI-PRD Competition	**48**	**5**	**7**	**1**	**2**	**33**
PRI Wins Two-Party District	14	1	1	1	1	10
PRI Wins 2 ½ Party District	24	2	0	0	1	21
PRD Hegemonic	0	0	0	0	0	0
PRD Wins Two-Party District	2	0	2	0	0	0
PRD Wins 2½ Party District	8	2	4	0	0	2
PAN-PRD Competition	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**
Multipartism	**70**	**7**	**7**	**39**	**6**	**11**
PRI Wins	20	3	1	5	5	6
PAN Wins	32	2	3	24	1	2
PRD Wins	18	2	3	10	0	3
Total	***300***	**75**	**59**	**66**	**29**	**71**

Source: electoral data acquired from Instituto Federal Electoral.

Table 1

Federal Deputy Election Results, 1961-2000

YEAR	PAN	PRI	PPS	PARM	PDM	PCM PSUM PMS PRD	PST PFCRN PC	PVEM	PT	Other
1961	7.6	90.3	1.0	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	--
1964	11.5	86.3	1.4	0.7	--	--	--	--	--	--
1967	12.5	83.8	2.2	1.4	--	--	--	--	--	--
1970	14.2	83.6	1.4	0.8	--	--	--	--	--	--
1973	16.5	77.4	3.8	2.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
1976	8.9	85.2	3.2	2.7	--	--	--	--	--	--
1979	11.4	74.2	2.7	1.9	2.2	5.3	2.2	--	--	--
1982	17.5	69.3	1.9	1.3	2.3	4.4	1.8	--	--	1.3
1985	16.3	68.2	2.1	1.7	2.9	3.4	2.6	--	--	2.9
1988	18.0	50.4	9.2	6.1	1.3	4.5	10.2	--	--	0.5
1991	17.7	61.4	1.8	2.1	1.1	8.3	4.3	1.4	1.1	1.5
1994	26.8	50.3	0.7	0.9	0.4	16.7	1.1	1.4	2.6	0.3
1997	25.8	38.0	0.3	--	0.7	25.0	1.1	3.7	2.5	0.1
2000	39.1†	37.8	--	0.8	--	19.1‡	--	†	‡	2.1

Annulled votes have been excluded.
†PVEM formed Alliance for Change coalition with PAN in 2000.
‡PT formed part of Alliance for Mexico coalition with PRD in 2000.

PRI = Institutional Revolutionary Party
PAN = National Action Party
PPS = Popular Socialist Party
PARM = Authentic Party of the Mexican Revolution
PDM = Mexican Democratic Party
PCM = Mexican Communist Party
PSUM = Unified Socialist Party of Mexico
PMS = Mexican Socialist Party
PRD = Party of the Democratic Revolution
PST = Socialist Workers Party
PFCRN = Party of the Cardenista National Revolutionary Front
PC = Cardenista Party
PVEM = Mexican Ecological Green Party
PT = Workers' Party

Source: Instituto Federal Electoral.

Table 3

Evolution of Competition in Mexican Elections:
Federal Deputy Elections by District, 1991-2000

Type of District	*1991*	*1994*	*1997*	*2000*
PRI Hegemonic	**187**	**73**	**19**	**10**
PRI-PAN Competition	**90**	**134**	**110**	**170**
PRI Wins Two-Party District	66	53	33	30
PRI Wins 2 ½ Party District	14	67	25	33
PAN Hegemonic	0	0	5	19
PAN Wins Two-Party District	7	6	18	52
PAN Wins 2½ Party District	3	8	29	36
PRI-PRD Competition	**22**	**60**	**114**	**48**
PRI Wins Two-Party District	19	29	33	14
PRI Wins 2 ½ Party District	3	26	25	24
PRD Hegemonic	0	0	1	0
PRD Wins Two-Party District	0	1	23	2
PRD Wins 2½ Party District	0	4	32	8
PAN-PRD Competition	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Multipartism	**1**	**33**	**56**	**70**
PRI Wins	1	29	29	20
PAN Wins	0	4	13	32
PRD Wins	0	0	14	18
Other: PT Wins	0	0	1	0
Total	***300***	***300***	***300***	***300***

Source: Federal Electoral Institute.

Table 6

Regional Bases of the Vote
Presidential Vote in 2000

Region	**Fox** ***PAN***	***Labastida*** ***PRI***	***Cárdenas*** ***PRD***	***Total***
North	*43.4*	*45.6*	*8.9*	*25.6*
Center-West	*51.0*	*32.3*	*14.3*	*20.2*
Mexico City Area	*46.4*	*26.7*	*22.3*	*27.2*
Center	*42.4*	*40.5*	*14.2*	*8.8*
South	*34.5*	*44.0*	*19.0*	*18.5*
Total	***44.0***	***37.0***	***16.0***	***100.0***

Source: Mitofsky/Consulta Exit Poll, July 2, 2000. N=37,096.

Table 7

Partisanship in Mexico
1986-2000

Year	***1986***	***1988***	***1994***	***1997***	***2000 (June)***	***2000 (October)***
Survey	*New York Times*	Gallup Pre-Election	Beldon and Russonello Pre-Election	ITAM Post-Election	Mexico 2000 Panel Study, Third Wave	Hewlett Mexican and US Visions of Democracy
PRI	46	45	48	30	35	29
PAN	16	20	16	22	23	31
PRD*	--	21*	7	22	10	10
None	32	10	--	18	30	27
Don't Know/No Answer	1	1	25	5	2	8
Other	6	3	2	3	--	1
N	1,576	2,960	1,526	1,243	1,288	932

*The PRD did not come into existence until after 1988. The figure presented for the PRD in 1988 reflects the sum of partisan preferences expressed for the parties composing the National Democratic Front (FDN), those which supported the 1988 presidential candidacy of Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas.

Sources: *The New York Times* Mexico Survey, 1986 (ICPSR 8666), October 28-November 4, 1986; Gallup Mexico Pre-Election Survey, 1988, May 12-June 1, 1988; Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México Post-Election Poll, 1997, July 20-27, 1997; Belden & Russonello Research and Communications, *Survey of Electoral Preferences in Mexico, 1994*, July 23-August 1, 1994;
Mexico 2000 Panel Study, Third Wave, June 2-14, 2000; Roderic Ai Camp, *Mexico through Mexican and U.S. Lenses*, October 2000.

Table 8

Retrospective Vote and the 2000 Presidential Choice

	Fox PAN	**Labastida PRI**	**Cárdenas PRD**
Congressional Vote in 1997			
PAN	86.9	7.6	3.2
PRI	16.5	75.5	6.2
PRD	31.1	5.6	61.5
Non-Voter or Don't Remember	46.7	33.4	15.9
Presidential Vote in 1994			
PAN	86.6	7.8	2.9
PRI	21.8	69.6	6.6
PRD	27.7	5.7	64.6
Non-Voter or Don't Remember	45.9	33.9	16.0

Source: Mitofsky/Consulta Exit Poll, 2 July 2000. N=6,196.

Table 9

Political Characteristics of Loyalists and Defectors
Change from 1997 to 2000

Variable	Loyalists			Defectors		Non-Voter to PAN
	PAN	PRI	PRD	PRI to PAN	PRD to PAN	
Partisanship						
PAN	76.0	2.7	0.7	26.5	43.0	2.6
PRI	1.1	86.5	0.8	27.7	2.8	4.8
PRD	0.3	0.4	75.8	1.1	14.0	46.9
Other	0.6	0.5	0.7	1.9	.2	0.8
None	20.9	8.7	21.4	41.1	38.3	36.3
Don't Know/No Answer	1.3	1.2	0.6	1.8	1.8	8.5
Self-Reported Voting Record						
Always Vote for the Same Party	65.9	89.1	65.6	29.3	17.3	37.0
Sometimes Vote for One Party, Sometimes for Another	29.5	9.8	28.2	63.9	76.2	44.8
Neither	4.2	0.7	6.2	6.3	5.9	14.8
No Answer	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.7	3.4
Presidential Vote in 1994						
Didn't Vote	11.1	9.0	11.9	17.3	11.2	51.2
PAN	75.8	1.9	1.8	8.4	19.4	2.4
PRI	6.9	84.9	4.9	64.5	16.7	10.7
PRD	1.6	1.1	77.5	2.0	46.5	17.9
Other/No Answer	1.3	0.4	0.7	2.0	1.0	5.3
Don't Remember	3.4	2.7	3.2	5.8	5.1	12.7
Percent of Total Sample*	15.5	20.0	5.9	4.5	2.9	14.8

*Table excludes voters for smaller parties (3.0% of the total sample); 1997 PAN voters (2.3%) and 1997 non-voters (16.8%) who voted for any other party in 2000; and those who could not remember or would not report their 1997 vote (13.7%). N=6,196.
Source: Mitofsky/Consulta Exit Poll, 2 July 2000.

Table 10

Social Characteristics of Loyalists and Defectors
Change from 1997 to 2000

Variable	Loyalists			Defectors		Non-Voter to PAN
	PAN	PRI	PRD	PRI to PAN	PRD to PAN	
Mean Age	39.9	43.7	41.7	39.3	43.6	34.7
Sex						
Male	54.4	47.0	55.5	51.3	63.0	44.2
Female	45.6	53.0	44.5	48.7	37.0	55.8
Income						
0-1 minimum salaries	15.2	38.6	27.8	25.6	16.8	28.8
1-3 minimum salaries	21.5	25.7	25.9	26.7	24.9	32.4
3-5 minimum salaries	18.3	11.8	15.2	13.5	15.5	12.9
5-10 minimum salaries	20.1	10.2	13.6	16.1	22.1	11.7
Over 10 minimum salaries	19.3	5.7	11.1	10.7	13.0	2.8
Don't Know/No Answer	5.6	7.9	6.5	7.5	7.6	12.5
Education						
None	2.7	11.0	6.7	6.2	1.6	7.3
Primary	21.5	46.4	32.1	30.8	19.4	37.0
Secondary	21.2	17.5	16.0	18.7	18.0	21.9
Preparatory	20.4	11.9	19.1	19.4	24.3	19.9
University	34.2	13.2	26.0	24.9	36.6	14.0
Urban or Rural						
Urban	92.3	72.3	80.0	86.7	93.2	80.3
Rural	7.7	27.7	20.0	13.3	6.8	19.7
Percent of Total Sample*	15.5	20.0	5.9	4.5	2.9	14.8

See notes on Table 9.