

by political commentators in Mexico. Furthermore, many of his political cronies did sign this call, including Vicente Fox (PAN), Porfirio Muñoz Ledo (PRD), Adolfo Aguilar Zinser, and the PRI's ex-governor of the state of Tabasco, Enrique González Pedrero, an EZLN supporter and the political controller of the current head of the PRD, Manuel López Obrador.

## Target: the Presidency

Camacho is intent on destroying not only the PRI, but the institution of the Presidency as well. In a July 18, 1996 speech, Camacho argued that Mexico's authoritarian Presidency needs to be replaced by a prime minister, along the lines of European parliamentary systems. Camacho proclaimed that "the authoritarian President must be replaced by a Presidential institution that is not deformed by control of the state party. . . . We must take from the President the excessive weight of administration . . . and leave the responsibility for administration in the hands of a head of the cabinet, who would be named by the President at the time of the Presidential election, and would remain in power if the President won the majority in mid-term elections. If an opposition political force should win a majority, the head of the cabinet would be named by the Congress."

## The Soros connection

Another crucial facet of Camacho can be seen in his close association with international speculator George Soros.

Named mayor of Mexico City in December 1988 by then-President Carlos Salinas, Camacho used this post to develop a close relationship with Soros. Camacho assigned this task principally to Juan Enríquez Cabot, head of Metropolitan Services of the Federal District, whom he commissioned to attract foreign investment into Mexico City real estate ventures. Enríquez Cabot's main qualification was the fact that he was the son of Marjorie Cabot Lodge, heiress of the famous U.S. family which founded the Bank of Boston, and of Antonio Enríquez Savignac, Mexico's tourism minister in the Miguel de la Madrid government, who designed "the world's most expensive" real estate projects in order to "re-urbanize" Mexico City. The investors who were attracted to Mexico City by the Camacho administration, according to the London *Financial Times*, were George Soros and Paul Reichman, of Soros Realty and Reichman International. According to the same paper, Enríquez Cabot claimed that Soros's "investments are a vote of confidence in Mexico and in its economic future."

Of those mega-projects, the "Alameda Project," in the historical center of Mexico City, is currently frozen, but the Santa Fé Project is alive and well. This is a luxury residential area on the outskirts of Mexico City.

In speaking of Soros, one must keep in mind that he is not only a speculator, but also an open promoter of drug legalization and a protector of narco-terrorists, through such non-governmental organizations as Human Rights Watch/Americas, which he finances. Human Rights Watch/Americas is

heavily involved in Mexico, defending the EZLN and granting human rights prizes to pro-terrorist Theology of Liberation priests such as the Jesuit father David Fernández, director of the Agustín Pro Human Rights Center of Mexico.

After Camacho left his post as mayor of Mexico City, Enríquez Cabot continued to work for him. When Camacho was named peace commissioner for Chiapas, Cabot became his special envoy to "negotiate" with "Sub-Commander Marcos." In March 1994, CBS's "60 Minutes" interviewed Marcos and that interview included the participation of none other than Enríquez Cabot, identified only as "Commissioner Camacho's public relations liaison . . . to the U.S. media."

Enríquez Cabot currently resides in the United States, operating out of Harvard's Center for International Affairs (see section on Castañeda).

# EZLN: the British plot's military wing

by Carlos Méndez

From its first "Declaration from the Lacandón Jungle," in January 1994, the narco-terrorist Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) defined its goals as the destruction of the Mexican Army, overthrow of the President, setting up a Constituent Assembly, and imposing indigenous "autonomy"—that is, separatism. Since then, its demands have not changed one iota.

In its first "Declaration of War," issued on Jan. 2, 1994, the EZLN also attacked the Army, stating, "we issue this to the Mexican Federal Army, the basic pillar of the dictatorship under which we suffer, monopolized by the ruling party, and led by the Federal Executive whose maximum, and illegitimate, leader, is Carlos Salinas de Gortari.

"Through this Declaration of War, we urge the other branches of government to restore the Nation's legality and stability by overthrowing the dictator."

In point No. 3 of its Declaration of War, the EZLN ordered its terrorist troops to "begin summary trials of the soldiers of the Mexican Federal Army, and the political police who have taken courses, or been advised, trained, or paid by foreigners, either in our nation or abroad."

In the "Fourth Declaration from the Lacandón Jungle," issued Jan. 1, 1996 as a "New Year's Message," the goals defined are the same as those included in the first, among them, the destruction of the Mexican Army and writing of a new Constitution.

In statements published in the Mexican media on June 16, 1994, the EZLN's "Sub-Commander Marcos" called on all the country's social organizations to attend a meeting to take



*A Zapatista guerrilla in Chiapas, Mexico, January 1994. The main goal of the EZLN is the destruction of Mexico's Armed Forces.*

place before Aug. 21 of that year, that is, prior to the Presidential elections, to organize a National Democratic Convention “from which a proposal for a provisional or transitional government would emerge.”

In a lengthy, three-part interview published by *La Jornada* in June 1994, Marcos threatened that “the only possibility of avoiding war is mobilizing before the 21st [of August], and take the test for admission to democracy on the 21st or 22nd.” That is, either the PRI “loses,” or there would be “a civil war, with many heads, or with no head, but in the end, with many forces fighting each other, with no clear definition of the dividing line between one side and the other.”

At an international narco-terrorist conference hosted by the EZLN in Chiapas, Mexico, at the end of July 1996—the Intercontinental Conference against Neo-Liberalism and for Humanity—a call was issued for the elimination of defense budgets, and for drug legalization. During his speech to the group, Marcos explicitly targetted “national armies,” characterizing them as “simple units of a larger Army—the one which neo-liberalism arms and deploys against humanity.”

### **Separatism = segregation**

As for indigenous separatism, in an interview with the Mexican daily *El Financiero*, *Proceso* magazine and the *New York Times*, given in January 1994 “from somewhere in the Chiapas jungle,” the so-called “Sub-Commander Marcos” said that, for him, the most important goal was to obtain the “administrative and political autonomy of the Indian regions,” adding that, for this, it would be necessary to reform

Article 4 of the Constitution to recognize the existence of various ethnic regions, each with their own structure.” It is this reform which President Zedillo finally rejected as “segregationist” in early 1997.

A wire from the French news service AFP, published in the Miami-based *Diario las Américas* on Feb. 27, 1994, reported that “In statements made to the *Vanguardia* correspondent [of Barcelona, Spain], ‘Marcos’ says he seeks ‘autonomy’ [in the Chiapas region] like that which the Basques and Catalans enjoy in Spain.”

Samuel Ruiz, the bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas, Chiapas, considered to be the EZLN’s real *comandante*, has also repeatedly attacked the Mexican Army. On Columbus Day, Oct. 12, 1996, he stated in Guatemala that the Mexican Army is already carrying out political tasks, and that, according to observers, it is they who have the upper hand inside the Zedillo government. Slanderingly charging that the Army was plotting a coup, Ruiz added that “for many, there is a very visible penetration of the Army, not only in the military arena but also in a political position; those with experience in this area say that when the military enters politics, they rarely leave.”

Barely a week later, on Oct. 20, 1996, the *New York Times* published a similar attack: “The growing role of the Army is worrisome,” they fretted. “If the Mexican Army becomes an independent central power, it could be a catastrophe for the nation and would weaken President Ernesto Zedillo’s hopes of moving forward with economic and political reform.”