

Will Colosio's British assassins kill Mexico, too?

by Gretchen Small

No thinking person, inside or out of Mexico, believes that the murder on March 23 of Mexico's leading presidential candidate, Luis Donaldo Colosio, was simply the act of a crazed 23-year-old mechanic from the slums of Tijuana. Not only had no political figure of Colosio's stature been murdered in Mexico since 1928, but the consequences for the Western Hemisphere of this assassination are far too grave for a sane person to cast blame upon the equivalent of random chance.

The assassination followed close upon two other events which have shaken the foundations of Mexico: the May 1993 murder of Mexican Cardinal Juan Jesús Posadas Ocampo, and the January 1994 outbreak of an armed insurgency along Mexico's southern border, an insurgency which proclaims ethnic separatism for indigenous peoples as its banner. Buckling under to the backing given the Zapatistas by the British and their pals in the U.S. State Department, the Mexican government had already begun to change the Constitution to please these narco-terrorists.

The political system through which Mexico has been ruled for the past 65 years is being shattered by the same British gamemasters who directed its creation back in 1928, out of the crisis which followed the 1928 assassination of President-elect Gen. Alvaro Obregón (see article, p. 28). Hardly had Colosio been buried than London issued marching orders: The institution of the Mexican presidency must be buried, too.

On March 25, London's *Financial Times* published a brazen editorial proclaiming that Colosio's murder creates "rich potential" for radical institutional change in Mexico, particularly of its "highly centralized executive." If a new "institutional structure" is not set up, the country will be plunged into "deep-seated instability," the paper threatened.

The *Financial Times* specified two institutions deemed acceptable to the interests of the City of London: the central bank, just declared "autonomous" from all government authority; and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Both institutions are beholden, not to Mexican government authorities, but to foreign financial interests.

Knocking out the Mexican presidency, Armed Forces, and Catholic Church—the three principal targets of the destabilization process unleashed last May—will not bring "democracy" to Mexico, as is foolishly repeated in Washington, D.C. today, but rather Balkan-style religious and ethnic warfare. These are dangerous games coming out of London: One out of ten Mexicans was killed in the successive civil wars from 1910 to 1928. Under current conditions of global and national economic breakdown, with narco-terrorist-led ethnic warfare already under way inside Mexico, led by a group with extensive ties to terrorists in other republics of the Americas, for any American to seek the elimination of Mexican national institutions is an act of strategic insanity.

Recognition is dawning inside Mexico that the institutional crisis is not some partisan battle for control of the state, but rather, a battle to ensure the survival of the nation. At Colosio's funeral, former President José López Portillo (1976-82) charged that "outside forces" out to destabilize Mexico were behind the killing. Who those forces are, López Portillo could not say. "I only know that, in order to so fanaticize men that they become assassins, very powerful forces are needed," and those forces lie abroad, he told the press. What he fears, he said, is "that they are going to kill Mexico."

Nor is that recognition limited to Mexico. Veteran Peruvian journalist Patricio Ricketts urged Mexico's neighbors to face up to the fact that "a destructive and destabilizing

program" lay behind both Colosio's murder and the Zapatista uprising, a program which has "catastrophic consequences" for every country in the hemisphere. Ricketts warned in Peru's *Expresso* daily March 25: "If in less than three months it has been possible to bring the most stable country in the continent to the edge of chaos and civil war . . . what could these destabilizers, capable of anything including assassination, not attempt in any of our countries?" Ricketts himself had narrowly escaped death by a Shining Path bomb only two weeks before.

LaRouche warns of anti-nation plot

American statesman Lyndon LaRouche has stepped forward to name the British imperial gamemasters as the "outside forces" out to kill the nation of Mexico. In a statement issued the morning after Colosio died, LaRouche identified the "interlocking network of London-centered intelligence entities" around the Hollinger Corp. as the policymakers running the destabilization of Mexico (see full text in *EIR*, April 1, p. 58)). He cited the case of Hollinger board member Henry Kissinger as illustrative of these forces.

LaRouche addressed that nagging question, "Why has this policy been adopted?" These are the same forces which are directing the assault upon the U.S. presidency through so-called Whitewatergate, which are attempting to prevent a Middle East peace accord, and which are savagely attacking the institutions of every nation of Central and South America, LaRouche wrote. Facing the imminent global financial collapse, these British interests are in a desperate drive to obliterate all national institutions, such that neither the United States, nor any nation or group of nations, can step forward to challenge their insane, globalist policy of usury, even as its collapse brings ruin upon the world.

LaRouche's analysis was quickly picked up across Ibero-America. A commentator on Radio Cultural in Buenos Aires, Argentina, reviewing the pattern of destabilization leading up to Colosio's murder, reminded his audience that *EIR* had published an article in 1989 citing Kissinger's plans to force a "disintegration" of the nations of Ibero-America, and added, "that is what we are seeing now."

Under the headline, "Plot against Mexico," the widely read Mexican magazine *Siempre* published in its first issue following the murder an interview with Marivilia Carrasco, the head of the Mexican chapter of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA), founded by friends of LaRouche. *Siempre*, which in January had reported LaRouche's warnings that the Zapatista uprising was a foreign-run operation aimed at the breakup of the nation, now reported LaRouche's charge that the attack on Mexico is being run by the same British forces behind the Whitewater scandal against President Clinton.

The MSIA argues that the objective of the British financial interests and their stooges in the United States is to "attack, encumber, disappear, Mexican institutions," *Siem-*

pre wrote. "Which ones? The basic ones, which sustain and gave rise to the country: the presidency, the Armed Forces, and, in passing, the Catholic Church, as also to erase national sovereignty."

Siempre asked Carrasco a question now being asked in the other Ibero-American capitals where governments have, like the Mexican government, done everything they could to prove themselves acceptable to the British-dominated "globalist" order: "Why destabilize Mexico, with a government like that of Carlos Salinas, which has given complete support to large foreign and national capital?"

"The attack is not against Salinas de Gortari, but against the institution of the presidency," Carrasco answered. "These groups consider a President, such as the Mexican one, a disposable instrument of their strategy. . . . After more than a decade of intense plundering, using payment of the foreign debt as a pretext to deepen the looting of the country, now they have entered the stage of provoking ethnic, religious, and economic differences, to create favorable conditions for the outbreak of civil war." People who argue that these financial interests could not want to hurt their business opportunities in this way, should read the book *Blood in the Streets*, Carrasco suggested. Co-authored by Lord William Rees-Mogg, a business partner of the British Rothschild family (represented on the Hollinger Corp. board), *Blood in the Streets* argues that more money can be made under conditions of chaos.

Recognizing the game

Colosio, the candidate of the governing Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) who was expected to win the August 1994 presidential elections, was shot at 5:08 p.m. on March 23, as he was leaving a campaign rally in a poor part of Tijuana. Wounded in the head and the abdomen, he died less than three hours later. Three men were arrested at the scene, one of them, Mario Aburto Martínez, accused of firing the fatal shots.

Before 12 hours had passed, the proverbial "lone assassin" theory began to be churned out, one of its most vehement proponents being U.S. Ambassador to Mexico James Jones (see *Documentation*). Mexican Attorney General Diego Valades called a press conference on March 24 in Tijuana to announce that Aburto was "undoubtedly" the sole killer; the other two persons in custody were being held as witnesses, not suspects.

That same day, the *Washington Post* projected that "the shooting of Colosio, in its own way like the assassination of John F. Kennedy three decades ago, is likely to help define a new identity for Mexico," and suggested that Mexicans put aside the question of "who pulled the trigger and why," and get down to implementing "radical reforms" of its political system.

That line did not last long. On March 28, *El Universal* published a set of pictures taken by a photographer for the

Profile of an 'Aztec'

John Hinckley

Mario Aburto Martínez, 23, offers the classic profile of a brainwashed zombie, not unlike John Hinckley, who tried to kill President Reagan in 1981. Described by interrogators as absolutely cold and emotionless, he immediately admitted to being the assassin of Luis Donaldo Colosio, and refused to answer questions as to his motives or accomplices. His occasional attempts to explain his actions were semi-coherent, ranging from assertions of pacifism to wanting to "change the world" and "save Mexico."

Witnesses describe Aburto as a loner who never went anywhere without his notebook and a "political tract" from which he studied and which no one was allowed to touch. He told interrogators that he belonged to a religious sect, but refused to identify it. He also claimed to have been involved since 1986 with a political organization, or "armed groups," which had been "making preparations" for several years.

In a search of Aburto's home, a history of the assassination of John F. Kennedy was found, along with books by Karl Marx and Loret de Mola. Loret de Mola's latest book is a novel on the assassination of a Mexican presidential candidate. Also found were Nazi swastikas and a great deal of pornography, both written and videos.

Strange drawings by Aburto were discovered in one of his notebooks, reportedly showing himself as an Aztec god with the name Caballero Aguila. According to his girlfriend, Aburto had been involved in a political organization which had code-named him Caballero Aguila, after an Aztec warrior sect which sought out prisoners of war for sacrifice to their gods. She said that she had gone to a wax museum with Aburto, where they viewed a figure of a Caballero Aguila. "That's me," he had told her. She also reported his claim that he had accepted a mission from his group which he was confident would prove successful.

Other drawings by Aburto discovered in his notebooks showed the murdered candidate Colosio in a casket, showed Aburto as a spirit trying to enter Colosio's body, and showed Aburto and Colosio holding hands and floating toward heaven.

San Diego Union which show several people in the crowd aiding Aburto. One of them, Tranquilino Sánchez Vega, had been previously arrested and later released. *El Universal* reviewed the numerous reports and allegations on the shooting from eyewitnesses, medical personnel, security officials, and others. Whichever of those specifics are true, the pattern left the "lone assassin" in shreds. By midday, the Attorney General's office announced that Sánchez Vega had been re-arrested and charged as an accomplice.

El Universal, however, marshalled its story to a definite purpose: to pin the murder upon the Army, specifically its presidential security division, which was in charge of Colosio's security.

Military officers reacted with fury, identifying the *Universal* story as a blatant attempt to direct Mexicans' shock and anger over the assassination against the very national institutions targeted for elimination by foreign plotters. Look at the pattern, officers argued. Security on both of Mexico's borders has been blown up, and now, once again, the military has been made a target.

Yes, they added, the candidate's security had been stripped: by the security-stripping operation run against the country as a whole. Military officers around the country had been filing complaints for months that they no longer could secure any area which the candidate visited, as the military came under increasing attack by the so-called "democratic" reformers in the PRI and the opposition, the same people who have backed the Chiapas

uprising since it broke out in January.

Chiapas explosion coming again

Pressured by the ever-anonymous "markets"—a sell-off by foreign investors led to a 3% drop in the Mexican stock market on March 29—President Salinas named Colosio's campaign manager, Ernesto Zedillo, as the PRI's new presidential candidate on March 30. Zedillo, who received his doctorate in economics from Yale University and served variously as budget and education secretary under Salinas, was favored by the City of London and Wall Street as the man to ensure continuity of the drastic free trade economic policies which successive Mexican governments have implemented since 1983.

But the British have no intention of letting Zedillo govern a stable Mexico, even on their behalf. Seizing advantage of the national turmoil, the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) issued a communiqué on March 25 announcing that its terrorists are again "on red alert . . . ready to defend Zapatista territory to the last man." The EZLN's movie-star Subcommander "Marcos" sent the press a farewell letter, announcing that EZLN cadre were now preparing for "martyrdom" and "immolation."

Zapatista-style uprisings are being prepared in other Ibero-American countries, too. Argentine authorities are reportedly tracking operations in the northeast region of that country. According to a transcript of a recent discussion between Argentine President Carlos Menem and U.S. Trade

Representative Mickey Kantor, published by *Clarín* on March 27, Menem warned the Clinton administration that it had better wake up to the hemispheric danger which the Chiapas terrorists represent.

"If we act quickly, we could stop the explosion from spreading throughout Latin America. In a small country like Guatemala, with 4 million people, there are 28 ethnic groups. That's dangerous. Ask the President of Ecuador about the repercussions of Chiapas in his country," Menem reportedly told Kantor. To Kantor's protests that Mexican President Salinas seemed to have the situation under control through negotiations, Menem shot back: "In such a situation, I would not have sat down to negotiate with hooded ones. That's how you institutionalize violence. It is not known who is behind the hoods. . . . We would not have acted in that manner. And I believe the United States would not have done it, either."

Documentation

British media orchestrate coverup of Colosio murder

Within hours of the killing of PRI candidate Luis Donaldo Colosio, the British media, led by the Financial Times, launched a campaign of crafted lies to cover the tracks of the real conspirators. Two big lies were put into circulation: first, that Mario Aburto was a deranged "lone assassin"; and second, when the evidence made that story virtually impossible to sustain, the lie that Aburto was working with "hardliners" in the PRI, the Mexican military, or even President Carlos Salinas de Gortari himself. Below is a chronology of some of the principal statements made in and to the press peddling these two lines, which clearly shows the British origin of the campaigns.

March 24, 8:50 a.m., on Good Morning America, interview with U.S. Ambassador to Mexico James Jones: "There's no indication of any kind of a tie-in [to the Chiapas uprising]. What it appears so far, this was a random act of violence with no organized effort behind it. . . . These random acts of violence happen to us more often than we care to recall. This is the first time it's happened in Mexico in over six decades."

March 25, *Financial Times*: "As of yesterday there was no indication of any conspiracy."

March 25, *Financial Times*: "But unless it emerges that Mr. Colosio's assassins were agents or elements in the Mexican ruling party, the re-opening of NAFTA seems highly improbable."

March 25, *New York Times*: "No evidence emerged [that] . . . Aburto had any political connections or was tied in any way in the recent peasant uprising in Chiapas . . . the authorities were confident that the man in custody was the one and only gunman. . . ."

March 25, *Los Angeles Times*, commentary by Mexico's Jorge Castañeda: "It will not be easy to convince the country of what exactly happened [i.e., that there was no conspiracy]. But without a full, exhaustive and transparent investigation carried out by immaculate figures, credibility and order cannot be restored soon. The Warren Commission didn't dissipate the doubts; however, without it, theories of skepticism and conspiracy would have prospered more than they did."

March 25, Colombian radio, former President Alfonso López Michelsen: Aburto "might have been deranged. . . . [There] is no evidence of any conspiracy."

March 25, *Jornal do Commercio* of Brazil, paraphrasing statement by Peter Hakim, head of the Inter-American Dialogue: "Peter Hakim . . . affirmed yesterday that the death of Colosio will have serious effects, if, for example, the involvement of anti-reform PRI factions or of the Armed Forces is demonstrated."

March 26, communiqué issued by the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN): "The hard-line and militarist option within the federal government planned and carried out this provocation to annul any peaceful intent to democratize national political life."

March 28, Associated Press, quoting statement of Porfirio Muñoz Ledo, president of the opposition PRD party in Mexico: "We think that behind the attack, an oligarchical group opposed to the democratic process was the one which armed the hand of the murderer."

March 29, F. Bartolomé in his column "Templo Mayor" in the daily *Reforma* of Mexico, citing remarks of the head of the Latin America division of the U.S. National Security Council, Richard Feinberg, formerly head of Inter-American Dialogue: "In an extreme example of this kind of thinking, there is Richard Feinberg . . . who has requested reports from diverse channels on the political evaluation of Mexico. . . . He is worried about the possibility that a leading PRI member of the old guard might reach Los Pinos [the Mexican White House]."

March 29, Peruvian Channel 5 interview with dissident member of the PRI, Ramiro de La Rosa, member of "Convergence 2000," which receives financing from the Project Democracy apparatus in the United States: "I don't rule out that Luis Donaldo Colosio may have been a victim of a conspiracy directed from the highest levels of power."

Two murders changed Mexico's history

Many observers have noted that a murder like that of PRI presidential candidate Luis Donaldo Colosio had not occurred in Mexico since the 1928 assassination of President-elect Alvaro Obregón. The true history behind that earlier assassination of a political leader in many ways holds the key to understanding what the British intend to achieve in Mexico today by their sponsorship of the Colosio murder.

The modern Mexican political system, whose backbone is the ruling PRI party, was founded in 1929 under British oligarchical auspices by ex-President Plutarco Elias Calles (1924-28), in the wake of the 1928 murder of President-elect Obregón. The Obregón killing was the last of a series of political assassinations which punctuated the factional battles for power in the aftermath of the Mexican Revolution of 1910-17. The Mexican Revolution was in many ways similar to the contemporaneous Russian Revolution: The Catholic Church was banned, socialist measures in education were adopted, and communal agriculture was enshrined in the constitution. And as in the Soviet case, the Mexican Revolution was characterized by one bloody murder and purge after another, as the competing forces vied for power. Thus, peasant leader Emiliano Zapata was murdered under the government of Venustiano Carranza. In 1920, Carranza in turn was killed, after the military insurrection led by Obregón. In 1923, Pancho Villa was also assassinated during the Obregón presidency.

In 1926, under the regime of Obregón's successor, Plutarco Elias Calles, British intelligence and its stooges in the United States used Calles, a fanatical Mason, to launch the Cristero War against the Mexican Catholic Church and the predominantly Catholic population in general. The Cristero War lasted from 1926-29, and evolved into a full-fledged, bloody civil war. In fact, in the period from 1910 until the Cristero War was finally settled in 1929, over 1 million Mexicans died, out of a total population of about 10 million at the time.

In 1928, Alvaro Obregón was reelected President of Mexico, and that's when the British stepped in again. Obregón was assassinated by a deranged "lone assassin," José de León Toral. It quickly, and conveniently, emerged that Toral was purportedly a Cristero fanatic, a Catholic synarchist with links to the Cristero apparatus. The evidence, some of it

obviously manufactured, seemingly pointed to the Catholics, and in this way another brutal round of persecution was launched against them, including the execution of innocent priests and so on.

Toral may or may not have been the patsy who pulled the trigger, but the murder plot was hatched by the British, and carried out by the incumbent masonic Calles administration, in an effort to perpetuate itself in power. In fact, it turned out that the murder weapon had been provided by international Fabian socialist networks that surrounded and protected the masonic Calles administration.

But there was one further twist in the strategy of the British gamemasters. The Obregón murder was then used by U.S. Ambassador Dwight Morrow, a banker from the British Morgan banking house, to bring about a negotiated "peaceful" settlement of the entire Cristero War. Morrow, with solid backing from an Anglo-American press campaign urging Mexico to use the Obregón crisis to enter a new era of "responsible political institutions," putting an end to the reign of dangerous and unpredictable military *caudillos* or strongmen, set about recreating Mexico's national institutions to British specifications.

The idea was to "package" all of the warring "revolutionary" factions into a single governing party, Bolshevik-style, which soon became known as the PRI. That dictatorial party would have top-down discipline, and would perpetuate itself in power through a powerful, single-term presidency, which was a way of assuring that the disputing factions wouldn't kill each other off but would stay united in the "revolutionary family."

The secret of everything, in Morrow's scheme, was that the system was based on a power structure which excluded the Catholic Church but included the current U.S. ambassador. The PRI thus became institutionalized as the party in place to govern on behalf of Anglo-American financial interests, run by a masonic, Soviet-style *nomenklatura*, while covering itself with "revolutionary" rhetoric.

The irony is that today, with the murder of Colosio, the destruction of the Mexican political system is being orchestrated by the same British gamemasters who originally created it 65 years ago. With Colosio's murder, they intend to bring about the short-term meltdown of the entire PRI-based political system, and in particular of the strong presidency. Their consideration is simple: Whatever his momentary political nature, a standing President is a sovereign, and therefore capable of being an institutional rallying point for the defense of sovereignty. Since the British gameplan is to eliminate national sovereignty altogether, the institution of the presidency must be eliminated.

If that is allowed to occur, the country will virtually instantaneously revert to the conditions of *bloody religious and civil warfare* that existed in Mexico in the late 1920s. The country will become, overnight, another Yugoslavia, on the U.S. southern border.