



Lund University  
Media and Communication Studies: Master (two years) Thesis  
HT 2012  
Department of Communication and Media  
Supervisor: Annette Hill  
Exam. Gunilla Jarlbro

# **MEDIA, DEMOCRACY, AND CHANGE**

The Case of the Mexican Election

by Feyley Gildardo Leyva Alvarez

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, thank God!

I would like to thank to my wife Maria and my children Vida and Oscar, their smiles, hugs and kisses were the energy that impulse me to end this work.

I would like to express my gratitude to Annette Hill for her patience and guidance.

Tack Christina Nilsson för din hjälp med engelskan. Gud välsignar dig!

Thank you Laurita for your help with the English and your comments.

Finalmente quisiera con este trabajo, agradecer y recordar a Carlos Fuentes, por sus letras y por su ejemplo, sus ideas y su pasión. Descanse en Paz. Lo siento “viejo”, no pudimos con tu encargo.

### ABSTRACT

Electoral campaigns have become critical moments in countries like Mexico in which democracy is in development. To observe the electoral process is important because in it further relationships between society and authorities are shaped. In electoral campaigns, the media plays an important role and in special television. However, television companies in Mexico have developed interests that struggle with democracy. The internet, often posed as an alternative to corporate media, is not used widely by the population because the lack of infrastructure and knowledge. Nevertheless, the election in Mexico in 2012 presented protests against a candidate, and a Social Movement arising in the middle of the campaign that struggled for more democratic mass media. This provides evidence of an emerging society more aware of the necessity of changes in the relationship between them and the authorities. The aim of this work is to explore the particularities of the Mexican election trying to present an explanation that allows understanding of the possible causes that originated protests and the rise of the movement Yo Soy 132, and in consequence, a possible change in the relationships between media, government, and society. The data collected for this Case Study comes from media reports; those included two newspapers, television news, and Interviews from *Televisa* as well as data from web pages of the Political Parties and from Federal Institutions. The analysis of the data was made using theories of media and democracy. The analysis found that “accessibility” and “knowledge” explained in to different approaches are important in understanding the particularities of the election in Mexico. Alternatively, the analysis found that to solve problems regarding “accessibility and “knowledge” are important challenges to Mexico to become fully democratic regarding media and democracy.

Key words; Mexico, Democracy, Electoral Campaign, Media.

## Table of contents

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.1. Justification.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. RESERACH QUESTIONS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1. Democracy and Media .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.2. Civic Cultures .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.3. Political campaigns and Media .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3.4. The Public.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3.5. Social movements.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.6. Television .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.7. The Internet.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>4. METHOD.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4.1. Delimitation of the case.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.2. Collection of Data.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.3. Limitations.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5. FINDIGS AND ANALISYS .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>5.1. The IFE.....</b>	<b>34</b>
5.1.1. The official debates.....	34
<b>5.2. The Candidates .....</b>	<b>35</b>
5.2.1. López Obrador.....	36
5.2.3. Peña Nieto.....	39
<b>5.3. The Protests against Peña Nieto.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>5.4. Social Movements in Mexico.....</b>	<b>43</b>
5.4.1. The Movement Yo Soy 132.....	44
<b>5.5. Television in the election.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>5.6. The internet in the election.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>6. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>6.1. Accessibility .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>6.2. Knowledge .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>6.3. Binding Time.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>APPENDIXES.....</b>	<b>62</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The 2012 Mexican Presidential election was historical because it represented the return of the oldest party (and prior to 2000, the *only* party to hold the presidency), the Party of the Institutional Revolution (PRI) in the presidency with an alleged alliance with *Televisa* Corporation, the largest mass media corporation in Mexico. The election presented at the middle of the campaign several protests against Peña Nieto, PRI's candidate, and against this media corporation.

The mass media attitudes in the campaign provoked the rise of a social movement called Yo Soy 132, led by students of one of the most important private universities in the country, in the middle of the campaign. The movement demanded "more democratic media". The movement argued that the mass media in Mexico managed unethically the information about the candidates. This lack of ethics in the management of information by the media was favouring to Peña Nieto, impeding that the citizens could accede trustworthy information to make a good decision in the moment to suffrage. In the highest point of their activities and still into the electoral campaign, the movement organized and screened on You Tube a debate between three of the four candidates, to open a space in which they could discuss directly with the candidates. This social movement and protests were connected with the candidate López Obrador who participated in his second electoral campaign as the candidate of the Party of Democratic Revolution (*PRD*) and as citizen candidate of a "social movement" called the Movement for the Regeneration of Mexico (*MORENA*)

The Mexican election also represented a change in the way the parties and candidates approached the mass media. A new regulation presented by the Electoral Federal Institute (*IFE*) in 2008 prohibits that politicians can buy spaces on the mass media and prohibits to media corporations to sell spaces to politicians. Nevertheless, it gives to the corporations the free choice to present or not to present the election debates on their channels. This situation led to the second larger television company *TV Azteca* to not televised the first political debate but instead screen a football match.

In this scope, the candidates tried to get access to the spaces of the mass media by participating in "interactive news making" declaring every time a "journalist revelation" was made (Corner & Pels, 2003 p. 76,78), thereby trying to increase their presence in the mass media, mainly in television. More over, the candidates used social media such as Twitter and Facebook to share ideas and political agendas therefore making the internet an alternative media that gave them the opportunity to reach their publics. The internet in the Mexican context became a news resource, and it was used by mass media to know and then publish in

their spaces the comments of politicians, movements and in general all the activities concerning with the campaigns.

### **1.1. Justification**

Democracy is one of the most important and extended concepts today. The concept has at least two dimensions; the ideal and the practice. The ideal democracy is one in which deliberation is central in to take decision. The deliberative democracy needs of structures that allow to the individuals to express their thoughts to influencing the political life of the community they belong. To make this possible, the people need that the information produced by policy and decision makers could be accessible to everybody in order to be discussed and analysed by the people. Additionally, the people also need spaces in which they can discuss directly with their authorities and between them the issues that are important for the community. In this perspective, the ideal of democracy is based in the decision-making that involves all the elements and groups that make up the society.

At a general level and in the practice, what is distinctive to all countries considered democracies are periodical elections. Mancini and Swanson (1996) mention that: “the elections are critical moments in the life of democracies” because “in both pragmatic and symbolic terms, campaigns are a microcosm that reflects and shapes a nation’s social, economic, cultural, and, of course, political life” (Mancini & Swanson, 1996, s. 1). The elections as a symbol, tells to insiders and outsiders that the country is a democratic one. The elections also represent the most important decision in which a society could be engaged; because of it, it is in the elections where the relation with the politicians that potentially could reach power is shaped.

Citizens’ participation, not matter their amount, is paramount in the legitimation of the politicians as decision makers and as authorities. About the participation of the public in election, Coleman and Ross (2010) argue that: “The public demands to be acknowledged, served, appeased, informed, consulted, and respected.” (Coleman & Ross, 2012, p. 8). Furthermore, the public represented in the media have another connotations. Coleman and Ross (2010) establish that the public can be represented as: “the roaring public”, “the measured public”, “the attentive public” and “the witnessing public” (Coleman & Ross, 2010, ss. 9,13,17,20). Thinking of elections, it is possible to argue that the public could be presented in the media supporting candidates or working against them. In those cases, the public in the mass media is presented as an active and a participating agent capable to change the tendencies of voters and with the power to change the attitudes of the candidates to affect

them in a way that they should modify their discourses to address the demand of the public. In consequence, the mediated activities of the public could affect the result of the entire election and consequently their participation in the election could shape the further relationship between politicians and population.

In electoral processes, the role of the media is paramount. However, the development of the media institutions and media corporations into the logics of the markets has started to be one of the most important threatens for any kind of democratic process. The case of Mexico is significant because historically the mass media have maintained relationship with power holders, and concerning democratic processes the work of the mass media have not resulted in positive experiences for the population. On the other hand, the mass media in the country have provided spaces for social movements, and protests creating a notion that mobilization could result in positive results, especially if the mobilization reaches the spaces of television, as was the case of The Zapatista movement in 1994.

The reason to write this paper is to present a description of the election in Mexico and analyse the actors and happenings occurring in it, into theories related with media and democracy. The case of Mexico is important to consider because democracy in the country is still in development, and there are many tensions between society, media, and politicians.

## 2. RESERACH QUESTIONS

How were Peña Nieto and López Obrador represented in the mass media in Mexico during the election campaign of 2012?

How can we understand the rise and the impact of protests in the middle of the Mexican election of 2012?

Can the called movement *Yo Soy 132* led by students and rising in the middle of the Mexican election fit with certain characteristics of a definition of a social movement?

How can we understand the role of television and the internet in Mexico during the electoral campaign of 2012?

### 3. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 3.1. Democracy and Media

The word *democracy* means, “the government of the people”. Despite this simple meaning, in its practice *democracy* goes from the act of voting to the act to protest in the streets. The ideal model of democracy is one in which the deliberation is central. Gutmann and Thompson (2004) define deliberative democracy as follow:

[...] we can define deliberative democracy as a form of government in which free and equal citizens (and their representatives), justify decisions in a process in which they give one another reasons that are mutually acceptable and in generally accessible, with the aim of reaching conclusion that are binding in the present on all citizen but open to challenge in the future (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, p.7).

The concept does implicate and recognize the existence of the governance. However, we should consider the way in which this government is elected by the people and the structures that allow this process to be also a democratic one. Situating the electoral process into the parameters given by Gutmann and Thompson (2004) this should present justification in the way it is done, most be accessible and most be considered into a period of time but at the same time it must be free to continue the discussion after the decision has been taken. Furthermore, Gutmann and Thompson (2004) explain that deliberative democracy present three characteristics the first of them is *reason-given*, about this issue they argue that: “The reasons are meant both to produce a justifiable decision and to express the value of mutual respect” (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, p.4).

In this sense, the *reason-given* is not presented as a process but as an attitude of correspondence between authorities and citizens. This means that authorities should present the reasons to the citizens considering them the important agents in words of Gutmann and Thompson (2004):

Persons should be treat not merely as objects of legislation, as passive subjects to be ruled, but as autonomous agents who take part in the governance of their

own society, directly or through their representatives (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, p.3).

The *reason-given* as an attitude should lead to a process in which the reason should be exposed and presented to the citizens. Gutmann and Thompson (2004) situate the second characteristic as the possibility to access the given reason. In more detail Gutmann and Thompson (2004) points out that: “A second characteristic of the deliberative democracy is that the reasons given in this process should be *accessible* to all the citizens to whom they are addressed” (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, p.4).

In this situation, the role of mass media and other structures that allow the politicians to present their reasons to the population, and that allow the population to discuss and show disagreement with those reasons are important for democracy in general. About this, Gutmann and Thomson (2004) argue that: “the deliberation by itself must take place in public, not merely in the privacy of one’s mind” (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, s. 4).

Another important characteristic of the *reason-given* is that it must really be reachable to the population and the way in which this is presented must consider the levels of literacy of the citizens. Gutmann and Thomson (2004) mention that: “A deliberative justification does not even get started if those to whom it is addressed cannot understand its essential content” (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, p.4). Thinking of in the election, the main reason that politicians must to present in an electoral process is why they are the best option to rule the country and in consequence, from the electoral campaign, present a frame that should establish the further relationship with the population, at least in very hypothetical level.

About the last characteristic of the deliberative democracy, Guttmann and Thomson (2004) mention that:

The third characteristic of deliberative democracy is that its process aims at producing a decision that is *binding* for some period of time.... The participants do not argue for argument’s sake; they do not argue even for truth’s sake (although the truthfulness of their arguments is a deliberative virtue because it is a necessary aim to justify decision). They intend their discussion to influence a decision the government will make, or a process that will affect how future decisions are made (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, p.5).

About this last, the decision making must have a determinate time, as in a electoral campaign, but must be open to a continues discussion. Summarizing, the terms presented by

Gutmann and Thompson (2004) define the deliberative democracy, as an attitude that should be presented in the society and that should permeate different processes. These attitudes should be presented in the processes of decision-making that each specific society, citizens and government has in its political life. In this process, the central part is the accessibility of the reasons. In this process, the mass media is important regarding its role a space of communication and connection.

The role of the media for democracy has been defined as paramount for democracy since the media spread and represent the meanings of the democracy. Thus, to understand the way a democracy is developing in a country, it is also necessary to understand how the media have developed some characteristics in particular contexts. Beyond the particularities of each country, it is possible to observe some characteristics in common.

The first one is the role of the media in the construction of meanings of democracy, and the second one is the mass media as commercial enterprises. In relation with mass as commercial enterprises, the existence of mega conglomerates and monopolies with particular interest affect the display of the messages presented in it, and in consequence affect the meanings of democracy. In the case of Mexico, the mass media are private owned. From this perspective, it is possible to argue that the messages and displays of the media in the country keep relation with their own interest larger than with the interest of the people in the country. Furthermore, regarding satellite television, two larger companies compete openly for audiences and contents those are *Televisa* and *Tv Azteca*. Flew (2007) says that:

Media organizations operate in three markets. First, there is the *markets for creative content*, or the ability to produce and/or distribute material which is sufficiently compelling to audiences, readers or users for them to exchange money and/or time for access to such content. Second, there is the *market for financial resources*, or the ability to finance their ongoing (sic) operations as well as new investments in technology distribution platforms, or territorial expansion of their operation. [and] Third, there is the *market for audiences/readers/users*, or the competition for both the expenditure of consumers and the time and attention devoted to accessing the content of the media organization (Flew, 2007, pp.8-9).

Into this perspective, the mass media immersed in the logics of the market try to present the content that could attract larger audiences thinking in the economical benefits that the

audience represent to the companies. Consequently, the contents that the media select are in the logics of figure out what the people want to watch. This also can signify that some characteristic of the democracy, such as *accessibility* is shaped into the interest of the media corporation. To start this discussion in more detail it is necessary to be aware that the simple existence of mass media does not guarantees democracy Dahlgren (2009) points out that: “The media are prerequisite – thought by no means a guarantee – for shaping the democratic character of society” (Dahlgren, 2009, p.2).

Even more, in some societies because of structural particularities and practices, the media should be considered also as a threat for democracy, especially in the actual situation the mass media is today. About this, Dahlgren (2009) in his book *Media and Political Engagement* argues that different key developments in the mass media today affect the function of mass media as bearer of political communication. The key elements presented by Dahlgren are: “*Proliferation, Concentration, Deregulation, Globalization, and Digitalization*” (Dahlgren, 2009, pp.35,39). The *key development* clearer represent in the case of the election in Mexico are: “*Concentration, Proliferation, and Deregulation*”. To start, Dahlgren (2009) argues, about *Concentration* that:

The media industries are following the general patterns found in the economy. Massive media empires have emerged on a global scale, concentrating ownership in the hands of a decreasing number of megacorporations (sic) (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 36).

In the interest of the case presented, it is not suitable to argue the global character of the companies that exist in Mexico. However, the tendency of the “concentrating ownership” applies in local contexts . Even though, the importance of the concept *Concentration* became paramount in a local context in the sense that: “Journalists employed by a large megaconglomerate (sic) will generally avoid topics that might damage its wide-ranging interests” (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 37).

The second element presented is *proliferation*. About *proliferation*, Dahlgren (2009) mentions that: “We have a whole lot more channels of communication today than we had forty or even twenty years ago” (Dahlgren, 2009, p.35). About the relationship between proliferation and democracy, Dahlgren (2009) argues that a consequence; “this abundance easily becomes disorienting” (Dahlgren, 2009, p.36). In other words, proliferation creates difficulties for the individual to manage all the information that is provided in different

channels of communication. From the perspective of accessibility, this could signify that the important information that the citizens need could be lost in the waves of the abundant information circulating in the mediated space. *Concentration* and *proliferation* could not be understood in specific social environment without the presence of regulations that allow it, in this sense the states has started to deregulate the spaces of the media to favouring the logics of the markets in the mass media. Dahlgren (2009) presents *deregulation* as:

Deregulation is the policy process whereby the various laws, rules, and codes that government use to shape media ownership, financing, and ongoing (sic) activities are withdrawn or weakened, opening up the doors to more markets mechanisms (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 37).

He points out that each time the media are less regulated and freer to act according to own interest. *Deregulations* presented in the case framed the contents of the media messages, but also allowed the media to avoid particular situation that should affect their benefits specially in connection with the possibilities to open their spaces to important contents for the decision making of the population. In brief, it is possible to argue that to reach the ideal of a deliberative democracy in a society, it depends of social, cultural, technological, and structural factors. The socio-cultural factors relate with the disposition of the people in being participants in the political life of a community. The technological-structural relates with the possibility that people could access to spaces, especially the mediated space, to find, discuss, and publish opinions regarding important issues that affect the society.

### **3.2. Civic Cultures**

Democracy is about participation. Following this idea and into the ideals of a functioning democracy, the concept of *civic culture* is paramount to understand how different elements, structures, and institutions work together promoting a stable relation between citizens with governors in a functioning democracy. According to Norris (2011): “The central message emerging from *The Civic Culture* emphasize that political stability required congruence between culture and structure” (Norris, 2011, p.59). However, in a more detailed analysis of the origins of the concept, Norris (2011) emphasises that: “Almond and Verba concluded that the United States (and to a lesser extent Britain) exemplifies their notion of a *civic cultures*” (Norris, 2011, p. 59). This takes as models two countries making the concept

an ethnocentric approach about what is a functioning democracy. About this, Dahlgren (2009) presents a more open approach and defines the concept using the terms *civic cultures*.

Dahlgren (2009) argues that:

[...] it is more accurate to speak about civic cultures-in plural- since the arguments rests on the assumption that in the late modern world there are many ways in which civic agency can be accomplished and enacted. In fact, given the many forms that political engagement may take, we should be open to considerable variation, and avoid defining the exact contours of any specific civic cultures in advance (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 104).

Furthermore, Dahlgren (2009) suggests six elements that need to be presented to guarantee a well functioning democratic. Taking as point of departure the interest of this thesis in a election, and considering the election as practice of democracy the first element considered is “practices”. About practices, Dahlgren (2009) mentions that:

To engage in practices contributes to experience, which can in turn serve to empower citizens. Not only does this solidify the specific practices as part of the civic repertory of the citizens, but the practices also interplay forcefully with knowledge, trust and values; practices involve defining, using or creating suitable spaces, and also help to foster civic identities (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 117).

Furthermore, Dahlgren (2009) mentions very briefly that: “Participating in election is usually seen as the paramount concrete practice for democratic citizens” (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 108). As is presented from the quote, the elements that interplay closer with “practices” are; “knowledge”, “trust” and “values”. It is possible to interpret that those are key in the consideration of a practice as a democratic one.

About the element “knowledge”, Dahlgren (2009) points out that:

A crucial aspect of this dimension is not just the question if citizens already have the knowledge they need, but more important, if they are able to acquire relevant knowledge, that is, if they have viable strategies for obtaining knowledge. Thus, to speak of knowledge here includes “knowledge acquisition”

– and thus this dimension is strongly related to the dimension of practices and skills (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 108).

Furthermore, Dahlgren (2009) explains that:

Some degree of literacy is important; people must be able to make sense of that which circulates in public spheres, and to understand the world they live in (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 109).

In the case this element is important because the structural characteristic of the country in presenting important levels of illiteracy and in consequence presents imbalances in the capacity to use tools to access information in special regarding the use of the internet and other new technologies. Nevertheless, other strategies must be considered, as for example the oral capacity to transmit knowledge through the talk and to share information in other places, this could not be fully observed in the case from the perspective in which this work is delimited. However, some practices presented in the case could not be understood if the element knowledge were not presented in the Mexican society. The other element presented in relation with practices is “trust”. About “trust”, Dahlgren (2009) points out that:

[...] in the democratic tradition, excessive trust is unsuitable in the sense that it can suppress conflict and sustain oppressive relations. At the same time, minimum degrees of trust in society are necessary and, assuming that they are appropriate” (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 113).

This is important to be considered in the case presented since important conflicts in Mexico have been related with lack of trust for institution, and in general the complexity of the Mexican society with different social, ethnical, and economics groups make difficult to considered “trust” as an element present in the activities in the Mexican context. However, it seems that this situation has changed in the election 2012 in Mexico. The last element connected with practices is “values”, in that case Dahlgren (2009) mention that:

We can distinguish between substantive values such as equality, liberty, justice, solidarity, and tolerance, and procedural ones, like openness, reciprocity, discussion, and responsibility/accountability. Both categories should be treated

as universal: In a democratic society, there cannot be exceptions to such values (Dahlgren, 2009, p.111).

The element “values” categorised those in substantive and procedural. Attending the practice of election, the procedural ones should be presented in it and in the people that engage in the process in different roles, such as the institution that actively participate including the media. This does not mean that the substantive values should not be present in an election, but this means that the procedural ones should be treated as key elements in the electoral process, meanwhile the substantives should be treated beyond the electoral campaign as values that should shape the general life of people living in a democratic country. Furthermore, a corollary of the political life whether the election or in other activities, is the participation of the people in it. In this case, the “engagement” of the people is important; about that Dahlgren (2009) mentions that “engagement” can be understood as:

[...] subjective states, that is, a mobilized, focused attention on some object. It is in a sense a prerequisite for participation: To “participate” in politics, presuppose some degree of engagement. For engagement to become embodied in participation and thereby give rise to civic agency there must be some connection to practical, do-able activities, where citizens can feel empowered (Dahlgren, 2009, p.80).

The definition argues that people to participate engage in micro activities and processes that later on are reflected in the participation in macro processes and activities in this case participation in electoral processes, and other activities connected with the political life in the country. As this thesis is focused, in one those macro processes, the levels, and different approaches of participation in the Mexican electoral process could be related with other processes inside the country that connected individuals that at the end were reflected in the protests and the reach of the social movement observed in the electoral process.

### **3.3. Political campaigns and Media**

Democracies have in common the participation of the people in regular election. The elections are complex process in which people participate to elect the project that a nation will

follow during a period. This process is denominated Election Campaign and according to Mancini and Swanson.

[...] election campaigns are critical periods in the lives of democracies [...] In both pragmatic and symbolic terms, campaigns are a microcosm that reflects and shapes a nation's social, economic, cultural, and, of course, political life (Mancini & Swanson, 1996, p. 1).

Referring to this, the political campaigns are not only important as the clear ritual that tells everybody that a country is a democratic one, but also is important because in the electoral process it is defined the further relationship between the government and the. Furthermore, about the political campaigns, Mancini and Swanson (1996) state that: "In thoroughly modernized campaigns, as we have noted, the voter's choice depends increasingly upon the voter's relationship with the individual candidate" (Mancini & Swanson, 1996, p. 14).

Thus, the campaigns being mainly presented on the media cause that in the election politicians became more aware of their performance, and that they created and followed strategies in order to perform in the way that they could be presented as the option the country needs. In detail, Corner (Corner & Pels, 2003) presents three modes in which the projects of political personhood are mediated. Those are: *iconically*, *vocally* and *kinetic*. About *iconically*, Corner (2003) Mention that:

Political publicity attempts to extract maximum benefits from this by means of symbolic management (as in the photo opportunity) but it also has to be wary of the kind of journalistic opportunism that threatens the off-guard politician with the wrong sort of visibility, both in terms of literal depiction and broader resonances (Corner in Corner & Pels, 2003, p. 69).

These elements situated in electoral campaign suggest that politicians take care the way they are presented in visual media. Consequently, it is possible to argue that the use of clothes and the way they are represented in relation with followers and non-followers are important as well for electoral purposes. However, the politicians produce as well speeches, those are reported in the media and those as much as the image should be carefully presented in the

mass media. Corner (2003) presents this as *vocally*, about it he argues that: “[*vocally*] have allowed and increasing informality of public address such that the significance of *what* is said becomes more interfused (sic) with *how* it is said” (Corner in Corner & Pels, 2003, p. 69). Thinking in electoral processes, *vocally* could be connected within the different ways the politicians relates their speeches to specific problems making them more “accessible” to the population by using strategies that allow to create an appreciation to closeness with sort kind of publics. *Iconically* and *vocally*, mean two different approaches to the media. The mixing of both plus the way the politician moves is paramount in the cases politicians perform to and for publics in open spaces. Corner (2003) considers that:

Third, they have introduced *kinetic* element to depiction – the political self in action and interaction (for example, the ‘high politics’ of the international conference, the ‘low politics’ of the visit to the factory) which certainly for television, requires a choreographic attention (Corner in Corner & Pels, 2003, p. 69).

All those elements are thought and planed for the performance of the politician in the mass media of communication. Related to this, the politicians access to the media in different situations and within different contexts and reasons. Corner (Corner & Pels, 2003) regarding the media function in the relation with politicians, mentions that there exist three scopes in which it is possible to observe the relation between media and the politicians; those are, “the *political publicity*, the *interactive news making*, and the *journalistic revelation*” (Corner, in Corner & Pels, 2003, pp. 76,78). In more detail, Corner (2003) says that:

First of all, there is *political publicity*, which projects politicians within the most favourable or unfavourable light depending on its party origins. Second, and shading away form this, there is the spectrum of *interactive news-making* (sic) where with different degrees of involvement, both politicians (with their aides) cooperate in the production of news and comments often for pre-selected outlets. Third, there is what might be called *journalistic revelation*, in wich in some cases without any political cooperation at all and in other with support from sectors of the political establishment at points (a classic instance being the leaked document), stories are developed that are critical of particular politicians (Corner in Corner & Pels, 2003, p. 69).

Thus, it is possible to summarize that the relationship of politicians in campaign and the mass media is complex. It is possible to say as well that the coordinators of campaign as experts create packages for the politicians in order to prepare them to different scenarios that could jeopardize their personal aspirations. The elements presented by Corner (2003) fit perfectly in the campaigns based on mass media, and it is necessary to mention that campaigns in Mexico have been traditionally connected with mass media. However, the campaign of 2012 presented as well a considerable use of the platform provided by the internet. About the use of the internet for electoral purposes, Carty (2011) argues that in the United States campaign of 2008 showed that:

Political elites are still very much part of the political campaign process as new computerised forms of communication are used to create “managed citizens”- meaning that political manager are using digital media not merely to collect public opinion, but also to create it (Carty, 2011, p. 88).

Even though, the use of the internet for electoral purposes should suppose a change in the way the politicians perform. However, the reports of Carty (2011) about the electoral campaign of 2008 in the United States seem to show that the use of the internet for electoral process and political campaigning were a part of the strategies in convoking the good opinion of the publics and create waves that benefits to a candidate, this not discarded totally the mass media. Carty (2011) describes the relationship between the internet and the mass media as “symbiotic”. In more detail, Carty (2011) argues that:

The election highlighted the symbiotic relationship between new and old media and illustrated that there may be more continuity between the tow rather than a full blown “technological revolution” that has replaced conventional forms of the mass media (Carty, 2011, p. 87).

About this, the strategies for the use of the internet for electoral purposes is connected with the presence and performance of the candidates on the mass media, but also is connected with the perception that the society has about the media that is used to perform. For example in the election in Mexico of 2012, the candidate López Obrador, paradoxically in the mass media, argued that the internet was a more democratic media than the mass media. Keeping

this in the electoral perspective resulted in that López Obrador kept more followers in the internet from the beginning of the electoral year of 2012 to the end. López Obrador alternatively mentioned constantly that the mass media was against him and against the “true change”.

### **3.4. The Public**

The public is the general people that have and special interest. Framed in the case, the public is the group of people interested in political participation but also is the group of people that follow a specific candidate. Coleman and Ross (2010) argues about the public that:

The public demands to be acknowledged, served, appeased, informed, consulted, and respected. While not wielding power itself, the public knows that those who do possess power can only claim legitimacy by speaking in its name and acting in its interest (Coleman & Ross, 2012, p. 8).

Despite this, the public need other elements to influence directly in the political life of the community. One of those elements is the media. The media represent the public in different ways and in different positions. In this perspective, the public has a vulnerable position divided in two characterises, its mobility and its necessity to be present and represented. In more detail, Coleman and Ross (2010) points out that: “the public is unable to represent itself. It is doomed to be represented” (Coleman & Ross, 2012, p. 9).

Thus, in this perspective, the representation of a somewhat public supporting a candidate or working against him, or even though only being mentioned by the media as the real public, this is observing the happenings of the campaigns. This observing public became the real protagonist because it is in action, the act of voting, that the election is solved. From this perspective, it is possible to argue that the public into an electoral process is a social actor. As social actor, Coleman and Ross (2010) argue that the public could be imagined as “the roaring public, the measured public, the attentive public, and the witnessing public” (Coleman & Ross, 2012, pp. 9,13,17,20). In the interest of this thesis, to explore the characteristics of the roaring public, the attentive public and the witnessing public are important to understand the presence of them in some reports in the mass media.

In relation to how those publics are imagined and present in the Mass media Coleman and Ross (2010) about the roaring public say that: “More than any previous medium,

television enables to see itself” (Coleman & Ross, 2012, p. 12). Thus, it is possible to argue that television has the capacity to delimit the kind of public a program or event is targeting. This became intense and complicated since television, as is discussed in the chapter Democracy and Media in this thesis regarding the key development of the mass media of communication, can represent the public into frames that benefits the companies. About the attentive public, Coleman and Ross (2010) mention that:

Thinking of the public as a product of social circulation is helpful in countering notions of the public as a pre-existing entity waiting to be discovered. It enables us to think of the public as a mediated presence which emerges, atrophies, and reforms in response to a diverse array of messages directed towards it (Coleman & Ross, 2012, p. 18,19).

However, this public presented in the mass media is seen by other public. In a simple explanation, those that watch television are public that observe how the persons present on the screen are just like them or with some characteristics similar to them. About “the witnessing public” Coleman and Ross (2010) mention that:

To give witness, in the sense of translating the sensation of direct observation into words or images that can be shared by others who then become vicariously complicit in an indirect experience, is what makes humans historically conscious animals (Coleman & Ross, 2012, p. 20).

Connecting the Mexican Election, it is necessary to consider that one part of the public was constructed inside the aspiration of the mass media, other part was constructed according with the aspiration of the candidates, and finally the self public that witness their presence as engaged individuals searching to be a part of the electoral process.

### **3.5. Social movements**

Because their practices and organization, social movements are connected with notions of deliberative democracy and civic engagement and it can be seen as a product of civic culture and as a key element in the transformation of practices of a whole society. Goodwin and James (2009) define a social movement as “a collective, organized, sustained, and no

institutional (sic) challenge to authorities, power holders, or cultural belief and practices” (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, p. 4).

One of the first interesting issues to solve in the making of this thesis was to know theoretically if a group originated in the middle of a campaign could be claim to be a social movement. About this first point Goodwin and Jasper (2009) point out, that: “mobilization keep a important relation with changes in societies, and the triggers are as different as the opportunities political institution, laws and cultures allow the mobilization” (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, p. 14). Thus, the movements should be conceived as opportunistic agent that take advantage of specific historical moments, this, at least in this level situated the possibility to defined the Yo Soy 132 group as a movement.

Furthermore, there are other characteristics taken by Goodwin and Jasper (2009) in the understanding about what is a social movement. One of them is to understand how the people engage in them. Goodwin and Jasper (2009) argue that three factors are important to understand the people that join social movements. Those are “biographical availability”, “ideological compatibility”, and “social network ties” (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, p. 56).

The two first factors are important in understanding the case in Mexico. They refer that people are involved in social movements when the movements are related closely with life experiences and beliefs. The last factor is crucial because it refers to identity and the movement presented in Mexico was defined explicitly as a student movement. In this sense the identity of being a student was a factor not only in the join of other students from different universities to the movement but also in the main characteristic of it.

Regarding the practices used by social movements, those are defined by the historical situation in which the movements emerge. However, there exist common strategies they used to reach their goals. Those are “persuasion, intimidation and undermine the credibility of the opponent whit the public, media and state” (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, p. 149).

The legality of their actions are connected with the openness of the media and the state in the context they develop their activities. The relation of social movements with the state is shaped by opportunity. This means that some states have regulation or instead presents infrastructures that make possible for their citizens engage in issues that affect them. Thus, practices as the protest on the streets under the rights of manifestation allow and present opportunities for social movement to impact in the society they want to change, but also stipulate limits in the legally of their practices that could not be in coherence with the situation they want to change. About this, Goodwin and Jasper (2009) points out that:

If nothing else, the state lays down the rules of the games in which protestors maneuver (sic), and if they choose to break those rules they are likely to encounter punitive action from the police or armed forces (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, p. 313).

Another important detail is that the social movement in Mexico was presented almost immediately provoked by the action of the mass media. About the relation mass media – social movements, Goodwin and Jasper (2009) remarks that:

[...] in the relation of social movement with mass media, the social movements struggle with problems like the creation of spokespersons whose powers comes from their ability to attract the media coverage further distorts a movement's messages (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, p. 315).

The social movements struggle as well with choosing the performance and the strategies that they should take in order to take the attention of the mass media and traditionally the movement has been represented into different frames. Gitlin (2009) presents a list of those frames. Gitlin (2009) enlists six but because the characteristic of the movement presented in the case the one considered for this thesis is *Trivialization*. According to Gitlin (2009) is about “making light of movement language, dress, age, style and goals” (In Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, p. 333). In Televisa, the movement was presented as a movement of well-educated university students. Consequently, its presence in the company did not signify the same grade of threat of other movements in the country.

The relationship between mass media and social movements has been seen as complicated. However, the social movements, within the rise of the internet and its possibilities, have used the platforms provided by this media to reach publics and in a sense, to avoid the disadvantages that signified to handle with the mass media. However, the use of mass media strategically is not completely avoided in successful examples. About this, Castells (1999) reports the case of the *Zapatista* Movement in Chiapas, Mexico. Castells (1999) reports the *Zapatistas* use of media and according to him: “They created a media event in order to diffuse their message, while desperately trying not to be brought into a bloody war”(Castells, 1999, p. 79). In this, the presence of the *Zapatistas* in the mass media was provided by the presence of a spoke persons in the mass media in Mexico about this Castells (1999) mention that:

The *Zapatistas'* ability to communicate with the world and with Mexican society, and to capture the imagination of the people and of intellectuals propelled a local, weak insurgent group to the forefront of world politics. In this sense Marcos was essential[...] But he was extraordinarily able in establishing a communication bridge with the media, through his well-constructed writings and by his *mise-en-scene* (Castells, 1999, p. 79).

Furthermore, the use of the internet was paramount in the presence, the appreciation, and the security of the movement. The strategy in the use of the internet by the *Zapatistas* was important for the movement to create networks at global level. About the use of the internet by the *Zapatistas* Castells (1999) argues that:

Extensive use of the internet allowed the *Zapatistas* to diffuse information and their call throughout the world instantly, and create a network of support groups which helped to procure an international public opinion movement that made it literally impossible for the Mexican government to use repression on a large scale (Castells, 1999, p. 80).

The case of the *Zapatistas*, in the Mexican context, analysed by Castells (1999), and Coleman, and Ross (2010, p.108) remark the importance of the media for social movement in Latino America. I would add that is paramount particularly reach Television, this is important not only because the capacity of the mass media to reach important amount of population, but also because the dramatic impact that is produced by the images screened on it.

### **3.6. Television**

Television needs to be understood on two levels. The first level is the material one, in which television is a device, a visible technology, a corporative building, and an industry. The second level is regarding the messages produced by television and the impact they have in the society in the cultural, social, political, and economic life. Regarding the case in which this study is conducted, the television in Mexico as part of the Latin America region presents some special characteristics to take in consideration at the time to present it and in relation with the impact it has in the political life of the country. Silvio Waisbord (1998) reports that

television in Latin America since the 1970's has presented: "The consolidation of the Business Model" (Waisbord, 1999, p. 257). This means that private owners take the control of the television channels and have displaced the few channels devoted to the public service. Even though, Waisbord (1998) reports in the decade of the 1990 that:

During the last decades, the television industry has been one of the few industries that boomed amid economic crisis and growing social inequalities (Waisbord, 1999, p. 254).

The tendency presented by Waisbord (1998) does not present any change during the last decade of the 2000. In relation with Mexico, Waisbord (1998) describes the reasons that make Televisa and Globo from Brazil monopolies in their respective country, one of the reasons that Waisbord (1998) attaches and that is interesting for this thesis in a historical perspective is that: "alliances with authoritarian governments were fundamental for the dynamic expansion of both companies" (Waisbord, 1999, p. 259). This situated the case of the Mexican Televisa in the period in which the PRI was the party in power. In this direction, Waisbord (1998) reports that: "Televisa's partner categorically declared support for the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI)" (Waisbord, 1999, p. 259). It is necessary to point out that Televisa is not longer the only one television corporation in Mexico, the second one is *TV Azteca*. About the origin of this television company Waisbord (1998) points out that:

Television Azteca network has been at the centre of charges that involve the brother of then-president Carlos Salinas de Gortari, who, allegedly, secured a loan drawn from drug-laundered funds for the Salinas Pliego group to bid successfully for the licence (Waisbord, 1999, p. 259).

With the historical perspective of the reports of Waisbord (1998), it is possible to say that the Television in Mexico from 1998 has an undemocratic characteristic. Regarding the relation of Television with democracy Corner (1995) argues that:

Later critics, however, have often judge what they have seen as the anti-democratic character of television communication to be, in good part, the result of strategic *intentions*. 'Television' as an institutional and formal practice has, in this view, to be placed firmly in relation to two spheres of self-consciously

exercised power. First of all, the sphere of control exercised by national governments in their attempt to manage public opinion and sustain legitimacy. Secondly, the sphere of control exercised by corporate, private interest, in their quest to maximise and naturalise their own power and profitability and to marginalised threats to their continued operations (Corner, 1995, p.41).

In relation of the case the first one seems be defined in two different directions. The first one is of the television corporations being each time more unregulated, as I discuss in the chapter Democracy and Media in the Literature Review. About the second, this not only refers to companies in relation to governmental powers but could be related as well with other forces and situations that threatens the operations of television corporations, as for example, in the case, the protest against the corporate buildings or the reports about people claiming that Televisa does not do its work correctly. In the situation presented in the case, it is also necessary to present the factors that could help to understand deeper to television as undemocratic force. Corner (1995) presents three. About the first one, Corner (1995) mentions that: “Television has become, among other things a sphere of intensive and sophisticated *knowledge management*” (Corner, 1995, p.43). This has stopped democracy in the sense that:

As the primary system of public communication in most modern societies, television (particularly at networks or national channel level) thus becomes prone to imbalances in its sourcing, its accessing of individuals and in the socio-political character of the definitions and conventions within which its policy is framed and its outputs produced (Corner, 1995, pp. 43,44).

Related to the case, this point is connected with the kind of people that is presented on television, and the sources the television channels have in order to present interpretation of specific situations. In the electoral campaign in Mexico of 2012, this was observed in the spaces opened to campaigns coordinators, but also in the spaces opened to professionals and experts that gave opinions about the success of the campaigns, and to a movement originated in a private university. Furthermore, the next element presented by Corner (1995) emphasizes the dramatic character of television in the presentation of the experts and political actors. Corner (1995) mentions that:

Television has turned the sphere of politics into one which is dominated by *strategic personalization*. Increasingly, political issues and choices are projected within a theatricalised framework which emphasises the personality and personal qualities of key political actors (Corner, 1995, p.44).

Finally Corner (1995) mentions that:

Television represents the world through visual and aural conventions which work to invoke *realist credibility* rather than critical engagement (Corner, 1995, p.44).

This last point is connected with the ways television screens reality, immersing this point in the logics of the competition for markets, this could be understood in the sense that television claims to present the reality by using conventional ways in order to legitimised its work as what the things screened are the things that really happens. The elements presented by Waisbord (1998) and by Corner (1995), stipulate directly that a concrete threat for the democracy lies in the relation between the way the companies reach their benefits from its relationship with government and in general with structures of power and the strategies the companies use to maintain those privileges and positions.

### **3.7. The Internet**

Likewise Television, the internet needs to be considered into different levels and like television, its understanding needs to be contextualized. About this, Curran, Fenton, and Freedman conclude that: “Like all previous technologies, its use, control, ownership, past development and future potential are context dependent” (Curran , Fenton , & Freedman, 2012, s. 181). Additionally, it is argue that the internet has produced alternative cultures. However, those cultures are not distant from the constructions we knew. About this Nayar (2010) argues that: “Cybercultures (sic) are at various points, and in different ways, attached to and connected with real-life material condition and they replicate, extend, and augment them” (Nayar, 2010, p. 3). Thus, the internet into these perspectives is used, consumed, and reached by people in relation with infrastructure, technical accessibility, knowledge, and intention embodied in a particular cultural framework. Thus, the use of the internet reflects the particular life of a country. In this, social, economics and political issues are important to

consider in the way the use of the internet could affect the political life of people inside different circumstances and in different countries. Connecting the use of the internet with democracy, Curran, Fenton, and Freedman mention that: “the internet came to reflect the inequalities, linguistic division, conflicting values and interests of the real world” (Curran , Fenton , & Freedman, 2012, s. 179). In relation with the Study Case presented, the situation of Mexico as a country in development presupposes that the use of the internet and the culture produced by this is shaped in specific characteristics. In a study presented by Gordon and Sorensen (2009), they present the cases of Jamaica and Chile. In those cases, Gordon and Sorensen (2009) evidence the importance of the infrastructure and the intention in the use of the internet in developing countries. They conclude in those cases that:

It was not unexpected for us to find little political activism associated with Internet use by the educated urban elite in Jamaica. Chile enjoyed a relatively free press until 1973 but was highly censored during the 1973-1990 military dictatorship. Since its return to democracy in 1990, the country has struggled to revive a robust for political press. The Internet has therefore offered Chileans a critical tool for political engagement, especially during periods of recent oppressive governance (Gordon & Sorensen, 2012, p. 286).

This situated the internet as a media in which socio-cultural and political factors affects the use of it by the people. In the case of Mexico, it has previously been presented the use of internet by social movements in the reference of the case of the *Zapatistas* and the democratic possibility of the tool. However, in the *Zapatista* case, the internet is presented as tool used by the movement to reach global publics. Consequently, it is necessary to considered structural factors in the use of the internet inside the country. About this, the INEGI (National Institute of Geography and Information) reports that only 22 per cent of the population in Mexico has the possibility to use the internet in their home and regarding accessibility, 33 per cent of the population is able to use the service of internet (INEGI on line 2010).

In a more recent study realised by the *Tecnológico de Monterrey* into the project World Internet Project (Tecnológico de Monterrey, 2012), it is reported that the main uses of the internet by the Mexican society are, to access to platforms to read e-mails, and to access to social platforms such as Facebook and Twitter. In relation with political uses of the internet, the reports show that from 2009 to 2012 the Mexican society considered internet as a political tool. Furthermore, the study shows that the main reason expressed by 45 per cent of the

Mexican because of not use the internet was that they do not know how to use it. In this perspective, the use of the internet by people in Mexico is shaped by the lack of knowledge about how to access the media and by the lack of accessibility of the Media to the whole population.

Into the scopes of political electoral campaign and the use of the internet in connection to this, an important reference is the work of Carty (2011) about the electoral campaign of 2008 in the United States. In the study, Carty (2011) concludes that:

To conclude, although the stated qualities of “openness”, “transparency”, and “participation” of the Obama campaign seem to merge well with the Internet, the integration of mobilization and recruitment efforts by professional management was accomplished through a system of coordinate and monitored by the Obama team. It perfected ways of taking advantage of commercial sites such as Facebook, MySpace, and You Tube that served as mediums for marketing, communications, and fundraising, specially among younger citizens (Carty, 2011, p. 89).

This reference could not totally be appreciated in the way that this investigation was constructed in relation with the use of the internet in Mexico during the electoral campaigns. However, the references that Carty (2011) makes about the appreciation of the internet as an open space with much more democratic characteristics that other media was observed in the Mexican campaign in to the speeches of the candidate López Obrador. During the campaign, López Obrador tried to create and environment that confronted the values represented by mass media against the values represented by the internet. The speeches performed by López Obrador confronted the truth displayed on the mass media with the truth that the citizens could share on the internet, giving more value to the truth presented in the internet than the truth presented in the mass media of communication.

Summarizing, the internet in specific societies, like other media, cannot be seen as a promoter of changes, but only as a tool that is used in to specific intentions in to pre determined cultural contexts.

#### 4. METHOD

The Mexican electoral campaign was complex and to understand its complexity it was necessary to use a method that brings up and then explains the main events in it. During the research it were read the reports of two newspapers with different editorial position and it were watched news reports from Televisa Corporation such as the debates produced by the IFE and the debate produced by the movement *Yo Soy 132*. Besides, it was collected data from the Political Parties, and Federal Institutions.

Considering the aim of the investigation the whole was conceived inside the tradition of the Case Study Method in a qualitative perspective. Gomm and Hammersley (2009) point out about the Case Study Method that: “Frequently, but not always, it implies the collection of unstructured data, and qualitative analysis of those data” (Gomm, Hammersley, & Foster, 2009, p. 3). Alternatively, George and Bennett (2005) explain that in a complex case with multiple interactions, the “process-tracing” as part of the Case Study Method is suitable to present the complications of the case. In more detail George and Bennett (2005) say that: “The simplest variety of process-tracing takes the form of a detailed narrative or history presented in the form of a chronicle that purports to throw light on how an event came out” (George & Bennett, 2005, p. 210).

In this thesis, this took part in form of a time line (appendix 3), in which was possible to observe the more significant event in the electoral campaign of 2012 in Mexico. Furthermore, George and Bennett (2005) stipulate that: “The explanation may be deliberately selective, focusing on what are thought to be particularly important parts of an adequate or parsimonious explanation” (George & Bennett, 2005, p. 211). A consideration in this second step is that the findings and analysis in this thesis are based primarily, but not exclusively, on media reports from articles published two newspapers in the two months before the election, as well as, television news reports on Televisa.

Johnson-Cartee (2005) quoting to MacNair, mentions that: the aim of the news report is “to inform us about what is happening of importance and, of course, is in some sense *new* in the world around us” (Johnson-Cartee, 2005, p.159). Thus, the following news was important to know the issues that were considered new in the election, in this particular case the appearance of protest against a candidate, the appearance of a social movement and the role of television corporation in Mexico. Additionally, this analysis is based on the observation of interviews to the candidates and the movement *Yo Soy 132* to know their opinions about issues and happenings that were occurring in the campaign. Interviews serve the purpose, according to Johnson-Cartee (2005) quoting Mac Nair, identifies that: “the interview, probing

the views and policies of those the news, special politicians and celebrities” (Johnson-Cartee, 2005, p.160).

The last important aspect of the Case Study method is the connection of the findings with theories that help to explain the case. Regarding the theories used to explain the data, it were considered approaches that present analytical and thematic frames that could be connected with issues observed in the data and that could explain the phenomenon in a congruent way. In detail, issues of “Media”, “Candidates”, “Civic Cultures”, “Social Movements”, and “Deliberative Democracy” were considered in the explanation of the findings inside the case.

#### **4.1. Delimitation of the case**

In the particular case presented, the process involved a larger number of actors. Thus, it was considered suitable to delimit the number of them. This decision was made considering the historical trace of the process of similar events and what was new in the Mexican election of 2012. From this perspective, elements that structure a usual election in Mexico are the IFE, the candidates, the media, and the public. There were four candidates in the Mexican Presidential election of 2012. However, in the collection were considered only the two candidates that were the most probable winners of the presidency when the ballots occurred; those were the candidates Enrique Peña Nieto and Andrés Manuel López Obrador. The media, and in special Televisa Corporation, is considered because of it was presented in the reports as an active actor that affected the electoral process. Finally, It is considered as well as actor the movement *Yo Soy 132* and the protest that rose at the middle of the campaign, those were also considered because represented new phenomena in the electoral campaigns in Mexico.

#### **4.2. Collection of Data**

The data was collected from the webpages on the internet. The data about the structural particularities of the election in Mexico was acceded from the official web pages of the Mexican federal government, such as Federal Electoral Institute (IFE); the National Institute of Geography, Statistic, and Information (INEGI) an other similar institutions. From the IFE, it was analysed the two debates organized by the institution and the propaganda that was allowed to be presented in the mass media (Appendix 4). Other important resources of information were the web pages of the political parties of the candidates. Those were the

Party of the Institutional Revolution (PRI) and the Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD). The collection of data from those resources helped to establish the contextual particularities in which the election occurred. Regarding data from the mass media, these were collected from the electronics archives of the newspaper selected and from what were shared by Televisa in its web page and on You Tube.

The newspapers' criteria of selection considered that they should have a historical archive of printed material accessible in their pages on the internet. The second consideration was that they should have national coverage, in Mexico. The last one consideration was that they should correspond to two different political editorial positions. The newspapers selected were *El Universal* and *La Jornada*. These newspapers share in electronic archives their impress edition, which allowed to control, and to access the information that was published outside of the internet. Other reasons to use these newspapers were that; first, they are two of the most published and cited mass media by other mass media in Mexico. Second, *El Universal* is recognized as right wing and *La Jornada* is recognized as left wing. Finally, both try to present the view of the other side beyond their different political editorial position. The collection of data from these newspapers covers the two months day by day, before the datum of the ballots. (Appendix 1 and 2)

Alternatively, Televisa was a data provider but in particular, news programs and the program called *Tercer Grado*. This last one was important to be able to understand what issues were commented in the mass media in general. In this television program, the editorialists of other mass media comment on the news and issues that are largely discussed within the period of a week. Referring to the case, this television program allowed me to corroborate and assure that the issues discussed in *La Jornada* and *El Universal* were issues largely discussed in other mass medias too. Another reason to watch this program was that the candidates were invited to the program and the editorialists asked them about their opinions of the relevant issues that were presented in the mass media in relation with their campaigns. In this sense, the use of this program was pertinent in to know the impressions of the candidates about the issues presented during the middle of the campaign that included the protest and the presumptive relationship between Peña Nieto and Televisa. About the programs and news on television, those were accessed from the electronic archives of Televisa Corporation, such as the electronic resources shared on the internet mainly on You Tube.

In relation with the movement rising in the middle of the campaigning, the information was accessed mainly from the news paper *La Jornada* and *El Universal*, In addition, the debate organised by the movement was accessed from the platform on You Tube.

Summarizing, the method used in this thesis can be summarized in four steps. The first was the recollection of the data about the Mexican electoral election from newspapers and news programs. During the recollection of data, the reading of the news about the event brings up situations that were “new” considering earlier election in Mexico, this were the role of the IFE and the regulation, the protests and the rising of a movement. The second step was the organization of the data according to the news issues and in relation with the central event, the election. In this the recollection of alternative data such as interview with the candidates that were protagonist and with the students that lead the movement and the reports about the reasons of the protest were important to found the thematic issues that were discussed by the actors during the electoral campaign. The third step comprehended the collection of data to contextualize the findings in this the data from Federal Institutions such as the watching of the debates helped to understand the issues that were new in the election of 2012. The last step was the explanation of the findings with theories that could explain the issues and that situated them in specific thematic areas.

#### **4.3. Limitations**

One limitation that I consider important to point out was the necessity to observe the case inside the limits of the internet. This investigation was not about internet at all, but was constructed from the data shared by the news papers on their respective websites. This presented as important issue to solve; the excessive information that those newspapers had about the election and campaigns on their pages on the internet. The exaggerate information shared on the web provoked the necessity to do a work of depuration controlling twice the information collected to be sure that it was inside the consideration in which this case is constructed. Despite this limitation, the internet as a tool for research seems suitable to make investigation about issues in which the researcher cannot be physically in the place where the event has its origin, since the data collected could be evaluated as a good qualitative data in the scopes of an investigation of this characteristic.

Another important limitation of the method and in order to present the data is the incongruence between the language of the data and the language of the last report. The newspapers and most of the data collected including the quotes about the candidates, the movement Yo Soy 132, and the reports from the newspaper were scoped in the political use

of the Spanish language. This made difficult to translate important key elements used in the analysis. This was solved checking the meaning of the words the actors were using and the possible meaning of the word in English, but also checking the context in which the words were used. This make that the words were not translate literally but in referencing with the original within the context it was used. In the Findings and Analysis is only quoted the translation in English because matters of space.

## 5. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

### 5.1. The IFE

The Mexican Political Party system is based on periodical election. The president is deposed each sixth year. The Federal Electoral Institute (IFE) is the organization responsible to organize the electoral process. In 2012, a new regulation about the content and use of the mass media for political purposes was applied and controlled by the IFE. The regulation explicitly prohibits to the parties, and organizations adhere to them to buy time to present political propaganda in the mass media. The regulation also prohibits to mass media corporations to sell spaces and publicity to political parties, candidates and organizations adhere to them. Finally, it prohibits to present comments and propaganda that benefit of prejudice a candidate by making remarks about personal issues. The aim of this regulation according to Valdes Zurita (2008, on line) is: “to promote equilibrate political campaigns, based on proposals and in benefiting of the public debate of ideas”. One important aspect of the regulation is that it does not obligate to mass media corporations to make efforts beyond the requirements of the IFE, those requirements do not include the obligation to present the official debates produced by the IFE in its channels.

#### 5.1.1. The official debates

About the use of the media for electoral purposes, the IFE organizes the official debates and the number of them can vary depending on previous agreements with the politics parties. At the Mexican election of 2012, two official debates for media in general were organized. This meant that the format of the debates were suitable for to be presented in only audio, or in audio-visual media. In the observation of the debates for audio-visual media, it was possible to perceive that the recurrent shot presented in them was the so called medium shot. According to Lury (2005), the medium shot is about: “picturing people and is more interested in looking at them than looking at the images as an image for the ‘art’s sake’” (Lury, 2005, p. 30).

Furthermore, the time to talk was also limited provoking that the candidates should prefer to present proposition rather than to debate with each other. In the reports of the media, it was possible to read that the population considered the debates as boring to see (La Jornada, 2012; El Universal, 2012) and part of the discussion about the second debate was the possibility to change the format in order to make the second debate more “attractive”. The second debate did not change the format.

Despite the recurrent report about the debates being boring for television, both debates reached considerable levels of rating, even though, the second debate was the second most viewed debate in the history of the country (12/06/2012, El Universal; 12/06/2012, La Jornada).

## 5.2. The Candidates

In Mexico, there are seven political parties (IFE 2012). Despite this diversity, three parties are constantly presented as real contenders to win the presidency or the majorities in the cameras. The other four parties usually contend in alliances with the three larger parties in the country. Those are the Party [of the] National Action (PAN), the PRI and PRD. In the election 2012, the campaign for the presidency presented only two candidates with serious possibilities to win. Those were Peña Nieto from PRI and López Obrador from PRD.

According to Mancini and Swanson (1996), the campaigns keep focus on the person more than in the ideology of the candidate's party. Even though, the party keep an important relation in the way the candidate perform and in the historical relationship between the candidate and the voters. In relation to the personalization of the campaigns, Corner (in Corner & Pels, 2003, p.68) suggests that *styling* is important in the political performance. *Styling* is about the appearance that the politician adopts in his/her public performance. The analysis of the *styling* of the candidates is paramount in understanding how the other actors, the movement, the television corporations, and the internet kept relation within the strategies of each candidate. *Styling* is also important in the understanding about how the politicians performed in the media. Corner (in Corner & Pels, 2003, p. 69) divides *styling* in three elements those are, *iconically*, *vocally* and *kinetic*. The element *iconically*, is about the representation of the candidates regarding the picture, the image they want to represent in any opportunity they have to be present in visual media. Regarding the element *vocally*, this is about how the politicians perform speeches. The analysis of the element *vocally* was quite difficult to make, since the candidates used different *vocally* strategies in each space they made a performance. However, the core of their speeches was easy to follow since it was summarized in their slogans.

The last element is *kinetic* defined as the way the politicians behave in front of people meeting them, especially another politicians. This element was present in the debates that were observed under this investigation and in the interviews in the program *Tercer Grado*.

Furthermore, Corner (2003) presents three momentums in which the candidates could accede or are able to be presented in the mass media. Those are: *the political publicity*, the

*interactive news making*, and the *journalistic revelation* (Corner in Corner & Pels, 2003, pp. 76,78). About *the political publicity*, the regulation makes that in the election 2012 the IFE limited the number of spots each candidate could have on the mass media, but allowed the candidates to accede the media by presenting themselves in different kind of interview-programs. About *Journalistic revelation*, Corner (2003) defines *Journalistic revelation* as the “involuntary participation of politician in the making news” (Corner in Corner & Pels, 2003, p. 77). In this, both candidates were presented in cases of corruption

Finally, the candidates were presented in the media in to *interactive news making*. According to Corner (2003), the politicians produce *interactive news making* by presenting themselves in events that were attractive to the media and that could signify good levels of audience. *Interactive news making* is also produced when the politicians make comments about a significant situation in the political life of a country (Corner in Corner & Pels, 2003, p. 77). Concerning this, the candidates never lost any opportunity to make comments about negative situations in which the other candidates were involve during the campaigns. This analysis starts with López Obrador who have larger political carrier than Peña Nieto.

### **5.2.1. López Obrador**

The main organization behind López Obrador in the Mexican Election of 2012 was the PRD’s party. Dissidents of the PRI formed this party in the decade of the 1980-1990. This group of dissidents presented themselves as left-wing politicians that did not agree with the developed of the PRI and in consequence, they were against the “new elite” of the PRI “formed by technocrats that favoured the imposition of politics that came from the exterior and that were not coherent with the Mexican reality ” (PRD, 2012). The PRD participated in his first election in 1988 and lost that election. At that time, the party argued that the election was fraudulent. The main argument against the results of that election was that the computer system that should count the votes malfunctioned when the PRD’s candidate started to take advantage. In the election of 2006, the party lost the election by less than two points. In that election, the party and its moral leader and candidate López Obrador argued that the election was fraudulent, and convoked a manifestation for the defence of the vote.

About the *iconically* element, López Obrador was exposed into civil movements connected with “social justice”, “the defence of democracy”, and in relation with heroes in the history of the country. On several occasions, he was presented in media with images of national heroes as background (MORENA, 2013). He was also exposed as a reflexive man

that ask for forgiveness if he could injury to someone in his struggle for democracy, this in reference of the protests he led in 2006 (Spots, 05/2012).

About the element *vocally*, Lopez Obrador presented two main slogans during his campaign. The first one was the “lovely republic” and the second one was “conscious people could save the people”. The first one was always connected with the values necessary to “regenerate the country” (Lopez Obrador, 2012). The second one addressed the participation of the “conscious people” to actively participate in the changes the country need. The slogans were complemented with his performances in which he presented himself as the promoter of a true change in the country working not only for reach the power for “the power sake”, but in relation with the people demanding it. He, about himself, argued constantly that he was “the proper leader to take the efforts of the conscious Mexican” to a “happy end”, mainly not because he has set himself in that position but because others had told the same thing (06/06/2012;Tercer Grado; 05/2012, 06/2012, El Universal). In relation to his self-image, he constantly argued that this perception was not general because the mass media were controlled by “very few” and those few “controlled as well the country” and they were against the “true change”. (IFE debates, 2012, 06/06/2012,Tercer Grado, 05/2012; 06/2012, El universal & La Jornada, Yo soy 132 Debate 19/06/2012)

In relation with the *kinetic* element, López Obrador was always presented as very tranquil and peaceful person, shaking hands and smiling to everybody, even to their opponents, all inside the notion of the “lovely republic”. The only voice variations and dramatic body movement came when the arguments against him were presented in form of personal accusations, without a clear evidence against him, and when he was connected with cases of corruption.

One of the most interesting events during the campaign was his interview with different journalists in the program Tercer Grado (06/06/2012) where it was possible to see him in different situations and his perform on different levels. The program could be divided in to four parts; the first was the discussion of his declarations against Televisa corporations. The second was the probable connection of him with a dinner in which entrepreneurs were asked for money. This is connected with politicians having presence on the media when a *Journalistic revelation* was done. About this, previously to the program Tercer Grado, El Universal (30/05/2012) had revealed that: people working in the electoral campaign team of López Obrador had asked for six million dollars to entrepreneurs. The money would be used to help to López Obrador to win the presidency. In change, the entrepreneurs would have an opportunity to talk with López Obrador when he would win the presidency. One of the

entrepreneurs invited to the meeting recorded the event and leaked it to the media. This incident was discussed in the program with the candidate. The third issue discussed, it was about his connection with a corrupt politician that was active in the PRD's electoral campaign team, and the last one was his opinion about issues as the right to marry for persons of the same sex.

In the first moment, in a graphic, the host showed to him and to the audience the time the corporation had given to him since the time he was the chief of the government in Mexico City and during the rise of the "movement MORENA" leading by him. López Obrador answered that according to the information he had the situation was quite different and that he should share the documents with the corporation later.

In a second moment, the journalist Adela Micha (Tercer Grado, 06/06/2012) asked him to comment about the audio recorder in which people connected with his electoral campaign team asked for money to entrepreneurs. He answered that he had nothing to do with the incident and that actually in the audio record it was not possible to listen that the recollection was ordered by him. Additionally, he mentioned that he was conscious that the audio got a lot of publicity, because the mass media, specially Televisa, and the newspapers Milenium and El Universal were against him (López Obrador in Tercer Grado, 06/06/2012).

The third situation was when the journalist Loret de Mola (Tercer Grado, 06/06/2012), asked about his the relation with a corrupt politician without presenting any documents. López Obrador reacted with a rush and strong "That is a calumny" (López Obrador in Tercer Grado, 06/06/2012). A similar situation was presented during the first debate in which Peña Nieto accused López Obrador having expended millions of pesos in television propaganda during his time as mayor of Mexico City. That comment made that López Obrador moved uncomfortable and lost his tongue by later replied "It doesn't true" (IFE primer debate; 06/05/2012). Few day later López Obrador commented in *La Jornada* (11/05/2012) "I quite if Peña probe that I expended 800 millions of pesos in publicity". (López Obrador in *La Jornada* 11/05/2012)

In the last momentum of the program, he was questioned about if he should support and promote the possibility that couples of the same sex could get married. About that, he mentioned that "important issues like this should be consulted with the population and the majorities should decide" (López Obrador in Tercer Grado, 06/06/2012). Along the interview, he told that some values were important in his life like "honesty" and that he continued as politician because of the compromises he had with the people that believed in him remarking that he was an "apostle of democracy" (López Obrador in Tercer Grado, 06/06/2012).

About the *interactive news* making, López Obrador made declarations that were very important and that helped him in becoming the second contender with possibilities to win the presidency. The first event in which he made important declarations was in the first debate. During that period, López Obrador constantly declared that the mass media were against him and that it was the reason because of Televisa would not open its main channel to the debate and Tv Azteca would not present the debate. The second event was during the rising of the protests. In this, he made declarations in which he situated himself as a part of the protests and in a sense as the leader of them.

### 5.2.3. Peña Nieto

Peña Nieto was the candidate of the PRI. This party won each election from the first post revolutionary election in 1929 until the election of 2000 where the opposition party PAN won the presidency. With this event, intellectuals in the country claimed that the country had definitively reached democracy, understanding democracy by the alternating of the party in the presidency.

In the historical-political-cultural life of the country, one of the most mentioned persons with negative connotations is the ex-president Salinas de Gortari, from PRI. He is remembered because during his period as president he signed the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) that provoked one of the largest crises in the Mexican economy, and because during his time as president the Zapatista Movement appeared in the State of Chiapas.

About the element *iconically*, Peña Nieto was exposed as a “juvenile candidate”, a “modern man” always smiling (Nieto, 2012). He also was exposed dressed traditional clothes or tuxedo always according to the situation (IFE, 2012). On television, he was always exposed in movement, in a casual conversation, or as a person that fulfilled his promises (Nieto, 2012)

About the element *vocally*, the slogan of Peña Nieto was “my commitment is with Mexico” (Peña Nieto, 2012) and it never changed during the electoral campaign. He expressed all the time respect, trust, and confidence for the Mexican Institutions of investigation, regulation and Mexican political institutions. He, about himself, referred constantly that “he does not decide anything” because that was the “faculty of the Mexican society”. This could resume in his declaration after the first debate. He told, “it was upon the Mexican society to decide the winner of the electoral contending” (in Tercer Grado, 2012; 05, 06/2012 El universal; 05, 06/2012 La Jornada).

About the relation with other candidates into the element *kinetic*, he never questioned directly a data quoted from national or international institutions, but the capacity of his opponents. A clear example occurred during the first official debate. In the debate, the candidate of PAN argued that according to Mexican Transparency (a organization that measures the levels of corruptions in each state) in the period he was governor in the State of Mexico, he had been an obstacle in fulfilling the regulations about transparency and accountability (IFE primer debate, 06/05/2012). He answered that “for sure” the PAN’s electoral campaign team “have read wrong the data and that they- PAN’s electoral campaign team- should review again the information” (Peña Nieto in IFE first debate, 06/05/2012).

In the *kinetic* aspect, Peña Nieto always modulated his voice and movement, shook hands, and smiled to their opponents. His presence in the program *Tercer Grado* (06/06/2012) could be divided in to four momentums. The first one was the discussion of the protests against him, and against his political party as result of the “fear” that existed in several Mexicans about his party returning to power (Tercer Grado, 06/06/2012). The second moment was the situation of corrupts politicians in his party. The third moment was the child he has outside his matrimony, and the last momentum was his position in issues like the marriage of homosexual couples and abortion. During his participation in the program, he never changed his voice or seemed to be upset because of the questions. On the other hand, he performed as a person that controlled the environment. In the program, after a question, he interrupted the next, arguing “Let me end to answer to...” This provoked one of the journalist to exclaim; “Peña but I want ask too and there is not time. Answer the question quickly!” (Tercer Grado, Carlos Marin, 06/06/2012)

Regarding *interactive news making* the protest in the Iberoamericana University was central in the change of attitude in the campaign team of Peña Nieto but also in his representation as a politician aware of democratic values, I mean the issue attracted the media and then was used to present positive propaganda in favour of Peña Nieto. In an interview, for example, he declared that “dialogue, debate, and openness enrich democracy” and that he understood the “plurality and the enthusiasm of the youth in the university” (12/05/2012, El Universal). El Universal (12/05/2012) also reported that Peña Nieto celebrated the “plurality, discrepancy, and vitality” of the students. Peña Nieto also remarked in others mass media that that situation in the University was not estrange because of “it is the way in which Mexico live its democratic life”.

Regarding Peña Nieto in connection with *Journalistic Revelation*, this happened in relation with the note published first by The Guardian (07/06/2012) and later on by

newspaper in Mexico. In the note, it was revealed a possible relationship of Peña Nieto with Televisa. The newspaper inside the country replicated what The Guardian (07/06/2012) has told and reported the actions taken by López Obrador's party. Because the note, the PRD presented a demand in the IFE asking for the revision of the contracts and the budget of the campaign of Peña Nieto (10/06/2012, La Jornada; El Universal). This was not discussed in the spaces of Televisa, and it was discussed very briefly in El Universal but only in relationship with the demand of the PRD.

Peña Nieto won the election by more or less 4 per cent. The electoral participation was around 60 per cent and in some states reached 80 per cent. That meant one of the larger participation in the history of the country (IFE, 2012). After the voting López Obrador argued that the elections 2012 were “the dirtiest election in the history of the country and that it was necessary to repeat all the process”, because of Peña Nieto have “bought the election” (03/07/2012, La Jornada). The situation lasted until September when the Tribunal Specialised in Electoral Process and Electoral crimes announced that the proves presented by López Obrador were not enough to cancel the election and approved the process as valid, announcing Peña Nieto as official winner.

### **5.3. The Protests against Peña Nieto**

The protest had their mayor presence in the newspaper controlled for this investigation from the 11th to the 26th of May (Appendixes 1&2 1210/0506) being constantly present in the reports of the newspaper along the campaigns and in Television news programs in Televisa. Even more, *La Jornada* gave the protests international connotation reporting protest against Peña Nieto in Madrid, and Paris (20/05/2012; 03/06/2012, La Jornada). Other important characteristic was that the protests were against television. In this, the newspapers reported that the protesters situated their actions in the opposite of the followers of Peña Nieto, arguing for example that Peña Nieto had the television and that they had “the protest and the social networks on the internet” (20/05/2012 La Jornada). The protests were presented in the mass media especially when they interrupted or appeared in campaign acts of Peña Nieto. One special report was in Televisa the day Peña Nieto was interviewed in Tercer Grado in which Televisa presented the protests occurring outside their studios (Primero Noticias; 24/05/2012)

The situation of the protest and some attitudes of close collaborators pushed Peña Nieto to publish a “manifesto” with 10 points for a democratic presidency. Those points remarked

attitudes that he would present in the case he would win the presidency and helped to shape the comments and opinions of his followers at the moment they should give an opinion about the protest (22,28/05/2012, *La Jornada*; 27/05/2012 *El Universal*). Thus, the further declarations of the Peña Nieto's party were shaped in an attitude of tolerance telling several times that; they were not against the protest, and that they thought that it was "good" for the democracy of the country to see the engagement of the students and population in general in the election. Nevertheless, the electoral campaign team of Peña Nieto remarked several times that the participants in the protests ought to be aware of the elections would be decided by voting and not by protesting (23/06/2012, 24/06/2012, *El Universal*; 20/05/2012, *La Jornada*). Another reaction from the Peña Nieto's campaign teams was the organization of "protest" in favour of Peña Nieto and against López Obrador. This was revealed and briefly covered by *El Universal* (23/05/2012) and *La Jornada* (25/06/2012). This protest was only announced in the mass media but it was not reported any constant movement or protests in favour of Peña Nieto, neither protest or a movement against López Obrador.

How can we understand the presence of the protest in the Mexican electoral campaign of 2012? One approach to understand the protest keeps relationship with the definition of the public by Coleman and Ross (2010). They argue that: "The public demands to be acknowledged, served, appeased, informed, consulted, and respected". (Coleman & Ross, 2010, s. 8). From this perspective, it is possible to argue that the protest showed the intention of the people to react and act and the desire to be an important part of the electoral process and not only a passive observer of the process. Thus, the engagement of the people in the election is an important element to point out, and in a sense, this situation could evidence a civic Mexican culture that is emerging and that needs more observation and more understanding.

More over, the reports presented to the participants in the protests as individuals who had knowledge about the situation of Mexico and who knew what meant the return of the PRI to the presidency. Dahlgren (2009, pp. 108, 109) mentions that "knowledge" is connected with "literacy", and the desire and skills that people need to access, and to understand information. In this, to have elements and devices that permit to the population to reach information and knowledge is paramount in to provoke engagement. In addition, something particular in this case is that knowledge was also connected with the remembrances of historical events and bad experiences with the PRI in the presidency. In this sense and in front of one of the protest, Peña Nieto in the time he was performing in a public place, claimed "Do not recall overcame past" (22,26/05/2012, *El Universal*) and in one of his spots

mentioned that “If Mexico has changed why it should be governed as in the past” (IFE spots, 06/2012)

Another approach to understand the presence of the protest could be situated in the strategies used by opponents to Peña Nieto in provoking scenarios against him using the tools provided by the internet, but also by direct speech of the candidates in the mass media. About the use of internet, Carty (2011) presents an empirical study in his book *Wired and Mobilizing* about how in the electoral campaign in 2008 in the United States. Carty (2011) mentions that the Obama’s electoral campaigns team “tried to find, organize, and energize supporters in a way that enable them to create a space outside of things they were disillusioned” (Carty, 2011, s. 77). Some data recollected seem to show that the protest initiated in the middle of the campaign in Mexico and largely presented to the end of it, were organized into this logic.

The protest provoked an atmosphere against the candidate Peña Nieto, and benefited the candidate López Obrador who, at least in the speech, presented himself as a part of the protests. He was quoted several times pointing out that the protests were a kind of legitimisation of his discourse and referring them as result of the “awakening of the Mexican people”. He also declared that the protests should impede the imposition of Peña Nieto” and the “return of the PRI to presidency” and that the protest in the streets were informing to the people the issues the mass media wanted to hide (Official Debates and Yo Soy 132 debate). During the most intense period and because the presence of the youth in the protest was significant, he convoked a “national meeting with the youth” in a public place in which students protesting against the PRI regimen were murdered in 1968. (21,22,23/05/2012 El Universal; 22,23,24,26/05/06/2012 La Jornada)

#### **5.4. Social Movements in Mexico**

The article ninth in the Mexican Constitution is about the right of association in which is included the right to deliberate. One general requirement to exert this right is the Mexican Nationality. Besides, the association or movement must show that it is a pacific one. The last point in the regulation is that the movements could not be repressed if the movement does not use as strategies to reach their goals the menace, insults, the intimidation, and the violence against private and public persons or public buildings and spaces (Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos, 2012).

The article ninth is representative especially in relation with the situation of social movement in the country as a constant presence. For example, Castells (1999, p.79),

Coleman, and Ross (2012, p. 108) and Carty (2011, p. 3) report the case of the EZLN in Mexico as an example of social movement. Furthermore, during the elections, the candidates were connected with social movements and organizations like the Atenco movement (La Jornada, 2012), even though a social movement MORENA was directly and openly connected with López Obrador. Another example of the presence of social movement in the campaign was the Movement for the Peace with Justice and Dignity (Movimiento por la Paz con Justicia y Dignidad) that convoked a meeting with the candidates to discuss the problem of the violence in Mexico (29/05/2012, La Jornada; El Universal). The presence of movements in Mexico is related with specific problems regarding the performance of politicians in power or regarding laws and regulation that affect to a specific sector of the population. However, the movement that rose in the middle of the campaign focused their actions in to get more democratic and open media and in to “what would represent the return of the PRI to the presidency”. One question to solve inside this case was if the self-called movement “Yo Soy 132” could fit in some theories about social movements.

#### **5.4.1. The Movement Yo Soy 132**

Goodwin and James (2009) present different perspectives that explain why a movement emerges, one of those perspectives is the culturist that explains that:

Culturists have reasserted the importance of perception, ideas, emotions, and grievances, all of which mobilization and process theorist once thought did not matter or could be simply be taken for granted. But these are examined today in the context of broader social and political changes, not in isolation from them. (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, s. 14)

In more detail, Goodwin, and James (2009) defined social movement as: “a collective, organized, sustained, and non-institutional challenge to authorities, power holders, or cultural belief and practices” (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, s. 4).

Under those perspectives, the rise of the movement Yo Soy 132 in the political campaign could be divided in to three larger moments. The first one was the protest in the Iberoamericana University that could be understood as the trigger that provoked the rising of the movement. The second moment was the definition of the movement and the declaration of its principles. The last moment, under the electoral period, was when it started activities protesting for getting national networking for the second debate, and finally the organization

of the debate between the candidates and students of different Universities on You Tube.

In more detail, after the protest in the Iberoamericana University, the coordinators of the electoral campaign of Peña Nieto were presented in some media telling that the protest there were organized by people that maybe were not students. After these declarations, a group of 131 students of the Iberoamericana University posted in You Tube a video. In the video, they argued that they were not manipulated and they showed their credentials of students and gave their names (Appendix 4 14/05/2012). This was reported in *La Jornada* (15/05/2012) and largely commented in *Tercer Grado* (16/05/2012). In this program, the comments were centred in the knowledge of the students about the political life of Peña Nieto and about the history of the PRI. Later on, the students of the Iberoamericana University convoked to a protest on the internet that ended in the corporative buildings of Televisa (18/05/2012, *El Universal*; *La Jornada* and Televisa).

The last event in this first moment was when a group of students were presented in an interview in *Primero Noticias* in Televisa. There, the students presented clear points and aims and convoked other universities to create a movement that had as main aim the democratization of the mass media. The main justification they presented to conform a movement was that the next day after the protest in the University, they had looked at the reports in the mass media and the mass media had misrepresented the protest. Furthermore, they told that the media had not given voice to them and had only presented the situation from the point of view of the PRI. From that perspective, it was obvious that the mass media and Televisa had covered the situation in favour of Peña Nieto and PRI (UIA students in the *Primero Noticias* 22/05/2012)

In this, it is possible to argue that emotions and perceptions of the students influenced on their respond to the electoral campaign team of the PRI and that emotions were a reason that made them to convoke; first protest, and then a movement.

In the second momentum, students from other universities joined and together with this group of students from the Iberoamericana University formed the movement Yo Soy 132. In this period, they defined their goals and aims. The main goal was to get the democratization of the media and equality in the coverture of the campaigns (24/05/2012, *El Universal*; *La Jornada*). The other important element was the declaration that the movement was against the return of the old authoritative regimens of the PRI represented in the candidature of Peña Nieto (31/05/2012, *La Jornada*).

Goodwin and James (2009) point out that three factors are fundamental to a person joining social movements; those are “biographical availability, ideological compatibility, and

social network ties” (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, s. 56). Thus, the clear factor to understand the movement as a university one is biographical availability. Regarding to this, other students of other universities identify themselves with the students of the Iberoamericana University and because the sharing of similar situation in their lives engaged in the struggle.

Inside the perspective of the campaign and connected with origin of the movement, It is also possible to argue that an important sector of the public joined the movement because they witnessed in the mass media the misrepresentation of the students. Coleman and Ross (2010, pp. 9,13,17,20) defining the “witnessing public” as the public that is “connected with issues of moral and justice” (Coleman & Ross, 2010, ss. 17,20). The way in which the Movement defined themselves as the recipes of a messages that provoke a specific action by them and them being witnessed of the “lack” of ethic in the media gave them reasons to go into the electoral dynamics. This representation engaged other students and other groups by processes of identification.

The third momentum in the life of the movement inside the electoral period in Mexico was well-organized activities. The first one was based on protests and manifestations asking for and obtaining the aperture of the channel 2 of Televisa and the channel 13 of Tv Azteca for the second debate. The movement asked also for the possibility to get national networking for the debate but this was denied (30/05/2012, La Jornada). The second activity was the organization of the first political debate in Mexico screened on You Tube on life, this also meant the first political debate organized by students in Mexico and in addition the first political debate organized by a non-institutional organization. Because the situation of the protest and the declaration of López Obrador that connect his ideologies with the group, Peña Nieto did not participate in this debate.

The debate Yo soy 132 was mainly screened on You Tube and according to information presented in La Jornada (20/06/2012) the highest level reached of viewers in that internet platform was 97 thousand 8 hundred and the lowest during a period the signal was poor, reached the number of 20 thousand viewers. Although the use of You Tube was important, it is also important to mention that the debate was promoted and transmitted by the Iberoamericana University’s radio, in the platform called UNO TV on the internet, and in radio channels of the Institute Mexican of Radio (20/06/2012, La Jornada).

The debate Yo Soy 132 was not very different from the official debates regarding camera shots. However, some parts were more dynamic than the official debates. This was because of the use of tools and devices such as video-chat were used for the students to directly dialogue with the candidate presented in the debate. This complexity in the use of

software and hardware, provoked fails in the transmission of the debate on internet at the beginning of the debate, but minutes later the signal was fixed and the debate was screened without any problem. In more detail, the debate had three episodes. In the first episode, the candidates responded a question made by a student. The student asked using a web camera, the candidate responded and then again, the student presented an argument about the answer of the candidate. In the second episode, the candidates debated between them different issues concerning the political life in the country, one of the questions was the situation of the mass media in the country regarding the monopolies of Televisa and Tv Azteca. In the last episode, the candidates answered questions that citizens had sent to the movement using accounts of Twitter, Facebook and by e-mail. According to *La Jornada* (20/06/2012) and *El Universal* (20/06/2012), the debate Yo Soy 132 reached a considerable number of viewers and listeners but it not reached the million of viewers.

Close to the voting, the movement started to organize the observation of the process using devices, such as mobile phones and cam recorders. The movement, according *La Jornada* (02/07/2012), recollected 2 thousand anomalies during the voting. However, there was difficulty at that moment to distinguish which of the records were made by the movement and which ones were not, specially because of at that time the organization of the movement was not clear and each university present already a Yo Soy 132 group that published in the name of the movement. After the voting, one of the spoke persons of the movement declared that, only information presented in the official page of the group on internet was the information convened by all the assemblies that conformed the movement (Antollini in *Primer Noticias*, 04/07/2012).

### **5.5. Television in the election**

According to the Institute of Geography, Statistic, and Informatics (INEGI), 95 per cent of the population in Mexico have a television (INEGI on line 2010). The two larger companies of television in the country are Televisa, and TV Azteca. According to the information provided by Televisa, the corporation manages four satellite channels in Mexico including the channel with national coverture called channel 2, and an important amount of local channels, (Televisa s.a. de c.v. , 2013). Tv Azteca controls three satellite channels at national level in Mexico. The channel 13 is the channel of the corporation that reaches more audience (Azteca, 2013).

Dahlgren (2009) points out that media are a “prerequisite for democracy but the

presence of them not means a guarantee” (Dahlgren, 2009, p.2). Dahlgren (2009) and Flew (2007) present different factors, and situations that make the media threats for democracy. Into the terms presented by Dahlgren (2009), the key elements in which the situation of the mass media in Mexico could be explained are; concentration, proliferation, and deregulation

What Dahlgren (2009) calls *deregulation* is related in the local with the “regulation” of Mexico that allowed the companies of television do not present the debate or to present them in the channels they believe convenient in the election of 2012. Concerning the first debate, Tv Azteca decided not to present the debate in any of their channels. The main argument of Tv Azteca to not to present the debate was that the regulation did not obligate to it. The owner of the company wrote on Twitter, and reported later on newspaper, that “ to the candidates, see them on Televisa; Morelia-Tigres, in my channel” (01/05/2012, La Jornada). Moreover, he also argued that “the rating was not a bad thing but understanding it is to understand the preferences of the audience” (05/05/2012. La Jornada). The attitude of the owner of Tv Azteca provoked the reaction and the debate between politicians of the different parties in power in Mexico. The main discussion between them was the possibility that the presidency should demand national networking obligating to Tv Azteca to present the debate. The last decision was taken by the IFE that denied this possibility (02,03,04,05/05/2012 El universal; 04/05/2012, La Jornada).

The regulation awoke a discussion about “democratic values”, the right of the companies to decide, but also the right of the people to watch what they want. Connecting the issue with the values presented in the Literature Review and provided by Dahlgren (2009, p. 11), the company argued values such as “liberty” and “tolerance”. The interesting point in this was that the company argument as if it was an individual, a person that claims being a subject invested into those in front of the government. At the same time, the attitude of the company hindered other values such as “solidarity” and “openness”. Those values were presented in relation with the company as it were a citizen. In that case, other values “responsibility” and “accountability”, presented as a responsibility of a citizen, were avoided by the company in the fact that it as economic corporation had, because the regulations, the right to not go beyond the limits stipulated by the IFE.

Another argument presented in the discussion to not force the company to present the debate could be shaped into terms of *proliferation*. On one hand, *proliferation* helps to explain the position of the IFE as provider of programs (Flew 2007). Connected to this, Tv Azteca’s owner mentioned to not present the debate because issues of “rating.” About this, the owner situated his argument in the interest of the Mexican society to watch a football match

rather than the debate. This position gave to the electoral process the range of another spectacle and to the IFE the position of a provider that presented a product that competed with other in the market.

On the other hand *proliferation* could be also understand in the declaration of the IFE about that the presence of the debate in the media was guaranteed even though without the participation of Tv Azteca. Thus, *proliferation* is paramount to understand why the IFE did not made efforts to obligate to Tv Azteca to present the first debate on one of its channels. From this perspective, it is possible to argue that; because the IFE considered the existence of alternative channels that could made available for the population to decide to watch or not the debate (03/05/2012 El Universal; 04,05/05/2012 La Jornada).

The discussion about to demanding or forcing TV Azteca to present the first debate and to Televisa to present both in channel 2 refers to the element of *concentration*. In the opinions of political forces in Mexico, the participation of Televisa, such as Tv Azteca in open their spaces for the debate was important to reach the whole population in Mexico, as it was evidence in the second debate in which both companies open their main spaces, channel 2 and channel 13. This action collaborates in the fact that the second debate was the second debate most viewed in the Mexican history (12/06/2012 El Universal; La Jornada).

About *concentration*, it is necessary to mention that Televisa has considerably more channels under its control than Tv Azteca. Under this logic, the reports showed that Televisa company presented the first debate in one of its channels, the channel 5 and furthermore presented the second debate in its channel 2. This could be understood into the values presented by Dahlgren (2009) as the values of “responsibility”, “openness” and even though “accessibility”. In the election, Televisa company was protagonist in other events inside the electoral period. For example, the protests against its installation and corporative buildings were not only presented in the reports of the newspapers but also presented in the news spaces of the company. This included also the movement aperture to the movement Yo Soy 132. Even though, the presence of López Obrador in the program *Tercer Grado* could evidence values such as “equality”, “justice”, “tolerance”, and “discussion”.

The discussion in which Televisa was involved with López Obrador involved elements that considered the power of the corporation in relation with other aspects inside the campaigning such as the generation of statistical data, and the presumably negative representation of López Obrador. The arguments López Obrador and the PRD assumed that Televisa was making *uncovering publicity* in favour of Peña Nieto (27/06/2012, La Jornada). They meant by *uncovering publicity* that in news programs in which the reporters presented

positive aspect about the campaign of Peña Nieto. In opposition, the channels of the company presented negative aspects in the campaign of López Obrador. This is quite complicated and it should take another investigation to see how *uncovering publicity* should work, and the connection of the news reporting Televisa did in relation with the candidates. However, it is necessary to take in to consideration that Televisa is a private company.

Regarding the openness of Televisa with the movement Yo Soy 132, Televisa invited the students to present their arguments and demands in an interview. The interview was about 20 minutes approximately and it started with a “look at them they are youth and at this time in the mourning they are fresh” and ended with a “thank you students to give back life to a very boring electoral period”(Loret de Mola in Primero Noticias, 22/05/2012). In the interview the key questions were about what they meant by “democratisation of the media”, and what relation they had with other protests against Peña Nieto. The students declared that they disagreed with the way the mass media had screened, written, and talk about the protest in the Iberoamericana University, and that they had nothing to do with other protests against Peña Nieto. Loret de Mola insisted that Televisa had presented the protest in the University and event though; in the report, they had presented a placard where Peña Nieto was called *killer*. In the interview, it was evident the element *concentration* connected with the work of the journalist trying to dismiss the impact of the movement and trying to present the company as trustworthy.

Despite the efforts of Televisa to be perceived as a company with no political interest, in the middle of the campaigning the British newspaper *The Guardian* was reported in national Mexican Media revealing a relation between Peña Nieto and Televisa. This publication received larger coverer mainly in left-wing media as *La Jornada* (08/06/2012) than those considered as the right-wing media like the case of the *El Universal*.

In *La Jornada* (08-10/06/2012) was presented the note of *The Guardian* in which it is reported that Televisa and Peña Nieto signed a contract in order to make a favourable presentation of Peña Nieto and present information against López Obrador. *La Jornada* (10/06/2012) presented information of ex- workers of *Televisa* in which a worker of the company talked with one of the most prestigious journalist in the corporation and in which seems to be revealed that the corporation had this relation. *La Jornada* did not only present the information of *The Guardian* but presented the version of the corporation. Televisa argued that: “the information was not the correct” (09/06/2012, *La Jornada*), and that actually the contracts were not with *Televisa* but with one of “the branches of the conglomerate” called “Esmas” and that, into the terms of the electoral regulations, they were “legal contracts”

(27/06/2012, La Jornada). This situation was, and still is, defined into a political, economical, and *historical* relation between PRI and Televisa. This historical relation has been defined as one that has beneficiated Televisa in obtaining political concession regarding permissions for the use of new technology and the possibility to influence in the regulation and laws concerning communication in general (17/05/2012, La Jornada).

It is argued previously that Televisa can be connected with values. However, it is necessary to consider that Televisa is a private corporation. Corner (1995) mentions that the private mass media move in two spheres. The first is connected with the intention that governments have in their use to control public opinion. The second is what Corner defines as: “the sphere of control exercised by corporate, private interest, in their quest to maximise and naturalise their own power and profitability and to marginalise threats to their continued operations” (Corner, 1995, p. 41). In this perspective, the “values” presented in Televisa must be considered into the intention of the company of not to affect the position of the company in front of the government and in front of their publics,

Furthermore, Televisa is the main provider of satellite channels in Mexico, following with Corner (1995), he mentions that television has three characteristics that make it, an undemocratic force. The first one is the *sophisticated knowledge management*; this is connected with the way television presents experts. The second one was the *strategic personalization* referred to the manners political issues and actors are presented inside a theatrical scope. The third one was *realist credibility*; this is about the way television pretends to present the reality rather than to generate an opinion about it. (Corner, 1995, p. 43,44)

In the description presented, it is possible to argue that in the discussion with López Obrador the first characteristic was presented in the arguments of the candidate about Televisa generating data and presenting experts that talk negatively aspects of the campaign of López Obrador. The first element is also observed in the openness of the company with the movement Yo Soy 132. The students in the space of Televisa who were from one of the most prestigious private universities in the country evidenced an imbalance, not in the sense that the students there were presented as experts, but in relation with other protest happening at the same time. Consequently the “knowledge” that could be represented in the origin of the protest in the University discriminate other expressions that by the time were presented in other spaces as well but that never accessed to Televisa. The other two elements were observed as well, but in the data collected is not enough to presented them clearly in the reports.

Summarizing the role of television in the Mexican election at his level was shaped

mainly in terms of *deregulation* and *concentration*. Into this scope the position of the company seems to be in the interest of the society and in opposition with the authority in the case of Tv Azteca. In the case of Televisa, the situation seems be more complicated. However, it is possible to say that, because of Televisa is the larger provider of televised spaces, and because of its position as conglomerate in the Mexican context, its position is more of a political actor than a company in open competency with Tv Azteca for publics.

## **5.6. The internet in the election**

Nayar (2010) argues that the internet is a place strongly connected with local situation and that actually the cultures in the internet replicated, extended and augmented the structures that exist outside the internet (Nayar, 2010, s. 3).

According to INEGI, in Mexico 33 per cent of the population has the possibility to access the spaces of the internet and according to an Study of The Tecnológico de Monterrey, 45 per cent of the Mexicans do not use the internet because they do not know how to use it. Despite this structural evidence, the internet was constantly presented in the electoral campaigns. The internet was represented in *La Jornada* and in *El Universal* as a space more aggressive than the mass media. Even more, the candidates had teams and groups that worked trying to control the spaces of the internet. The main labour of these groups was to post comments against a candidate or menace users that should present comments in favour of the opponents, (06,07/05/2012, *La Jornada*; 07/05/2012, *El Universal*).

It is also reported the creation of the web pages, which focus, was to present information against other candidates (09/05/2012, *La Jornada*). Despite the diversity of platforms, the reports about the internet were centred mainly on the use of Twitter. The comments of important people in the campaign such as the candidates, the president of the republic and other important actors in the political life in the country were followed mainly on this platform of the (07,08,16,19,21,26,27/05/2012, 20/06/2012, *La Jornada*; 07/05/2012, 06,11/06/2012, *El Universal*). The newspapers followed in this investigation, reported as well activity on Facebook, especially in relationship with the protests and movement Yo Soy 132. The last platform reported in relation with the movement Yo Soy 132 was You Tube that served as a main platform in the “debate Yo Soy 132” (20/06/2012, *EL Universal*; 20,21/06/2012 *La Jornada*).

In this scope is necessary to remark that, despite the potentiality of the internet still were the mass media that pointed out the issues occurring on spaces of the internet and spotlight

them. For example, in *La Jornada* (29/05/2012), an editorial was presented. In this editorial, *La Jornada* referred the internet in opposition to the television companies. The editorial argued that the internet was as a tool being used by conscious people against the “imposition” of mainly, the televisions companies. The editorial called the situation “The mother of all the battles” referring to the struggle between the “well informed” society using internet in opposition to the “political and economic class” manipulating the information in the mass media to maintain the control of the whole population. *El Universal* (2012) presented as well several opinion articles about how important was the internet to reach people and to organized protest.

Another aspect that the use of the internet augmented was the knowledge in its use. For example, the movement *Yo Soy 132* was originated in Mexico in a private university. The movement not only showed knowledge in issues against PRI, but knowledge in the use of the internet. The debate promoted by the movement demonstrated the knowledge of the students in the use of the internet.

The internet was represented in the newspapers controlled in this work as an important tool in create networking, suitable to present proposition of action for those that had access to the tool, and as news provider used largely by a sector of the population that posted opinions that were later extended to the whole society by the mass media. Nevertheless, it is necessary to point out that the impact of the internet in the election in Mexico should be framed in terms of its accessibility. In this, the internet being accessible for only a sector of the population limited its democratic capacities and evidence imbalances in the knowledge of the society and consequently, the possibilities to take a well-informed decision not only in the voting but in future relationship with policy and decision makers. This was evident even for the protest and movement. They were aware of the capacity of the internet and several time declared that they believe in the capacity but not “blindly” adding that to take the streets were also part of the strategies to provoke the change they wanted to provoke (29/05/2012, *El Universal*).

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

The main reason to write this work was to present a description of the particularities of the Mexican election and connect them with theories about democracy and Media. It is possible to conclude that democratic elements can be found in the process especially in the relationship between the authorities and the television companies, and between the television companies, candidates, protests, and social movement. However, the elements that were found need to be shaped in to the attitudes, and in to the interest of the providers of space for deliberation. In the Mexican case, television as resource of accessibility affects the other elements in part because television seems to be situated in a position between the society, the economic forces, and the authorities. In this sense, the accessibility of the mass media was an element that was largely discussed during the election and that can explain the reasons that provoked the rise of the movement and in a sense the protests.

Furthermore, it was possible to observe a process of *reason-given*. This was connected firstly with the speeches of the candidates in relation with their arguments about why they were the best option to be president. Nevertheless, the *reason-given* to point out in the Mexican election is the decision of IFE to no force to TV Azteca to present the first debate. This is important because of the arguments presented by the company and the IFE in relation with democratic values.

Another element of importance in the election was knowledge. This is an important element to consider in understanding the development of the democracy in the country and its most important challenged to be fully democratic. Knowledge is discussed from different approaches in the middle part of the conclusion. Those go from the knowledge management of the media and the knowledge represented by the social movement and the protests.

The last element considered is *binding time*. This is related with engagement and the necessity to make further investigation following the possible changes in the relationship of the Mexican society with the government, biased on what was observed in the election of 2012. This is also presented in the conclusions as the hope of the writer that, with the antecedents found in the analysis of the election, Mexico is on its way to becoming a fully democratic society. Summarising, the conclusions follow two concepts presented by Gutmann and Thompson (2004) those are: “*accessible and binding time*” (Gutmann and Thompson, 2004, pp.3-5). The third element, *reason-given* is annexed to the element *accessible*, and the element knowledge is presented separately because it was important to considered in the democratic develop of the country.

## 6.1. Accessibility

The accessible element of the information in democracies according to Gutmann and Thompson (2004) lies in the possibility that the necessary information for to be able to take a decision should be accessible to everybody. In this, two considerations are important; the first one is that: “the deliberation by itself must take place in public” and that: “A deliberative justification does not even get started if those to whom it is addressed cannot understand its essential content” (Gutmann and Thompson, 2004, p.4). In this, television plays an important role, but so do other spaces as well, such as the streets and the internet. Regarding, television, the character of accessibility was limited by issues of *Concentration* and *deregulation* (Dahlgren, 2009). *Concentration* and *deregulation* are paramount in understanding the attitudes of Televisa and TVAzteca.

Dahlgren (2009) refers to *concentration* and its consequences in connection to the work of a journalist. This could be seen in the attitudes of, for example Loret de Mola in the interview with the students asking what they dislike in the way the Televisa has screened the news if even they have been present a placard calling “killer” to Peña Nieto arguing that Televisa company actually presented negative aspects of Peña Nieto. This was a clear example of a journalist trying to provoke a vision of objectivity in favour of the company. More over, The *concentration* of channels by the corporation allowed the company to present itself as a responsible actor by opening one of its channels without threatening its other operations. Thus, the openness of the Televisa Corporation cannot be understood if we do not observe the position of *Televisa* as a company that monopolizes the televised space in the country. In comparison to *TV Azteca*, *Televisa* controls considerably more channels than *TV Azteca*. This makes it possible for Televisa to open more spaces and therefore could announce disingenuously that Televisa is always open to democracy. Corner (1995) arguments that private corporation acted in its own benefit. In more detail Corner (1995) points out that: “the sphere of control exercised by corporate, private interest, in their quest to maximise and naturalise their own power and profitability and to marginalised threats to their continued operations” (Corner 1995, p.51).

The accessible element is also connected with the elements *deregulation* and *reason-given*. Gutmann and Thompson (2004) establish that: “The reasons are meant both to produce a justifiable decision and to express the value of mutual respect” (Gutmann and Thomson, 2004, p. 4). In the campaigns, the *reason-given* became also a mutual act that concerned the Television corporations in relation with the authority of the *IFE*. This was clearly observed in the first debate and is a little less obviously in the second debate in the relation *IFE* with the

*TV Azteca* corporation. In this, the *IFE* gave several reasons in the last final decision for not to demand national networking even though, the *IFE* had all the support of other political actors to demand it.

On the other hand, *TV Azteca* argued using mainly democratic values for not to present the debate. As I mention in the “Findings and Analysis”, the company presented itself as a subject of the rights that emanate of those values. Thus, *TV Azteca* acted as a part of the society such as it was an individual with the right to deliberate with the authority regarding a decision. Furthermore, it is necessary to consider that the mass media as industries and as organizations that work into the logics of the markets have started to demand special privileges in order to produce benefits. In this, the deregulation of the markets makes the activities of the corporations possible. This present *deregulation* in the sense presented by Dahlgren (2009, p.37) as one of the most serious risk for democratic. At this level and in relation to Mexico, *deregulation* seems to be already problematic even though for the most symbolic act of a democracy, the elections.

About the accessibility and the use of the internet, Nayar (2010) argues that: “Cybercultures (sic) are at various points, and in different ways, attached to and connected with real-life material condition and they replicate, extend and augment them” (Nayar, 2012, p.3). Regarding the accessibility of the internet, the information collected reveals that only 33 per cent of the population have the possibility of using the internet. On the other hand the reports on the mass media connected the internet with the protests, and mobilization, with the candidates and their strategies to control the spaces provided by the internet. Finally, the candidate López Obrador spoke about the internet as a space opposed to mass media in which the information was trustworthy. First, this gives the possibility to interpret that the internet was more accessible in the country than the numeric data suggests, otherwise would not be possible to understand clearly the struggles of the candidates to control the spaces of the internet. Second, the internet in the campaign of López Obrador became a political speech and a presence that help to reach democratic values. However, it was clear in the speech of the candidate and protests that it were necessary others strategies to augment the impact of the internet.

More over, the data recollected in the reports reveal as well that some characteristics that are presented in the political campaigns outside of the internet were presented in the spaces provided by it. Under this perspective, the use of internet by political purposes presented in Mexico a strong partisanship, as is revealed in the reports. The internet was an aggressive space in which specialized groups organized by the political parties posted

negative comments in the e-pages and on the internet accounts of the opponents. Another aspect in the use of the internet was that politicians use the space to provoke mobilization outside the space of internet together with their performance in the public spaces and mentioning that important issues were revealed on the internet. In this, the internet could be understood as a news resource that politicians used to take forward issues that later on journalists used to make news or to present augmented reports taking as a departure point the comments that politicians and important people in the political life of Mexico posted on their internet accounts.

The use of the internet in the election also evidences also the segregation and the inequalities of the Mexican society. Nayar (2010) argues about the accessibility of the spaces of the internet that: “Racial and class inequalities exist in terms of the access to and use of digital resources” (Nayar, 2010, s. 3). Concerning this, the movement Yo Soy 132 is a clear example in the sense that the movement demonstrated class inequalities regarding the possibility to augment the capacities in the use of the internet by a sector of the population in Mexico. This is clearly demonstrated by the movement producing a debate that was present in live on You Tube and in other media. In contrast, a study of the *Tecnológico de Monterrey* reports that 45 per cent of the Mexicans did not know how to use the internet.

Thus, to really understand the role of the internet in the election it is necessary to situate it within and into another levels of connection between the people in Mexico. In this work, it is possible to argue that the reports about the use of the internet in the mass media were more important in the impact it had in the election than the internet by itself. Nevertheless, it is necessary as well to explore other elements in the daily life of the Mexicans that could connect the use of the internet in other activities of the Mexican people. This is not explored in this thesis, but it is interesting to take a further investigation to know what other activities in the civic culture of the Mexican society can involve the use of the internet.

## **6.2. Knowledge**

Knowledge is the element that kept a significant relationship in all the actors and events presented in the analysis done for this thesis. Knowledge was connected with the protest, the movement, the candidates, with the use of the internet and with the approach of the mass media. Dahlgren (2009) mentions about knowledge that this is related with literacy and with the capacity and the intention of the people to search for information. Consequently, the lack of “literacy” could be determinant in the accessibility of the information the Mexican

population needed to take a decision. In this thesis, knowledge was identified in three different approaches.

Starting with the most evident found in the case, 45 per cent of the population in Mexico do not know how to use the internet. Thus, the accessibility of the internet was also limited by lack of knowledge in the use of this tool and as we have discussed previously, the use of the internet evidenced imbalance and a strong segregation of the population in Mexico, this was also evident in the necessity to find another strategies to provoke mobilization and participation.

Inside the protest, the element knowledge was connected with historical remembrances. In this, the mass media and the candidate López Obrador present the mobilization in relation with the historical issues, connecting politicians with negative connotations with the candidature of Peña Nieto and when *PRI* had the presidency. This element impacted in the results of the elections, since it was constantly presented and augmented not only by the other candidates in the debates, but also in the reports of the media, in comments coming from the protests and from declarations of the movement Yo Soy 132. One comment that could summarize the impact of this, it was the comment of the candidate Peña Nieto “don’t recall overcome past” presented in one of his performances that one of the protests had interrupted during his electoral campaigning and in one of his audio-visual propaganda.

Knowledge was also an element connected with Television corporations, but in the terms presented by Corner (1995). In this, Corner (1995) mentions that: “Television has become, among other things a sphere of intensive and sophisticated *knowledge management*” (Corner, 1995, s. 43). In this it is possible to say, that *Televisa* in the Mexican election of 2012 was more open to sort levels of knowledge. In the election, the rising of the Movement Yo Soy 132 was interesting, and it was much more interesting that *Televisa* opened their spaces to them. However, the characteristic of the students presented in the first interview in *Televisa* could define the kind of knowledge that the movement would manage in the relationship with the corporation and the attitude that the movement should have during the first month of its existence. Even though, it is possible to argue that in the conformation of the movement Yo Soy 132 the intervention of *Televisa* Corporation was important. In relation to this, Goodwin and Jasper (2009) mention that “The social movements struggles with problems like the creation of spokespersons” (Goodwin & Jasper, 2009, p. 315), because this could determinate the character of the movement. When the first interview, it was presented in *Televisa* a group of students that argued to have knowledge of the situation of the campaigns and to have knowledge regarding the work of the media. In this, it is relevant the

origin of the core of the movement, this mean students of private universities with skills in the use of the internet, and with higher levels of education than the average population in Mexico. More over is possible to argue that Televisa Corporation could influence the kind of people that later on would join the movement and the further relationship between the movement and the company.

It is important to mention that knowledge as historical remembrance seems to contribute to redefine the relationship between a society connecting old negative experiences with future aspirations. Historical negative experiences establishes a frame that result in the demand of a more democratic relationship in the sense that the society becomes more vigilant to the signs that could reveal the return of those bad experiences

### **6.3. Binding Time**

About the last element, Gutmann and Thompson (2004) mention that: “The third characteristic of deliberative democracy is that its process aims at producing a decision that is *binding* for some period of time” (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004, p. 5). The decision after the electoral period is about six years. However, in a functioning democracy Gutmann and Thompson (2004) point out that the elements that participate in the discussion: “They intend their discussion to influence a decision the government will make, or a process that will affect how future decisions are made” (Guttmann & Thompson, 2004, p. 5). In this sense in the middle of the campaign Peña Nieto, who won the presidency, presented 10 points that established how the future relationship with the government would be shaped. At the same time, the 10 points established how the decisions into his government should be made. In this, the movements and protests and the whole society in general in Mexico will continue the discussion with the PRI based on early experience with the Party. This can be interpreted as change in the relationship between the institutions and the population occasioned by the engagement showed in the electoral period of 2012.

## REFERENCES

- Azteca. (01 01 2013). *Azteca*. Available in Azteca: [www.azteca.com](http://www.azteca.com) 03 01 2013
- Carty, V. (2011). *Wired and Mobilizing: Social Movements, New Technology, and Electoral Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Castells, M. (1999). *The Power of Identity*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Coleman, S., & Ross, K. (2010). *The Media and the Public "Them" and "Us" in Media Discourse*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. (30 11 2012). [www.diputados.gob.mx](http://www.diputados.gob.mx) Available in [diputados.gob.mx](http://www.diputados.gob.mx): <http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/1.pdf>, 03 01 2013
- Corner, J. (1995). *Television Form and Public Address*. Tottenham: Edward Arnold.
- Corner, J., & Pels, D. (2003). *Media and the Restyling of Politics*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Curran, J., Fenton, N., & Freedman, D. (2012). *Misunderstanding the Internet*. New York: Routledge.
- Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and Political Engagement*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Flew, T. (2007). *Understanding Global Media*. Hampshire: Palgrave macmillan.
- George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Science*. Massachusetts: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.
- Gomm, R., Hammersley, M., & Foster, P. (2009). *Case Study Method*. London: SAGE Publication.
- Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. (2009). *The Social Movement Reader; Cases and Concepts* (2nd Edition). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gordon, N., & Sorensen, K. (2012). Jamaica and Chile Online: Accessing and Using the Internet in a Developing World Context. in P. H. Cheong, J. Martin, & L. Macfadyen, *New Media and Intercultural Communication* (Vol. 13, ss. 275-289). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Instituto Federal Electoral. (01 01 2012). *Partidos Politicos y Agrupaciones Politicas Nacionales*. Available in [www.ife.org.mx/portal/site/ifev2/Partidos\\_Politicos/14\\_09\\_2012](http://www.ife.org.mx/portal/site/ifev2/Partidos_Politicos/14_09_2012)
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística Geografía e Informática. (01 01 2012). *INEGI*. Available in [www.inegi.org.mx/prod\\_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvinegi/productos/encuestas/especiales/endutih/2010/endutih2010.pdf](http://www.inegi.org.mx/prod_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvinegi/productos/encuestas/especiales/endutih/2010/endutih2010.pdf) den 13 04 2012
- Johnson-Cartee, K. (2005). *News narratives and news framing: constructing political reality*. Oxford: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- López Obrador, A. (06 12 2011). *Fundamentos para una República Amorosa*. Mexico Df, Mexico.
- Lury, K. (2005). *Interpreting Television*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Mancini, P., & Swanson, D. (1996). *Politics, Media and Modern Democracy; An International Study of Innovation in Electoral Campaigning and Their Consequences*. London: Praeger series in political communication.

MORENA. (01 01 2013). *MORENA, movimiento regeneración nacional*. Available in [www.amlo.org.mx](http://www.amlo.org.mx): <http://www.amlo.org.mx/> 03 01 2013

Nayar, P. K. (2010). *The New Media and Cybercultures Anthology*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic Deficit; Critical Citizens revisited*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Partido de la Revolucion Democrática. (01 01 2012). *PRD*. Available in [http://www.prd.org.mx/portal/documentos/historia\\_PRD.pdf](http://www.prd.org.mx/portal/documentos/historia_PRD.pdf) den 14 09 2012

Tecnológico de Monterrey. (2012). *World Internet Project, México*. Available in [wip.mx](http://www.wip.mx): <http://www.wip.mx/> 11 01 2013

Televisa s.a de c.v. (1 07 2012). *Televisa*. Available in [www.televisa.com/quienes-somos/326259/breve-historia-corporativa-grupo-televisa/](http://www.televisa.com/quienes-somos/326259/breve-historia-corporativa-grupo-televisa/) den 12 07 2012

Televisa s.a. de c.v. . (01 01 2013). *TELEVISA*. Available in [Televisa : www.televisa.com](http://www.televisa.com) 01 01 2013

Waisbord, S. (1998). Latin America. i A. Smith, *Television: An International History* (2 ed., pp. 254-263). New York: Oxford University Press.

Valdez Zurita, L. ( 01 01 2008). [www.ife.com.mx](http://www.ife.com.mx). Available in IFE: [http://www.ife.org.mx/documentos/Reforma\\_Electoral/link\\_intro.htm](http://www.ife.org.mx/documentos/Reforma_Electoral/link_intro.htm) 22 11 2012

yo soy 132 . (2012). *yo soy 132 media*. Available in <http://www.yosoy132media.org/yosoy132oficial/principios-generales-del-movimiento/> 20 09 2012

## APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX 1

Reports about the election connected with the first Debate, The protest, the Movement, Television and Internet in La Jornada.

<p><b>0110/05</b></p> <p>The period of the first debate and the discussion with Tv Azteca</p>	<p>01/05 Rechazan cambiar horario de Liguilla. Torpedean Tv Azteca y Femexfut el debate. Salinas Pliego; a candidatos, véanlos en Televisa; el Morelia-Tigres, en mi canal. El Pan intentó cambiar la fecha; lo rechazan Movimiento Progresista y Panal.</p> <p>01/05 Se pliega AN y Tv Azteca y pide aplazar el debate por el fútbol. Movimiento Progresista y Panal rechazan tal posibilidad; PRI_PVM, en veremos. Alud de críticas a Salinas Pliego en Twitter; vean el encuentro de candidatos por Televisa, responde desafiante. Transmitir el Juego, prerrogativa de la televisora: Consejeros del IFE.</p> <p>01/05 Se niegan a desechar <i>regalo</i> a televisoras.</p> <p>02/05 Censura Valdés que Tv Azteca haga prevalecer sus intereses económicos. La transmisión del fútbol a la misma hora del debate, mal mensaje para los ciudadanos, dice. La televisora apuesta por una democracia de baja intensidad; México no merece eso, advierte.</p> <p>02/05 Beltroes y Ramírez Marín justifican a la empresa de Ricardo Salinas Pliego. Exigir a la gente que vea algo es propio de regímenes autoritarios.</p> <p>02/05 Tv Azteca, la empresa que más sanciones ha recibido del IFE. En respuesta, ha emprendido campañas televisivas contra el instituto.</p> <p>04/05 Rehúye la SG ordenar cadena nacional para el debate. En estudio interno, arguye que violentaría la autonomía del IFE. Presiona PRI y concesionarios para que se rechazara la petición.</p> <p>04/05 El IFE desaprovechó el aval pleno de Los Pinos para una cadena nacional. Poiré ofreció a la institución total apoyo gubernamental si hacía la solicitud respectiva, Para evitar problemas con televisoras, la mayoría de consejeros rehusó “imponer” el enlace. “No nos creemos que somos autoridad, deploran.</p> <p>04/05 Peña Nieto y Vázquez Mota tendrán lugares contiguos en el escenario.</p> <p>04/05 Por respeto al IFE, descarta la SG ordenar la difusión en todo el país.</p> <p>02/05 Peña Nieto: corresponde al IFE buscar que el debate tenga mayor difusión. “Voy a participar; ahí estaré”, afirma el abanderado presidencial del PRI. Ofrece a líderes sindicales una alianza permanente y ser “fiel intérprete de sus anhelos”</p> <p>02/05 López Obrador pide a concesionarios difundir el debate por televisión abierta. Por vez primer miles de bajacalifornianos brindan apoyo al candidato en Tijuana. Si no lo hacen quedará demostrado que quieren imponer a Peña Nieto en Los Pinos.</p> <p>02/05 IFE: Salinas Pliego muestra su desdén por la democracia. No se moverá la hora del debate: Leonardo Valdés. López Obrador insta a Tv Azteca a rectificar.</p> <p>03/05 Desecha la petición del Movimiento Progresista y el PAN; Rehúsa el IFE pedir cadena nacional para el debate. “No está en la ley; será la cita con menor audiencia”, dice el instituto. Inexplicable que ahora el PRD “se hinque” ante el gobierno: PRI.</p> <p>03/05 Habrá “involución democrática”. Demandan partidos de izquierda que se difunda el encuentro.</p> <p>03/05 Exhorta Peña Nieto a los ciudadanos a estar pendientes del domingo. Se asume como pragmático y por encima de “dogmas, paradigmas e ideologías arcaicas”. Lanza <i>goyas</i> con integrantes de la Aapaunam; la universidad,</p>
---	---

	<p>“conciencia crítica y alma del país”</p> <p>03/05 Aún queda tiempo para que Salinas Pliego rectifica y se transmite del debate: AMLO. Masoquismo colectivo, si la ciudadanía opta por más de los mismo, pero lo respetaremos. Las trabas para difundirlo, por la preocupación sobre el desempeño de Peña Nieto, considera.</p> <p>04/05 Se confirma que televisoras están por encima del organismo electoral: AMLO. Exige dar a ciudadanos elementos para hacer elección adecuada.</p> <p>04/05 Hay “suficientes opciones” para ver la confrontación opina el PRI. Se debe respetar el derecho de quienes no quieren observar la discusión, señala.</p> <p>04/05 Necesario, analizar contrastes entre los cuatro candidatos, sostiene Narro. Cúpula empresarial insta a Tv Azteca a difundir el encuentro.</p> <p>05/05 No hay reto al Estado; el debate a muy pocos interesa: Salinas Pliego. Las transmisiones en cadena nacional “remiten a tiempos oscuros del pasado”, acusa. El <i>rating</i> no es una cosa maligna, entenderlo es respetar las preferencias de la audiencia”. El formato del encuentro, ejemplo de la degradación del discurso político, dice el empresario.</p> <p>05/05 Rechaza TEPJF ordenar la cadena nacional para el debate. El poder de televisoras “arrodilló” a IFE y Gobernación: Moreal.</p>
<p><b>0621/0506</b> The use of internet</p>	<p>06/05 Bravucos virtuales se apoderan de la batalla en las redes sociales. Conocidos como <i>trolls</i>, librarán hoy un debate paralelo al de los aspirantes presidenciales. Todos los días apoyan a sus candidatos y atacan a adversarios. El priista Enrique Peña Nieto es quien tiene más seguidores de esta clase.</p> <p>06/05 El “análisis de sentimientos” en redes sociales es vita en <i>cuartos de guerra</i>. Los aspirantes a la presidencia reciben informes cotidianos.</p> <p>07/05 Hacen de Twitter arena electoral; Afines a candidatos se confrontan en las redes.</p> <p>07/05 La mayoría de los <i>trending topics</i>, vinculados con la polémica. Twitter; la discusión derrotó al futbol.</p> <p>08/05 Quadri capitaliza en Twitter impulso del debate: Los cuatro candidatos registraron incrementos en el número de seguidores de sus cuentas den la red social, pero el aspirante de Nueva Alianza duplicó el número de seguidores el día del encuentro.</p> <p>09/05 Priistas crean portal web para comprobar que Vázquez Mota cobraba sin ir a legislar. “Mentira, su argumento de que es una persona responsable”, dice vocero del tricolor. La mayoría de las veces uno de sus ayudantes acreditó su asistencia a San Lázaro: Sherman.</p> <p>13/05 Convocan cibernautas marcha antiEPN</p> <p>14/05 Difunde el PRI en video su versión sobre visita de Peña Nieto a la Iberoamericana Omite insultos, gritos, pancartas de protesta y máscaras de Salinas de Gortari.. El candidato evalúa con sus colaboradores cercanos el rumbo de su campaña presidencial.</p> <p>14/05 Protestas contra Peña en la Ibero evidencia rechazo a política tradicional académicos.</p> <p>15/05 No somos porros ni acarreados, responden alumnos de la <i>Ibero</i> que increparon a Peña. Muestran sus credenciales en un video dirigido a cúpula y voceros de PRI y PVM.</p> <p>16/05 Alumnos de la <i>Ibero</i> recién amenazas y en respuesta colocan sus fotos en Twitter. El video donde cuestionan descalificaciones del PRI desató advertencias a los jóvenes. “Sí, sí, ya te encontramos a ti y a todos tus compañeros. Cuidado”, escribió presunto priista.</p> <p>19/05 Logran las protestas resonancia mundial en Twitter</p> <p>20/05 Anonymous <i>tira</i> página web del PRI</p> <p>21/05 Del Twitter al Zócalo a favor de López Obrador. Nueva catarsis antipriista y antitelevsiva inunda la plaza pública. Jóvenes viejos convergen en un acto de apoyo sin la presencia del candidato.</p> <p>20/05 Convocan en redes sociales a jornada mundial de movilizaciones por AMLO. Prevén marchas para hoy en París y otras 18 ciudades europeas.</p> <p>24/05 Aclaran redes sociales forma de votar por candidatos de alianzas. Hay siete formas válidas de sufragar por López Obrador.</p> <p>24/05 Advierte el <i>Observatorio Electoral</i> sobre un uso indebido de redes sociales el 1º</p>

	<p>de julio. Imposible determinar si su influencia será determinante, considera.</p> <p>26/05 Se dispara en redes sociales demanda de democratizar tv y otros medios informativos. Jóvenes convocan a asambleas en <i>islas</i> de CU y la Plaza de las Tres Culturas.</p> <p>26/05 De ganar AMLO, habrá gran cruzada nacional de “alfabetización digital”</p> <p>27/05 Desmiente el PRI convocatorias en Twitter para marcha.</p> <p>29/05 Crean, pero no ciegamente, en el poder de la comunicación de las nuevas tecnologías. Estudiantes rompen el silencio hartos de la clara parcialidad de radio y tv.</p> <p>29/05 Aumentan la percepción de que candidatos temen a internet. Los jóvenes y las redes sociales dan color a las opacas campañas políticas.</p> <p>30/05 Protestas en Chiapas.</p> <p>06/06 Las redes sociales, “secuestradas por profesionales del rumor” y la intolerancia.</p> <p>09/06 Insta Peña Nieto a cibernautas priístas a no dejarse provocar. “No somos 132 somos un chingo que estamos a tu favor le gritan.</p> <p>20/06 El debate fue primer <i>Trending topic</i> en Twitter. Sin transmisión por Tv, la audiencia puso a prueba capacidad de Internet.</p> <p>21/06 Los jóvenes “hicieron milagros con recursos limitados sostiene Google.</p>
<p><b>1210/0506</b> Protests against Peña Nieto and Mass Media</p>	<p>12/05 Por primera vez en su campaña enfrenta expresiones públicas de hostilidad. Insultos, reclamos y porras en la visita de Peña Nieto a la <i>Ibero</i>. <i>Feminicidios</i>, estancamiento educativo, Atenco, entre los temas que le criticaron. Suspende su participación en Radio de la Uia. El abanderado del PRI pide a los jóvenes valorar por quién votar.</p> <p>12/05 “A favor o en contra, no importa, son chavos interesados en la política”, destaca. Videgaray inicia control de daños: no nos sentimos agredidos, “esta es la democracia”.</p> <p>13/05 “El PRI cosecha lo que sembró” (PRD)</p> <p>13/05 Alumnos de la Uia niegan <i>montaje</i> al expresar rechazo al candidato del PRI. “Ningún partido nos organizó; somos adultos y leemos”, señalan.</p> <p>15/05 Respetaré la libre expresión de quienes no simpatizan con mi proyecto: Peña Nieto. Mi objetivo es claro; acabar con la violencia que lastima a México, dice el candidato de PRI-Verde. Llama dejar “encono” y continuar la competencia por la Presidencia “en paz y en orden”</p> <p>16/05 No siembren el odio pide el priísta.</p> <p>17/05 No caer en provocaciones de quienes van abajo en preferencias, pide Peña a priístas. En su desesperación “muestran su rostro de agresividad”, afirma en Campeche. El candidato del PRI a la presidencia acusa al PRD de promover las protestas en su contra.</p> <p>19/05 No caer en provocaciones, pide el candidato priísta a sus simpatizantes.</p> <p>19/05 PRI; panistas alientan marcha contra Peña.</p> <p>20/05 Repudian miles a Peña Nieto, televisora y PRI. Estudiantes, los protagonistas de la marcha. También protestan empresarios y obreros. El candidato priísta “tiene la <i>tele</i>; nosotros las calles y las redes”.</p> <p>20/05 Responden en casi 20 entidades a la convocatoria contra el priísta.</p> <p>20/05 Peña afirma respetar las manifestaciones en su contra.</p> <p>20/05 Grupos priístas de choque apalean a antipeñistas, mujeres y reporteros. Trabajadores municipales de Colima participan en el ataque.</p> <p>20/05 Las marchas prueban que no hay apatía de jóvenes. Interés por lo que ocurre en el país expertos.</p> <p>20/05 Diré a Calderón que me encargaré de planear el presupuesto: AMLO: Luego del triunfo, desde julio recorreré el país para recoger propuestas hacia el 2012, señala. Elogia el papel de los jóvenes contra la manipulación en tv; “se han convertido en motor del cambio.</p> <p>22/05 Protestas obligan a Peña Nieto a presentar manifiesto para respetar la libre expresión. “En una presidencia democrática no caben ni la violencia contra periodistas ni la censura”. Ofrece instancia “ciudadana y autónoma” que supervise la contratación de publicidad en los medios</p> <p>23/05 Más voces de rechazo contra el priísta.</p> <p>23/05 Legítimas, protesta de jóvenes: Beltrones</p> <p>23/05 Alumnos de escuelas públicas y privadas se manifestarán hoy en la <i>Estela de Luz</i>, Exigen transparencia informativa proceso electoral libre.</p>

	<p>23/05 “Hay un despertar ciudadano en el país; es general, es toda la población”. En la campaña vamos bien; el PRI va cayendo, dice López Obrador.</p> <p>24/05 Se solidariza la UIA con estudiantes amenazados.</p> <p>24/05 Cientos de estudiantes de 14 estados salieron a rechazar la información manipulada.</p> <p>24/05 Las movilizaciones juveniles, proceso inédito en el contexto electoral: expertos. Sus reivindicaciones recogen reclamos de todos los sectores señalan.</p> <p>25/05 Expondrá Peña ante priistas su manifiesto.</p> <p>25/05 Gritos e insultos a Peña Nieto. Protesta juvenil a las afueras del estadio municipal de Querétaro.</p> <p>25/05 Hasta en un mitin organizado por el PRI aparecieron las protestas en contra de Peña.</p> <p>26/05 Voceros del régimen los tacharán de intolerantes: AMLO a universitarios, Exige que nadie intente manipular este movimiento que es “tan limpio”</p> <p>26/05 Romper con el pasado y oír a los jóvenes, pide Peña al PRI. Respetable y genuino, el movimiento que lo ha increpado, señala. Debemos profundizar la democracia advierte en reunión con el CPN.</p> <p>26/05 Necesario que movilización ciudadana se convierta en votos en julio: IFE</p> <p>28/05 En Zacatecas, las protestas en su contra arruinan acto proselitista de Peña Nieto. Frente a la plaza de armas de esa capital colocan enormes manes en rechazo a su candidatura. “Déjenlos que se manifiesten; no caigamos en provocaciones”, pidió el priísta a sus seguidores.</p> <p>31/05 Impidió la juventud que se impusiera la “república de la televisión”: AMLO. Se abrirán las normales rurales, dice a simpatizantes que piden reapertura de El Mexe. Los estudiantes se percataron que los concesionarios querían en la silla a Peña Nieto, sostiene.</p> <p>31/05 Caen “barreras artificiales entre universidades públicas y privadas. “Somos herederos de los fraudes y las crisis económicas afirman estudiantes.</p> <p>02/06 Aflora el repudio lagunero.</p> <p>03/06 Se movilizan mexicanos en Madrid y repudian el posible retorno del PRI.</p> <p>03/06 Marchan estudiantes en diversos estados contra Televisa y Peña Nieto.</p> <p>02/06 Marchas en Morelos contra el aspirante priísta y en demanda de comicios limpios.</p> <p>04/06 Simpatizantes de AMLO realizaron marcha de apoyo en Juárez; Dos protestas en QR.</p> <p>10/06 Cientos de estudiantes se movilizan en Acapulco contra las cadenas de tv.</p> <p>05/06 Quienes dominan México no contaron con el despertar de los jóvenes asegura AMLO.</p> <p>15/06”Insuficiente, que la juventud se movilice y acabe con el mito de que es apática e individualista”</p> <p>24/06 EPN: protestas no decidirán elección. Pide al magisterio su “voto de confianza”; respetará autonomía.</p>
<p><b>1730/0506</b> Yo Soy 132</p>	<p>17/05 Constituyen alumnos de la <i>Ibero</i> red estudiantil por democracia. Plantea acercarse a miembros de otras universidades, públicas y privadas. Busca abrir espacio a la discusión de ideas y a la información del ciudadano</p> <p>18/05 Estudiantes de la Uia convocan marcha pacífica.</p> <p>19/05 Difunden los jóvenes su código ético.</p> <p>19/05 Cese de manipulación informativa en campañas, piden universitarios. Los estudiantes exigen a medios de comunicación que “se diga la verdad y no mientan”. En las manifestaciones participaron grupos de la <i>Ibero</i>, la <i>Anáhuac</i> y el <i>Tec</i> de Monterrey. Las consignas: “Somos estudiantes, no porros”; “Televisa te idiotiza, Tv Azteca te apendeja”.</p> <p>24/05 Democratizar medios de comunicación, clamor de Yo soy 132. Cuestionan la relación Peña-Televisa. De nueva cuenta miles de jóvenes saltaron de la Internet a la vía pública. Mitin deviene en marcha. Protesta pasa por Chapultepec 18.</p> <p>25/05 Llama Yo Soy 132 a dar un apagón a Televisa y Tv Azteca el 30 de Mayo. Através de las redes sociales la coalición interuniversitaria convoca a realizarlo de 19 a 21 horas. La acción forma parte de las demandas para impulsar la democratización de los medios señala. Se analiza recabar más de un millón de firmas para pedir a la ONU observadores electorales.</p>

	<p>26/05 Nadie Manipula a alumnos de la <i>ibero</i>, asegura rector Morales. El subsecretario Yuirán se declara parte de Yo Soy 132.</p> <p>26/05 Descarta el PRI blindar actos de Peña Nieto; critica <i>provocaciones</i>. La Cámara de Diputados ofrece espacio para que universitarios expresen opiniones. Luisa María Calderón se proclama “la 133”, lo que causa protestas en Twitter.</p> <p>27/05 Acuerdan universitarios: el movimiento será plural y apartidista, no apolítico. Rechazan la imposición de Peña Nieto por la clase político-empresarial. “Salir de las redes y hacer contacto con la gente en las calles”, otro pacto.</p> <p>27/05 Arrancan un arduo proceso que busca definir criterios y acciones comunes. El movimiento Yo Soy 132 saca de un prolongado letargo a alumnos de la UNAM.</p> <p>27/05 Priistas agreden a miembros de Yo Soy 132 que buscaban entrar a acto del mexicano.</p> <p>30/05 Victoria, que debate se transmite en canales 2 y 13; vamos por la cadena nacional: Yo Soy 132. “Somos pacíficos; no nos vamos a sumar a ningún partido y mucho menos a un grupo violento”. Alistan propuestas con el fin de reformar los procedimientos para otorgar concesiones de radio y tv.</p> <p>31/05 Yo Soy 132 rechaza el regreso del viejo régimen, “cuyo rostro actual” es Peña Nieto. Exigen juicio político contra Calderón, el candidato priista y Gordillo</p> <p>01/06 El PRI respeta las opiniones de Yo Soy 132, pero no las comparte. Algunos señalamientos están fuera de la realidad, afirma vocero.</p> <p>02/06 Académicos de UNAM y Uia protestan en el IFE en apoyo a alumnos de Yo Soy 132.</p> <p>03/06 “Soy 132 por la miseria que veo”</p> <p>03/06 Yo Soy 132, positivo para la democracia si no se partidiza, coinciden en el IFE. Es innegable que alentarán a los ciudadanos a votar, dicen consejeros y representantes. Son jóvenes que no se conforman con lo que oyen en los medios; deben atenderse sus reclamos.</p> <p>03/06 A diferencia de las luchas de los años 60, ahora el enemigo a vencer son los medios, expertos. Yo Soy 132 ha roto las barreras de las clases sociales, “la desesperanza es igual para todos. Son jóvenes preparados, lo que impide que sean engañados fácilmente, dice académica del Tec.</p> <p>06/06 El movimiento Yo Soy 132 acuerda que no llamará a votar por ningún partido. Integra la Asamblea Universitaria General, que será el máximo órgano de decisión.</p> <p>07/06 Frente a oficinas de Cofetel Yo Soy 132 exige democratizar medios informativos.</p> <p>08/06 Integrantes de Yo Soy 132 protestan en mitin de Peña Nieto en Chalco.</p> <p>10/06 El movimiento Yo Soy 132 demanda a periodistas reflejar la verdad del país.</p> <p>11/06 No más PRI demanda el Yo Soy 132 en Guadalajara.</p> <p>13/06 Yo Soy 132 despertador de las conciencias: López Obrador.</p> <p>14/06 Yo Soy 132 pide “Apagar la Tv y encender la verdad”</p> <p>17/06 Trascender la coyuntura electoral, demanda Vallejo al Yo Soy 132; “la batalla será difícil”. A lo que nos enfrentamos no son poderes nacionales, sino mundiales, opina líder estudiantil. Los movimientos estudiantiles de Chile y México herederos del zapatismo: Gónzales Casanova.</p> <p>19/06 Pide Yo Soy 132 a todos los canales transmitir el debate. Reitera el carácter apartidista y pacífico del movimiento estudiantil.</p> <p>19/06 Se deslinda Yo Soy 132 de audios editados.</p> <p>20/06 El debate de Yo soy 132. Ejercen jóvenes su derecho de réplica ante tres candidatos. Colocan carpeta con preguntas en el lugar que Peña Nieto dejó vacío. López Obrador, Vázquez Mota y Quadri reiteran sus propuestas.</p> <p>20/06 Por primera vez esto no fue un monólogo: estudiantes.</p> <p>20/06 Se logró imparcialidad, afirman</p> <p>21/06 PRI, PAN y PRD felicitan a Yo Soy 132.</p> <p>21/06 Temen estudiantes que se dé mal uso a datos de página web. Recomiendan a los usuarios no visitar el sitio “yo soy 132.mx”</p> <p>22/06 Correa: La rebelión de Yo Soy 132 ejemplo para AL.</p>
--	--

	<p>29/06 Yo soy 132 critica en Televisa, Banamex, Telmex la concentración de la riqueza Son consorcios representativos del sistema que ha hecho que aumente la pobreza, señalan. Durante la Cadena Nacional por una democracia real expone los <i>Saldos del neoliberalismo</i>.</p> <p>30/06 Niega el IFE a Yo Soy 132 permiso especial para observar los computes de sufragios.</p> <p>28/05 “Nadie debe tratar de manipular la expresión limpia de los estudiantes”. Deben mantener su movimiento por la vía pacífica, dice el tabasqueño.</p> <p>09/06 Arrestan en Juárez a adeptos de Yo Soy 132.</p>
<p><b>1027/0506</b> Television and Televisa</p>	<p>10/05 Choque IFE-TEPJF favorece a Tv Azteca. Magistrados consideran “inconsistencias” en multa a la televisora</p> <p>11/05 Demanda esclarecer por qué el priista niega contratos con Televisa. Renuncio si Peña prueba que gasté 800 millones en publicidad: AMLO.</p> <p>12/05 Canal 11 y la CIRT, entre los posibles organizadores del segundo debate.</p> <p>13/05 Rechaza el PRD injerencia privada en la producción televisiva del próximo debate.</p> <p>17/05 La periodista recibe apoyo de PRI, PAN y Movimiento Progresista. Televisa se deslinda del desplegado contra Carmen Aristegui, pero lo avala (Nota de la relación Televisa-EPN).</p> <p>21/05 La tv pretende un fraude anticipado: el candidato. Pide López Obrador no caer en provocaciones.</p> <p>26/05 Cientos de estudiantes se movilizan en Cuernavaca contra Peña Nieto. Protesta frete a las oficinas de Televisa Morelos.</p> <p>08/06 Documenta <i>The Guardian</i> la colusión Televisa – Peña. Presenta pruebas de plan para desprestigiar a López Obrador.</p> <p>08/06 Respuesta de la Televisora.</p> <p>09/06 Hay “evidencia” de pagos a Televisa por apoyo a Peña, señala el rotativo británico. El dinero reporta que parte de los datos difundidos fueron proporcionados por un ex empleado de la televisora; éste insiste en rechazar la información.</p> <p>09/06 Laura Barraco divulga <i>chat</i> que sostuvo con el conductor. Ex colaboradora de Loret aporta datos sobre el supuesto pacto televisora-Peña.</p> <p>09/06 Es un refrito sin sustento y parte de la <i>guerra sucia</i> de la campaña: Peña Nieto. Son los mismos documentos que López Obrador llevó al debate de candidatos, señala. La información veraz sobre contratos con medios está en la página del gobierno mexiquense.</p> <p>09/06 El PRD interpondrá denuncia contra el Revolucionario Institucional y Peña. Tiene facultades el IFE para solicitar información a Televisa afirman consejeros.</p> <p>09/06 Televisa lamenta “sesgo informativo”</p> <p>09/06 Son los mismos documentos que López Obrador llevó al debate de candidatos, señala. Es un refrito sin sustento y parte de la <i>guerra sucia</i> de la campaña: Peña Nieto. La “información veraz” sobre contratos con medios está en la página del gobierno mexiquense.</p> <p>09/06 AMLO exige al priista difundir sus contratos con la televisora. Demanda al mexiquense revelar además sus viajes por el mundo. Afirma que el aspirante del <i>tricolor</i> se hospedó en un hotel de París que cuesta 20 mil por noche.</p> <p>27/06 Unidad secreta de Televisa operó en 2009 a favor de Peña: <i>The Guardian</i></p> <p>27/06 Son legales los contratos de Esmas: Televisa.</p> <p>10/06 Promoción personal para apuntalarse en el proceso actual, arguye. Presenta PRD queja contra Peña Nieto por contratar espacios en radio y tv.</p>

## APPENDIX 2

Reports about the election connected with the first Debate, The protest, the Movement, Television and Internet in El Universal.

<p><b>0110/05</b></p> <p>The period of the first debate and the discussion with Tv Azteca</p>	<p>01/05 Televisoras no transmitirán debate en canales estelares.  02/05 IFE: un reto a la autoridad, la actitud de televisora.  02/05 AMLO pide a TV Azteca a difundir el debate  02/05 Tv Azteca reta a la autoridad: IFE  03/05 Desechan debate en cadena nacional.  03/05 EPN pide ver el debate y contrastar ideas  04/05 SG exhorta a medios a unirse a transmisión.  05/05 Debate no va por cadena nacional: Trife  05/05 AMLO pide a Tv azteca difundir el debate  8/05 Preven aspirantes cambiar formato del próximo debate.  08/05 Equipos de campaña ya operan cambios al formato.  09/05 Conciliacion tras comicios, pide Peña.  09/05 IFE gastó 3,9 mdp en debate, reportan  12/06 Logran rating “histórico” (DEBATE)</p>
<p><b>0621/0506</b></p> <p>The use of internet</p>	<p>07/05 Candidatos también compiten en las redes.  07/05 Hacen de Twitter arena electoral.  11/05 Preparan alumnos de la Ibero “bienvenida a Peña.  06/06 Twitter, espacio para “ciberbulliing” político.  09/06 “No somos bots, somos de verdad” (EPN en redes)  30/07 IFE y Google ofrecen cifras en tiempo real.</p>
<p><b>1210/0506</b></p> <p>Protests against Peña Nieto and Mass Media</p>	<p>12/05 Mantuvo calma en mar de pasiones.  12/05 Peña ofrece respeto a las voces críticas.  13/05 Peña fue un diálogo franco en la Ibero. Pide investigar a fondo la deuda ilegal de Coahuila.  ocial.  18/05 Estudiantes marchan hoy por “derecho a información”; exigen equidad informativa. Alumnos de la UNAM, Tec de Monterrey, Universidad Anáhuac, Iberoamericana y del ITAM, exigen una cobertura informativa equilibrada del proceso electoral. Van a Televisa.  19/05 Universitarios exigen equidad informativa. Acusa que hay sesgo informativo en la cobertura de campañas presidenciales. Aseguran que esta marcha es el primer paso de un gran movimiento nacional de jóvenes en todo el país.  20/05 JVM pide tomar calles; EPN: respeto protestas. En Michoacan, la aspirante a Los Pinos recordó que los fines de semana se organizan marchas en diferentes estados para evitar el retorno del PRI  20/05 Jóvenes motor de cambio.  20/05 Miles protestan contra el PRI  20/05 Respetaré protestas en mi contra: Peña Nieto.  20/05 Josefina arenga a manifestarse.  21/05 Celebran marchas; piden no polarizar. Los candidatos presidenciales JVM y AMLO celebraron la realización de marchas contra el aspirante EPN, encabezadas por jóvenes, pero llamaron a evitar la confrontación y la manipulación de las expresiones.  21/05 Peña minimiza descalificaciones.  21/05 Ellos tiene la tv, nosotros a la gente” (AMLO)  22/05 Peña presenta decálogo por “presidencia democrática”  22/05 Peña no revivan pasados superados</p>

	<p>22/05 Los jóvenes son el cambio AMLO  23/05 Nadie detendrá este movimiento, alumnos de Ibero.  23/05 AMLO ganará por los jóvenes.  25/05 Pide De la Fuente escuchar a jóvenes.  25/05 Estudiantes ven éxito en movilización.  27/05 Narro: Jóvenes son el presente.  30/05 Pide EPN no generar odio en campaña.  31/05 Jóvenes evitaron la imposición: AMLO. El abanderado celebra decisión de transmitir debate por canales de mayor alcance.  24/06 EPN: protestas no decidirán elección. Pide al magisterio su “voto de confianza”; respetará autonomía.  01/07 Boletas y no bloqueos definen comicios.  02/07 Ningún regreso al pasado, asegura Peña Nieto. PRI arriba en 3 estados: PRD-PT en 1 y AN en 1.</p>
<p><b>1730/0506</b> Yo Soy 132</p>	<p>24/05 Jóvenes pugnan por un voto informado. Bajo la etiqueta yo soy 132, llaman a través de las redes a manifestarse.  24/05 Exigen equidad de medios.  26/05 Jóvenes alistan lineamientos y estatutos de su movimiento. Los integrantes de Yo Soy 132 es posible que avalen este fin de semana sus estatutos, entre ellos que integran un movimiento apartidista, mas no apolítico; se esperan que el proceso de diálogo se consolide al interior del IPN o UNAM. Los jóvenes piden a políticos no colgarse de su proyecto.  28/05 Yo Soy 132 confirma su posición anti-Peña Nieto.  29/05 Segob atiende a Yo Soy 132  30/05 Yo Soy 132: movimiento apenas inicia. Miembros del colectivo Yo soy 132 declararon que el movimiento no termina con las elecciones en México. Estudiantes de la Universidad Iberoamericana dijeron que trabajan en propuestas educativas y de seguridad durante un foro en EL UNIVERSAL.  30/05 Yo Soy 132 busca que jóvenes voten informados.  31/05 Yo Soy 132 derriba muros.  01/06 Yo Soy 132 plantea a IFE tercer debate.  04/06 Iglesia respalda Yo Soy 132.  06/06 Yo Soy 132 aprueba su modelo de organización.  07/06 Yo Soy 132 pide debatir con candidatos a Los Pinos.  09/06 Mas de 131 definió el formato del debate.  10/06 Yo Soy 132, un objetivo diversas afines. Unidos por su descontento ante la falta de equidad en la contienda electoral que se libra en los medios de comunicación, los jóvenes que lideran este movimiento, comparten además una vida marcada por el deseo de dar la batalla para erradicar la corrupción y la desigualdad social que ven en el país.  10/06 Hijo de AMLO, con Yo Soy 132  08/07 López Obrador, Vázquez Mota y Quadri debatirán con Mas de 131  12/06 Universitarios afinan debate.  13/06 Se deslindan de agresiones a Peña (132)  14/06 Yo soy 132 viaja en Metro con manifestación silenciosa. Con cajas de cartón, pintura y plumones de colores elaboraron unas “televisiones”, con consignas del movimiento Yo soy 132 y Yo si leo, no veo Televisa.  15/06 Llaman a proteger a activistas de Mas de 131  16/06 Piden debate con Yo Soy 132 en Tv.  17/06 Artistas respaldan a Yo Soy 132.  19/06 Yo soy 132 se deslinda de joven universitario ligado con la izquierda.  20/06 Exponen ideas ante jóvenes de Yo soy 132. Tres de los cuatro aspirantes presidenciales respondieron cuestionamientos en temas de seguridad, educación, ciencia, salud, arte, cultura y sustentabilidad; los candidatos felicitaros la aportación democrática que representó este intercambio de ideas.  20/06 Peña explica su rechazo al debate de Yo Soy 132.  21/06 Experto: memorable, el Debate 132.  25/06 Fox: medios crearon Yo Soy 132</p>

	28/07 Yo Soy 132 quiere una ciudadanía crítica. 29/07 Descarta Yo Soy 132 marcha politizada
<b>1027/0506</b> Televison and Televisa	14/05 Dan radio y tv tiempo igual a EPN y Josefina. Consiguen 30%, seguidos de AMLO con 25% reporte. 28/05 IFE: tiene EPN mayor presencia en medios. 29/05 Televisa abre su canal 2 al debate 01/06 Pide FCH a medios objetividad en comicios. 03/06 Ve un complot de medios en su contra. 10/06 Denuncia PRD a EPN por “The Guardian” 11/06 FCH responde a AMLO (en twitter). 11/06 FCH replica vía Twitter dato de AMLO en debate. Calderón escribió a su cuenta de Twitter lo siguiente, con lo cual evidenció públicamente que estuvo al tanto del debate: “Si el gobierno despidiera a todos los altos funcionarios, de director a Presidente ahorraría 2000 mdp. ½ sueldo: 1000 m”

### APPENDIX 3

#### Time line of events

#### FIRST DEBATE; MAY 6<sup>th</sup>

1 to 10 Mayo

It is discussed the attitudes of Tv Azteca. IFE argued that there exist enough channels to guarantee the population watch the debate.

#### PROTESTS

11 al 20 de Mayo

Several protests are convoked on the internet. The protests are against Peña Nieto and against Mass media corporation especially against Televisa.

#### THE MOVEMENT 132 RISES

21al 31 de Mayo

The movement rises. The media covered the first meetings and the process almost day by day.

#### SECOND, DEBATE 10 of Juny.

1 al 10 de Junio

Television corporations screened the debate; Televisa screened it in cannal two arguing it has listened to the population. Tv Azteca argued that it would screen the debate because there was not longer football. The movement argue that it was a triumph of the movement.

#### DEBATE YO SOY 132;19 de Junio

11 al 20 de Junio

The first political debate organized by students and presented in You Tube.

#### BALLOTS FIRS OF JULY

De 21 de Junio al 1 de Julio

PRI won the elections. The IFE reported that the participation reach historical levels. In some states, it is reported that the participation was about 80 per cent.

## APPENDIX 4

Audio-visual resources available on You Tube and shared by Televisa and IFE Debates

Description	Link	Date
López Obrador ask for forgiveness and declare that what he did in 2006 was in favour of the democracy and to preserve the peace	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=85hKTI ZRSuc">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=85hKTI ZRSuc</a>	05/2012
PRD presents historical heroes that are connected with López Obrador	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YtAkq Nt6NCU&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YtAkq Nt6NCU&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B</a>	05/2012
López Obrador presents his son, and talks about the changes that Mexico needs in relation to the security for the children	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NJ1g7 H2V_y0&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NJ1g7 H2V_y0&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B</a>	05/2012
PRD presents a students that talk about why they would vote for López Obrador	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fTqeI7 T5nGQ&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fTqeI7 T5nGQ&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B</a>	06/2012
PRD presents a students that talk about why she would vote for López Obrador	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QZgU Bu-U9aU&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QZgU Bu-U9aU&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B</a>	06/2012
Mentioning the names of the states that conform the republic, he walks and says thank you for the opportunity to contend.	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jqMAD 33ZSQ8&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jqMAD 33ZSQ8&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B</a>	05/2012
Peña Nieto talks about his family and his origins	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OTfQs aHvR-c">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OTfQs aHvR-c</a>	05/2012
In a car in movement, Peña Nieto talks about the changes he would made if he became president	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gArZvz xAE9I&amp;list=SPFE43D1CC99A1FC05&amp;index=90">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gArZvz xAE9I&amp;list=SPFE43D1CC99A1FC05&amp;index=90</a>	06/2012
Peña Nieto makes reference of the past and that he would be a democratic president	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zOj0tlx -JQM&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zOj0tlx -JQM&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B</a>	06/2012
Peña Nieto talks with a family	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ilB6_u H-pQc&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ilB6_u H-pQc&amp;list=PLD3E597157C7D420B</a>	06/2012
First debate in the Mexican Election of 2012	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rjzr7Tf Y5Zw&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE&amp;index=1">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rjzr7Tf Y5Zw&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE&amp;index=1</a>	06/05/2012
Note about the visit of Peña Nieto to the Iberoamericana University in Televisa in Noticiero con Joaquín López-Dóriga	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e_A3Q syQHIM&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e_A3Q syQHIM&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE</a>	12/05/2012
Answer of 131 students to the PRI's president	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P7Xbo cXsFkI">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P7Xbo cXsFkI</a>	14/05/2012
Tercer Grado, about the campaigns and the protest in the Iberoamericana University	<a href="http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/tercer-grado/173272/las-campanas/">http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/tercer-grado/173272/las-campanas/</a>	17/05/2012
Note about the protest in the The Televisa corporative buildings and studios on Televisa in Noticiero con Joaquín López-Dóriga	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GbOc MFoEXw&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE&amp;index=15">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GbOc MFoEXw&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE&amp;index=15</a>	18/05/2012
Interview with students of the Iberoamericana University at the beginning of the movement Yo Soy 132 in Primero Noticias22	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M8ERz pQ_qvA">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M8ERz pQ_qvA</a>	/05/2012
Protest of the movement 132 presenting their demands, aims and goals	<a href="http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/noticiero-con-joaquin-lopez-doriga/174225/manifestaciones-del-movimiento-yo-soy-132/">http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/noticiero-con-joaquin-lopez-doriga/174225/manifestaciones-del-movimiento-yo-soy-132/</a>	23/05/2012
“Manifest” of the movement 132 presented in Noticieros Televisa	<a href="http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/noticias-y-reportajes/174205/manifiesto-jovenes-yo-soy-132/">http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/noticias-y-reportajes/174205/manifiesto-jovenes-yo-soy-132/</a>	23/05/2012
Teaser of the protest in Televisa on Primero Noticias, because the presence of Peña Nieto in the program Tercer Grado	<a href="http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/primero-noticias/174227/avance-del-24-mayo/#">http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/primero-noticias/174227/avance-del-24-mayo/#</a>	24/05/2012

Peña Nieto in Tercer Grado.	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tXuXC92tZgc&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE&amp;index=23">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tXuXC92tZgc&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE&amp;index=23</a>	24/05/2012
Comments about the visit of the Candidate Peña Nieto on Tercer Grado	<a href="http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/tercer-grado/175082/pena-nieto-tercer-grado/">http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/tercer-grado/175082/pena-nieto-tercer-grado/</a>	30/05/2012
López Obrador on Tercer Grado	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KeyD5coar2s">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KeyD5coar2s</a>	06/06/2012
Comments of López Obrador about his visit to the program Tercer Grado on Noticiero con Joaquín López-Dóriga and commentaries about the openness of Televisa.	<a href="http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/noticiero-con-joaquin-lopez-doriga/176119/amlo-habla-tercer-grado/#">http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/noticiero-con-joaquin-lopez-doriga/176119/amlo-habla-tercer-grado/#</a>	07/06/2012
Second Debate in the Mexican Election of 2012	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QdbyBP_Yw_E&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE&amp;index=2">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QdbyBP_Yw_E&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE&amp;index=2</a>	10/06/2012
Commentaries about the visit of the López Obrador to Tercer Grado by the Journalists in Tercer Grado	<a href="http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/tercer-grado/176977/ecos-amlo-tercer-grado-y-debate/">http://tvolucion.esmas.com/noticieros/tercer-grado/176977/ecos-amlo-tercer-grado-y-debate/</a>	13/06/2012
Debate Yo Soy 132. Debate organized by the movement with the participation of three of four candidates	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5yyUbF_hswI&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5yyUbF_hswI&amp;list=PL19B550DE732784BE</a>	20/06/2012