

Dateline Mexico by Jacobo Frontoni

The President and the terrorist

The Mexican President's biographer is the coordinator of the São Paulo Forum's Narco-Terrorist International.

At an official ceremony at Los Pinos, the Mexican presidential residence, the sole surviving founding member of the Sandinista National Liberation Front of Nicaragua (FSLN), Tomás Borge, presented Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari with a copy of Borge's authorized biography of Salinas, *Salinas, the Dilemmas of Modernity*, the Mexican press reported Oct. 19. Shortly afterwards, at the presentation of the book to the general public, Regino Díaz Redondo, director of the Mexico City daily *Excelsior*, described the book as "an unusual document" because it is the first time that "a sensitive ex-guerrilla has become an interviewer."

To be sure, the book is unusual—but for other reasons. The most unusual aspect is that a sitting Mexican President, who is Wall Street's darling and model for the Third World, would agree to have his biography written at all, and, with his cooperation, by someone who had not only been interior minister for the FSLN's Marxist dictatorship, but who now serves as the coordinator of the Narco-Terrorist International recently relaunched by Fidel Castro under the innocuous name of the "São Paulo Forum."

As *EIR* has previously reported, last May 23, Borge was the first person on the scene (at the crack of dawn and still in his pajamas) of an explosion of a secret underground arsenal in Managua, Nicaragua's capital, which belonged to the terrorists of neighboring El Salvador, the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN). The discovery of this arse-

nal led to the uncovering of a terrorist operation, including kidnappings, of continental proportions.

What is also unusual are the confessions of affinity which Salinas, Borge, and other leaders of the São Paulo Forum give for the new world order.

In his book, Borge writes, "When Carlos Salinas gave his March 4, 1992 speech, in which he described his reform of the Mexican Revolution, many were surprised to hear the bugle call of so-called 'social liberalism.' . . . Neo-liberals, by conventional wisdom, are cruel, insensitive and insatiable. This is not a half-truth, it is a given. . . . Therefore, if social liberalism is invoked against neo-liberalism, it could be said, and it makes sense, that it has created expectations among some revolutionaries and impoverished sectors of the population who have an inkling of the Mexican reforms."

The São Paulo Forum also rails against neo-liberalism, i.e., free trade, only to agree in the next breath with the austerity conditionalities of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and with paying the usurious foreign debt.

According to Borge, "Salinas's fears concerning the coming to power [in Mexico] of the forces of the so-called right and left are deeper than is generally known. The victory of the right would signify subordination to the United States and a concentration of wealth in the hands of a handful of magnates. The victory of the left, paradoxically, would jeopardize the sovereignty of the country. The left

would want to show at all cost that they are not so ferocious, not so dangerous, not such an enemy of the order dictated by the United States, and, in fact, such behavior would lead toward making concessions."

But, what fears? Would this be more subordination and loss of sovereignty than Salinas has already brought about with the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)? What fear of "a handful of magnates," when Salinas and the ruling PRI party recently asked about 30 of them for millions of dollars each to finance the PRI? And concerning the left, aren't the Inter-American Dialogue and the State Department the ones promoting the presidential candidates of the São Paulo Forum, based on the fact that the Forum agrees with NAFTA, the IMF, and more? Isn't Fidel Castro himself imposing austerity measures on Cuba that are at once Maoist and free trade, dollarizing the economy, and increasing tourism and prostitution on a huge scale, not to mention the ubiquitous drug trade?

This is coherent with the well-known fact that Salinas's Maoist Pronasol program of "self-help" public works has dozens of "former" communist leaders and "ex"-terrorists employed in leading posts, and the fact that the Maoist terrorist *Antorcha Campesina* organization is part of the PRI, and that the National Peasant Federation, which is also part of the PRI, has as its leader one Hugo Andrés Araujo, a veteran of communist, Maoist organizations.

Borge fawns, perhaps because of terrorist links: "The PRI, on the other hand, has nothing to prove: It is nationalist, and this is known to all; it is populist despite its new support for free market economics, and this obligates it to respond to social needs. . . . Solidarity [Pronasol] is supposed to be the visible face of social equity."