Press Briefing

A program to stop the AIDS pandemic

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Mr. LaRouche is a candidate for the Democratic Party's 1988 U.S. presidential nomination. The following discussion is excerpted from the second in a series of occasional press briefings by the candidate, dated July 1.

As of this past week, public-health policy in the matter of AIDS has become a leading issue of the 1988 presidential campaign. The November 1986 California ballot will carry a proposition requiring that AIDS be classified as a dangerous communicable disease. One hundred and fifty thousand homosexuals paraded, denouncing me, in Los Angeles during the middle of the week, and there were much smaller demonstrations against me in San Francisco and New York City this past Sunday. Meanwhile, in Paris, the World Health Organization (WHO) began to admit publicly, for the first time, that AIDS is a major threat to life among the normal members of the world’s population.

The population is beginning to be strongly polarized around the AIDS issue, and the personal attacks on me on this issue are now threatening to dominate the 1988 presidential campaign, as well as influencing marginally the November 1985 elections. In addition to the attacks on me by homosexual parades, there have been hysterical statements by politicians and some newspapers. Meanwhile, it is estimated that about 4 million Americans will die of AIDS or AIDS-related causes by 1990, and at least a million such deaths during the coming 12 to 18 months; barring a thermonuclear war, AIDS will soon be the leading cause of death in the United States, unless effective measures are taken to stop the spread of this pandemic. A politician’s stand on AIDS will soon be the leading domestic issue in an increasingly polarized environment.

It is safe to predict that a majority of the voters will soon demand support for my policies on AIDS. Polls taken by some news media in California are already indicating such a trend. A growing percentile of homosexuals will be included among those supporting these policies. It is also expected, unfortunately, that there will be a rather violent minority which denounces me for my public-health policy on AIDS.

In light of these political developments, honest journalists and editors will begin to break the black-out on the facts about AIDS. As the facts about AIDS become better known, the reason that AIDS has become a major political issue internationally will begin to become better understood. For the sake of those who are interested, I summarize the basic presently known facts about AIDS, and then describe the two reasons AIDS has become a leading policy-issue for the 1988 presidential campaign.

Facts about AIDS

My knowledge about AIDS is based on the work of a special scientific task-force, which has been working for about a year, reviewing the facts with leading medical specialists around the world. Recent developments confirm the accuracy of what I published on this issue last September and October, but there have been more recent discoveries which enable me to report the facts with better precision than was possible with the knowledge available to scientific specialists nine months ago.

AIDS is the most diabolically clever kind of fatal infection which is ever known to have attacked the human population. To the best of our knowledge, AIDS is approximately 100% fatal to those who contract the infection, and every person infected is an active carrier of the disease to unsuspecting contacts, even before the infected carrier presents AIDS or AIDS-related symptoms. One of the reasons AIDS is so diabolical, is that it is a slow-incubation infection; the present estimate is, that, on the average, an infected person will carry the disease for about four years before coming down with symptoms, and will die within about a year or so after coming down with the symptoms. This means that millions of infected persons walk around, infecting others for about four years each, before showing symptoms of the infection.

The popularized assumptions about the possibility of communicating the infection, are dangerously false. Casual communication of the infection by an unsuspecting carrier to an unsuspecting victim, is highly likely. Under certain conditions, the infection can be communicated as an air-borne disease. In black Africa, there are at least 30 million cases of infections. Most of those infected are not classifiable as members of what the U.S. Centers for Disease Control list as "high-risk categories," such as male homosexuals and drug users. In the United States, among sections of the very poor living in the insect-bite belts of the Caribbean and Atlantic coastal states, we have an explosion of AIDS among local populations who do not fit any of the CDC "high-risk" classifications. Exactly what the probabilities are, we do not know presently, chiefly because our government has failed
to conduct the necessary kinds of investigations, and has even attempted to prevent such investigations; we do have conclusive proof that casual transmission of the infection is the normal method by which the infection is carried to persons who are neither homosexuals nor drug-users.

The best estimate available so far, is that the number of persons infected with AIDS in the U.S.A. is not less than 4 million persons, and that the rate of infection is doubling approximately every six to eight months.

These estimates suggest, that Americans dying of AIDS or AIDS-related causes during 1986, are, on the average, those who contracted the infection during 1981 or 1982. This also means that at least one-third of the 4 million presently infected will die during the coming two years, and nearly all of them within four years. It means that, under present medical and public-health conditions, the death-rates caused by AIDS will double, triple, or even quadruple every year, and will soon become the leading cause of death among younger American adults.

Unless we do two things, as a matter of policy, the entire U.S. population could be wiped out by about the end of this century. First, we must isolate and treat all carriers of the infection. Second, we must launch a “crash program” of research and treatment for AIDS infection and symptoms, whatever cost such a program entails.

The medical research and treatment programs must center around two general objectives. First, we must aim to suppress the infection. This means attempting to prevent a person already infected from continuing to be a carrier of the infection. It also means attempting to suppress the growth of the disease in the person already infected. Second, our “crash program” must aim to develop both cure and innoculation for the infection. There are already some promising lines of research in both directions, some more promising, some less so; the amount being spent on this disease is so pitifully small that we must describe our government’s present AIDS program as a grim joke.

An issue of economic policy

At present, detection and isolation of persons infected with AIDS is our first line of national defense. We have no cure, and we have no assured method of treatment to suppress the infection. Every person infected with AIDS is, however innocently, a menace to hundreds or thousands of unsuspecting other citizens. Humane isolation and treatment of persons infected with AIDS means the kind of cost per person we associate with tuberculosis sanatoria; with not less than 4 million Americans already infected, this means many billions of dollars, much less than the hundreds of billions Americans are spending annually on their recreational-drug habits.

In the present budget-balancing hysteria, our government does not wish to hear about spending such sums, no matter how many millions of Americans die because of such stubborn neglect.

A “crash program” for medical research, is also a multibillion-dollar effort. It means reviving those institutions which the United States closed down over the 1969-72 period as a result of Henry A. Kissinger’s negotiations with Moscow; it means matching the Soviets’ work in their 10 major immunological centers. It means cranking up medical and biological training-programs, as well as promoting research by a wide range of kinds of laboratory programs, all of which have significant bearing on the study and conquest of this and related diseases.

AIDS is the greatest danger the human race has ever faced, potentially a greater menace to life on Earth than a full-scale thermonuclear war. However, we are faced with early spread of new varieties of deadly epidemics from Africa, including the dreaded Lassa FEVER, according to scientific reports delivered to a recent Paris conference. Meanwhile, inside the United States, we already have major outbreaks of new strains of tuberculosis, and of new varieties of familiar diseases we thought we had brought under control earlier during this century. It is the poor who suffer the greatest degree of threat from all of these infections, AIDS included; but, once these diseases gain a large foothold among the urban poor, they spread rapidly to the population in general.

We need a “crash program” of national defense against infectious disease, and against diseases of aging of tissue, such as cancer and cardiovascular diseases. Assuming that we conquer AIDS during the coming 5 to 10 years, as we could surely do with a “crash program,” we still need these same institutions of research and care as our national defense against all dangerous forms of new and old diseases.

Today, there is a great hullabaloo around government, over a few billions spent on national defense, and a refusal even to discuss the expenditure for AIDS so urgently needed. At the same time, we are spending only a few tens of millions on fighting an annual U.S. expenditure for recreational drugs running into the hundreds of billions. Not only are our citizens and children paying hundreds of billions of dollars annually for recreational drugs; this is the major cause of street-crime and related forms of crime, and costs our society many, many billions of dollars through other effects. So far, despite the dedicated efforts of a few public servants and other citizens’ groups, our national war on drugs is a bad joke, even by comparison with the Nixon administration’s program. So far, there are only token, slap-on-the-wrist treatments of major financial interests involved in drug-money laundering, while influential groups, such as the Inter-American Dialogue organization, propose to legalize the cocaine, marijuana, and heroin traffic into the United States. The argument, that we can not afford adequate national defense, can not afford a “crash program” against AIDS, is naked hypocrisy when seen in light of the expenditure for drugs.
Beyond this sort of hypocrisy around Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, the reason our government is refusing to face the issues of both national defense and AIDS, is that our Liberal officers, is still insisting that our government and Federal Reserve continue those monetary and economic policies of the past 15 years which have bankrupted both our government and our national banking system. If the United States scrapped these monetary and economic policies, in favor of the kinds of economic-recovery measures we used so successfully between 1939 and 1943, our tax-revenue base would grow, our deficits would be brought under control, and we could afford both national defense and a "crash program" against AIDS.

In black Africa today, a visitor driving through the streets watches persons collapsing and dying on the streets before their eyes. This is a commonplace experience. We have not reached that point with the AIDS epidemic in the United States; but we shall within a few years, unless we adopt a "crash program" against AIDS now. For our government to say that we can not afford such a "crash program" is the most monstrously insane sort of hypocrisy one might imagine.

**AIDS and the ‘counterculture’**

More than half the male homosexuals in the United States are now estimated to be carrying the AIDS infection. All of those infected today will be dead within two to four years, unless the kind of program I have outlined is implemented. Yet, hundreds of thousands of these homosexuals, in Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York City, and elsewhere, have denounced me as a "fascist" for proposing measures to attempt to save them from otherwise certain, early death. One can only conclude that these homosexuals are suffering a very special kind of insanity.

One of the parading groups attacking me in New York City, on Sunday, presented itself as "Nazis in Leather." It is rather well known that the fascist dictator Benito Mussolini was a pederastic bi-sexual. A prominent authority has published a report in Italy, describing Mussolini as "even a bigger homosexual than Hitler." The leadership of the Nazi Sturmabteilung (SA) was a homosexual ring; much of the Nazi inner core was recruited from among post-World War I homosexual circles such as that of Stefan George. Although Hitler later launched a brutal, although token persecution against some German catamites, this was done as a measure of compromise with forces which demanded that the Nazis suppress their own homosexual practices as a condition for Hitler's remaining dictator.

Many of the neo-Nazi groups of today are homosexual rings, just as the cited contingent of New York homosexuals described themselves as "Nazis in Leather." The high incidence of homosexuality among fascist groups is not an accidental phenomenon. Naturally, those homosexuals tending toward sado-masochistic preferences are the most likely candidates for brutal concentration-camp guards; but, wherever homosexuality appears in the form of a "political movement," rather than an individual inclination of scattered members of the population, such "political movements" express the essence of the fascist personality type.

The trouble is, that the average American has been "brainwashed" by Hollywood and other popular media, into a dangerously false image of the Nazi type. The duped public imagines that the Nazis were some "super-rationalist" variety of "authoritarian personality," an extreme of the image of the "Prussian officer" type. Directly the opposite was true. The violence-prone Green Party activist in West Germany today, is an almost perfect copy of the ranks of Hitler's Nazis. The Nazis were fanatically "ecologists," of the "back to nature" types, like today's Green Party. The West German terrorist and "punker" of today, is a resurrection of the kind of violence-prone Nazi who brought down the Weimar Republic.

A former Swiss volunteer member of the Nazi SS, Dr. Armin Mohler, a student of Nazi-sympathizing Prof. Karl Jaspers, has documented the inner mind of the Nazi type of yesterday and today with some precision. The Nazi type is a product of the influence of such figures as Fyodor Dostoevskii, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Aleister Crowley upon post-World War I Germany: Hitler was an Austrian "bohemian," and his followers were chiefly members of the "Age of Aquarius" movement led by Nietzsche and Crowley, the same "Aquarius" movement behind today's "ecologists" and "political homosexuals."

Nietzsche and Crowley proposed to eradicate the heritage of Socrates and Christ, to make the 20th century the birth of the "Age of Aquarius." Both Nietzsche and Crowley identified the "Age of Aquarius" with the worship of Dionysos and Lucifer. Both identified Socrates and Christ with the "Age of Pisces"; hence, their doctrine was to destroy the "Age of
Pisces," in order to make way for the "Age of Aquarius."

Twenty-first-century fascism and bolshevism were twin outgrowths of this "Age of Aquarius" project, both steered from such centers of influence as Venice and the Tiberius cult on the island of Capri. The sponsors of both, who overlapped, as the case of Venice’s Count Volpi di Misurata illustrates the connection, created two gangs, the fascists and the bolshevists, with the idea that one of the two competing gangs would prove to be the successful one, and that the two would ultimately be merged into one, under either German or Russian sponsorship. Various theosophical cults, such as Crowley’s theosophists and the Golden Dawn cult which Aldous Huxley introduced to California, were also organized forms of the "Age of Aquarius" projects.

When the fascist or bolshevist ideologue speaks of "The Revolution," what he means is not simply a particular kind of political revolution. He means a "permanent revolution": a continuing, violence-ridden upheaval, to the purpose of destroying the last relic of the Augustinian Judeo-Christian heritage, and destroying the heritage of Socratic reason. He means a pandemic of countercultural upheavals, to crush and eradicate everything produced by Western Judeo-Christian civilization.

Such a fascist or bolshevist ideologue is a pure type, of satanic evil incarnate. His pleasure, his pleasure-seeking motive, is to commit any act which he views as rejecting and destroying Western Judeo-Christian culture. This is the satanic essence of Hitler and Hitler’s Nazism, and the satanic quality of Mussolini’s fascism as well: pleasure in doing evil simply because one’s conscience believes that it is evil, like Iago in Shakespeare’s Othello.

The establishment of a homosexual political movement, is of this satanic type. This is not the individual homosexual who says, “Despite my peculiarity, treat me as a human person.” This is homosexuality pursued out of hatred against Judeo-Christian morality; this is purely satanism. Those poor wretches who paraded in front of New York’s St. Patrick’s cathedral, announcing themselves as “Nazis in Leather,” accurately pinpointed themselves as a satanic type, and revealed more nakedly than some others in the demonstration, the essential character of the political movement for homosexuality.

When these Nazi-like satanists of the political homosexual movement accuse me of being “Nazi-like,” they are echoing the Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan who insisted, at a New York University gathering, that I must be exposed as a follower of Socrates. Moynihan’s argument echoed the thesis of the leftist I. F. Stone, who endorsed the judicial murder of Socrates; his argument echoed the thesis of the London Tavistock Institute, which insists that Socratic reason is the essence of what Tavistock and Moynihan describe as “the authoritarian personality.” Moynihan and the “Aquarian” ideologues generally, insist that whoever insists that public policy must be consistent with both morality and reason is the kind of “authoritarian” who must be driven out of American political life, and perhaps judicially murdered, as Socrates was.

I have no evidence that Moynihan is a homosexual or a cocaine-sniffer; however, he is a member of the “Aquarian” counterculture in a more general way. Moynihan’s “neo-Malthusianism” is key to the Congress’s “benign neglect” of both the wretchedly poor of the world, and of the plight of present and future AIDS victims.

The core of the neo-fascist counterculture of today is the so-called “neo-Malthusian” movement centered around the Club of Rome, and the Club of Rome’s interface with the Soviet KGB, the Laxenberg, Austria-based International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis. This movement was formally launched in 1963, by Soviet-friendly British officials working inside the OECD organization. It was first launched in the form of the OECD’s proposals for reforms in public education, the source of the policies of today’s U.S. National Education Association. The Club of Rome was launched by OECD official, Dr. Alexander King, and Lord Solly Zuckerman, during the second half of the 1960s. Zuckerman and King worked closely with Soviet KGB official Dzermen Gvishiani, to establish the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis as the Club of Rome’s interface with Soviet KGB headquarters in Moscow. Zuckerman is a member of the circle of Henry A. Kissinger’s special friends in London, the inner group of associates of former British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, who resigned under a cloud of suspicion as a suspected Soviet asset. Zuckerman himself is well known as a Soviet asset in his own right.

The transformation of the 1960s “New Left” into the “ecologist “Rainbow Coalition,” beginning 1969-70, was a project steered by the same U.S. Establishment circles which had adopted the neo-Malthusianism of the Club of Rome. The creation of the lesbian and male-homosexual cults of today, was begun during the 1969-70 period, by such groups as the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, as part of the process of transforming the 1960s anti-war Aquarian “Rainbow Coalition.” The launching of the first U.S. terrorist organization, the Weatherman narco-terrorist cult, was an integral part of this same project.

In several interviews, Club of Rome founder King has insisted that the purpose of the Club of Rome was pure Anglo-Saxon racialism: Bertrand Russell’s program for reducing drastically the population of Greeks, Italians, and Iberians, as well as the darker-skinned races of Africa and Asia. Notably, this policy was first introduced to the U.S. government in a pilot-project form, during the mid-1960s, and was promoted by Zbigniew Brzezinski under the rubric of “Techno­tronic Society,” during the second half of the 1960s. The center of this support for the Club of Rome, and for the promotion of the Aquarian counterculture more generally,
was the same group of Establishment families, associated with the New York Museum of Natural History, which had backed Adolf Hitler during the early 1930s. This includes the Harriman family, which is the principal backer of both Brzezinski and Moynihan.

U.S. tradition, until the late 1960s and early 1970s, was the promotion of technological progress in an energy-intensive, capital-intensive mode. On the basis of the ability to increase our productivity, through such technological progress, the majority of Americans insisted we could meet the material costs of defending the sacredness of individual life, and of providing political and economic equalities of opportunity for our citizens' households. The "ecologist" movement, and other elements of the "Rainbow Coalition" of Aquarian radicalism, was used to destroy the means for meeting such material demands, and to undermine the principle of the sacredness of human life as the principle of law set forth in our Declaration of Independence and at the outset of our federal Constitution.

The characteristic shift in public morality during the past 20 years, has been toward revoking the principle of the sacredness of life, step by step. The "abortion movement" was used as the wedge-end of a campaign which has introduced to the U.S. today the Nazi crime against humanity, euthanasia, in the name of the "right to die" movement, and, now, the introduction of active measures of homicide in hospital and other practice, as a cost-saving measure.

This countercultural mentality comes to the fore in the refusal of our government and the leadership of our political parties to confront the realities of the AIDS pandemic. "Let them die," says our government, say the liberal leaders of both major parties: "Our budget will not let us defend our nation against Soviet imperialism, or defend our citizens against the most diabolically deadly pandemic the world has known."

Who are today's Nazis? They are the homosexual political movement and Senator Moynihan, among others of the counterculture's Rainbow Coalition.

Whether homosexuals are Nazis or not, we shall not treat them as the Nazis would have done. Their lives are sacred, too, and we must respond to their plight so, for the sake of the principle of life.

The crazed political elements among homosexuals may refuse to accept the public-health measures needed to defend the United States from a pandemic more deadly than thermonuclear war, but those among our citizens who are still sane will not allow us to be blackmailed by the counterculture's threats of violence. The AIDS issue has surfaced as the leading domestic issue of the 1988 presidential campaign, and will become the most discussed issue as the death-rates from AIDS-related causes soar. How a prospective President stands on the AIDS question implicitly reveals his or her morality on every issue; so, increasingly, the majority of our citizens will come to view the candidates.

### Political war over AIDS referendum

A California ballot initiative to have AIDS declared a communicable disease, subject to existing public health laws, has polarized the political life of the state.

The initiative, sponsored by the Prevent AIDS Now Initiative Committee (PANIC), was certified on June 20 for placement on the ballot in the Nov. 3 election, after supporters of presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche gathered nearly 700,000 voter signatures to do so.

The AIDS referendum has been endorsed by a growing number of national medical experts, and one congressman. Gus Sermos, the Centers for Disease Control health officer who set up the AIDS surveillance program in Florida, on July 7 announced his support for the initiative. A Mississippi resident, Sermos charged that the Atlanta-based CDC's cover-up of the AIDS crisis constitutes "malfeasance," and a violation of the CDC's own procedures for dealing with a deadly communicable disease.

An eight-year veteran of the CDC, Sermos set up the AIDS surveillance program for the state of Florida in 1983. In November 1985, he was abruptly ordered back to an empty office at CDC headquarters in Atlanta, as a result of a deal between the CDC and Florida health officials, who were upset by Sermos's exposure of their misuse of federal monies granted for AIDS surveillance. Now Florida—with the third-highest number of AIDS cases in the United States—has no active surveillance program for seeking out new cases.

Although an investigation by the inspector general of the Department of Health and Human Services has documented a number of Sermos's charges, Sermos was fired from the federal service.

California Rep. William Dannemeyer (R-Fullerton) became the first congressman to support the PANIC Initiative, in a July 2 press conference. Noting that the initiative would not change a single already-existing law in the state, Dannemeyer said he is also proposing federal legislation to make it a crime for infected individuals to kiss, copulate, or donate blood. "We cannot just sit here and watch the growth of this epidemic without taking rational acts to stop the transmission of this disease," he said.

Medical doctors who have officially endorsed the initiative include: Donald E. Gibson, Connecticut; H. S. Hewes, Texas; G. W. Kimball, Arkansas; Carlos Mattioli, Texas; Luz Velandia Popescu, D.D.S.