

# Proposition 69 to be law in California

by Warren J. Hamerman

On the same June 7 ballot that will select the California presidential primary winners, the voters of the state will have the opportunity to vote once again for traditional public health measures to stop the spread of AIDS. A ballot referendum virtually identical to last year's Proposition 64 has fully qualified through a citizen petition drive which gathered the signatures of about 725,000 registered voters (see "Stop AIDS Initiative Back on California Ballot," *EIR*, Dec. 11, 1987, Vol. 14 No. 49). The State of California has given the 1988 ballot initiative the number "Proposition 69."

The State of California will provide every registered voter in the state with a "Voters' Handbook." According to California state procedure, three "official" proponents of Proposition 69 have a signed "argument in favor" printed and circulated to all voters in the official handbook. Lyndon LaRouche, who will also be on the same June 7 ballot as a candidate in the Democratic presidential primary, is one of the three official proponents. In response, an "argument against" will also be printed in the Voters' Handbook by the three official opponents of the Proposition—Laurens White, M.D., President of the California Medical Association, Marilyn Rodgers, President of the California Nurses Association, and C. Duane Dauner, President of the California Association of Hospitals and Health Systems. The "argument against" basically does little more than invoke "authority" and "calm" to say that the population has more to fear from those who sponsor the referendum than they do from AIDS itself. The official proponents are then allowed a "rebuttal" to the argument against. The opponents then "rebut" the proponents.

In 1986 Proposition 64 was defeated through a systematic campaign of lies and misinformation coming from four sources of fierce opposition:

1) The Reagan administration and its California Republican associates who opposed Proposition 64 because they viewed fighting AIDS as "too costly" and a "budget-busting" area. As a result of the Bush-Reagan administration's cost-cutting opposition, all official government health authorities such as Surgeon General Koop, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), and Health and Human Services (HHS) fabricated "lines" against Proposition 64.

2) The Hollywood countercultural lagoon led by Liz Taylor and Patty Duke, who viewed public health measures as a threat to their libertine lifestyle of drugs and degeneracy.

3) The homosexual activist lobby who believed that they had the right to proselytize and organize for so-called "safe deviant sex" on taxpayers' funds.

4) Misguided physicians and scientists who had developed a vested interest in peddling lulling misinformation to the population, and thereby continued their lies through sheer momentum.

By all indications, the lies of 1986 will not be accepted by the voters of 1988.

---

## Documentation

---

*Below we print the official 1988 Voters' Handbook Proposition 69 "argument for" and "rebuttal" by Lyndon LaRouche and his associates.*

### Argument in favor of Proposition 69

Proposition 69 extends existing public health codes for communicable diseases to AIDS and AIDS virus carriers. This means that the same public health codes that already protect you and your family from other dangerous diseases, will protect you from AIDS. Proposition 69 will keep AIDS out of our schools, out of commercial food establishments, and give health officials the power to test and quarantine where needed. These measures are not new; they are the same health measures applied, *by law*, every day, to every other contagious disease.

Today AIDS is out of control. Present "policy" is a disaster. There were about 500,000 AIDS carriers in California in 1985, according to health authorities. At that time the number of cases of this highly contagious disease was doubling approximately every 6-12 months. Even assuming that the doubling rate had slowed to every 24 months, this would mean an estimated 1 million Californians infected with the AIDS virus today. Many of these newly infected persons can thank those who fought against Proposition 64 for their tragic condition.

The number of "unexplained" AIDS cases—cases not in "high risk" groups, such as homosexuals and intravenous drug-users—continues to grow at alarming rates. Indeed, the majority of cases worldwide fall into no identifiable "risk-group" whatsoever. The AIDS virus has been found living in many bodily fluids, including blood, saliva, respiratory fluids, sweat and tears, and it can survive upwards of seven days outside the body. There presently exists no cure for the sick, and no vaccination for the healthy. It is 100% lethal.

AIDS is the gravest public health threat our nation has ever faced. Traditional California public health law clearly states that certain proven public health measures *must* be taken to protect the public from *any* communicable disease, and no competent medical professional denies AIDS is "communicable." Nevertheless, politicians and special interest groups have circumvented the public health laws. Califor-

nia's current "AIDS testing confidentiality" statute even prohibits doctors from disclosing AIDS infection status to health authorities, endangering medical and law enforcement personnel, and the general public. For the first time in our history, a deadly disease is being treated as a "civil rights" issue, rather than as a public health issue.

Under present policy, since health officials generally do not know who is infected, there is little they can do either to prevent the infected person from infecting others, or to get that person proper medical attention before they develop full AIDS. Many who spoke against Proposition 64 now call for testing and contact tracing. Had it passed, these measures would already be in effect. How many more Californians must become sick and die before we act to stop this epidemic?

The medical facts are clear. The law is clear. Common sense agrees. You and your family have the right to protection from *all* contagious diseases, including AIDS—the deadliest of them all. If you agree, vote *yes* on Proposition 69.

*Khushro Ghandhi, California Director, National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC) and Member, Los Angeles County Democratic Party Central Committee*

*John Grauerholz, M.D., F.C.A.P.*

*Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Candidate for the 1988 Democratic Party Presidential Nomination*

## **Rebuttal to argument against Proposition 69**

The argument against Proposition 69 is actually an argument against use of traditional public health measures to stop *any* disease. AIDS is a disease of persons infected with the AIDS virus. Infected persons infect uninfected persons, and the infection is spreading. Medical literature has documented cases of non-sexual, non-needle-transmitted infection. At least three health-care workers, and a mother caring for an infected child, may pay with their lives for discovering that needles or sexual intercourse are not necessary to transmit AIDS.

Research indicates that other infections in AIDS virus carriers, like tuberculosis or herpes, can activate the AIDS virus and lead to full-blown AIDS. Identification of infected persons makes treatment of such "co-infections" possible and may forestall progression to full AIDS.

There is no vaccine, and no cure, for this deadly disease, but research has provided better tests. The opponents of Proposition 69 oppose widespread testing to identify and treat those at risk of developing AIDS and infecting others. Their "policy" makes it virtually impossible to treat and educate those most "at risk." The opponents' "policy" is to allow the uninfected to become infected, the infected to become sick, and the sick to die, preferably cheaply.

Proposition 69 enables health authorities to use traditional public health measures to stop AIDS. The cost is small compared to the cost of the growing number of AIDS cases resulting from the present non-policy. Restore a traditional public health policy in California. Vote *Yes* on Proposition 69.

# Meese proposal for police force rebuffed

by D.E. Pettingell

Attorney General Edwin Meese, returned to Washington on April 13 after a one-week five-nation trip to the Dominican Republic, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia where he met with Presidents and cabinet members to discuss ways of increasing cooperation in the war on drugs. Top on Meese's agenda was the proposal for the formation of a "multinational police force" which, as the *New York Times* put it, would help "restore order in Latin American nations where governments are threatened by narcotics trafficking." The idea was utterly rejected by Ibero-American governments as an attempt, once again, to override national sovereignty on the pretext of "fighting drugs."

At the end of his visit to Bogotá, and in response to a Colombian journalist's question, Meese was forced to play down the proposed multinational police force as something that would not solve the short-term problem of drugs. He said that in his discussions with Colombian President Virgilio Barco, Barco called the "police force" idea "something that was interesting as a long-range concept" but that "would involve treaties and treaties are a difficult problem."

"We have never considered sending U.S. troops here," he added, "if Colombia does not request it." Furthermore, Meese said, "we are very impressed with the excellent job the Colombian Armed Forces and the Colombian Police are carrying out against drugs." Meese is the first high ranking U.S. official to visit Colombia in the two years that Andean nation has been ravaged by mafia violence. Meese's heavily guarded visit lasted only five hours.

But the U.S. secret government did not wait for "treaties" to be signed, to put into operation the illegal supranational strike force. The day Meese began his tour, the supranational force debuted with the kidnap-arrest of Honduran drug lord Ramón Matta Ballesteros April 5. Matta's long-awaited detention was run by the U.S. Marshals Service from the raid of his mansion in Honduras, to his formal arrest by the United States in Puerto Rico. In the proposed multinational police force, the U.S. Marshals would expand to the international arena the role they play domestically. According to U.S. officials traveling with Meese, the multinational police force, among other things, would offer protection to prosecutors, judges, and other public officers in Ibero-America, who are targeted by the Medellín Cartel, the cocaine empire based in Medellín, Colombia.

The Drug Enforcement Administration, the traditional anti-drug law-enforcement force which operates in foreign