ing itself to lead the counter-offensive. . . . The war to contain the spread of AIDS must, if it is to have any hope of success, be waged all-out. . . . What we fear is that even now Lord Whitelaw and the others may not realize it is going to take more, far more than a public relations exercise to combat this insidious and fast spreading plague."

From a different political standpoint, the liberal *Guardian*, on Nov. 4, under the title, "Only a Start in AIDS Fight," welcomed the new Cabinet committee, as a possible "important step towards a more serious public approach to the disease," but stated that there must still be "real concern that it has come unnecessarily late. . . . If a more serious approach had been taken two years ago, lives could have been prolonged. High-level attention to AIDS is important. But it is vital that Lord Whitelaw and his team do more than just strike attitudes. . . . Lord Whitelaw and his colleagues must be prepared to follow through the logic of the setting-up of their committee. We know there is a crisis and a growing threat. That crisis has to be addressed as a matter of priority, and much more than a matter of public relations."

Although expressing skepticism about screening, the *Guardian* called for "an international agreement about controls over [the spread of AIDS] through travel," combined with large-scale assistance programs to AIDS-flashpoint areas in Africa and elsewhere in the developing sector.

'Awesome political retribution'

Ninety members of the British Parliament, almost all from Mrs. Thatcher's Conservative Party, put forward a special motion Nov. 3, calling on the BBC and the Independent Broadcasting Authority to provide free broadcasting time to inform the public about the dangers of AIDS.

Also, with national elections likely in 1987, the first shots may have been fired in an "AIDS war" between the political parties. Commentator Paul Johnson, writing in the *Daily Mail* under the heading, "AIDS: The Danger Labour Ignores at Britain's Peril," exposed how the opposition Labour Party's alliance with the "homosexual lobby," and attempts to sabotage the Thatcher government's war on drug-traffickers, have expedited the spread of AIDS. Johnson also attacked the hypocrisy of Labour's anti-nuclear campaign, following the Soviet Chernobyl nuclear disaster, while Labour actions, at the same time, "entail real risks of hastening the spread of an undoubted large-scale killer—AIDS. . . . In Britain, AIDS has already killed over 250 people—many, many more than have so far died in the Soviet Union as a result of Chernobyl. A report to the cabinet warns that a further 3,000 will die in the next three years and that 300,000 more will be infected. In short, unlike nuclear power, AIDS is a genuine mass-threat to British lives."

Johnson concluded: "On the issue of AIDS and the homosexual connection, Labour is playing with human lives. As the public grasps this fact, there could be an awesome political retribution."

Liberal press fears Prop 64's impact

From hundreds of news reports and feature articles on California's Proposition 64 around the world, we have selected the following as indicative of the international impact of the initiative.

U.S.A.

Newsweek, *major liberal U.S. weekly magazine, Nov. 10*

Noting that President Reagan has made few comments on the epidemic, *Newsweek* says: "He may yet be forced into it. Even at its present level, the AIDS epidemic threatens to swamp the nation's health-care system. . . . AIDS poses profound ethical and legal questions . . . and it has become an issue in electoral politics as well. This week, for example, California voters will decide on Proposition 64, a cunningly-crafted referendum item that could force state officials to isolate and quarantine AIDS victims. Sponsored by the disciples of political extremist Lyndon LaRouche, Proposition 64 seems destined for defeat. But it may still be a harbinger of a national debate on AIDS—a debate that could require Reagan, that most cheerful of Middle Americans, to commit his office to controlling this ghastly epidemic."

Germany

Die Zeit, *West German liberal daily associated with the Trilateral Commission, a full-page feature article, written as a position paper for a Nov. 6-7 West Berlin meeting on social and political implications of AIDS, by Erwin Haeberle, of the California-based Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality.*

"LaRouche, at least, will be very satisfied, even if he has a defeat, because he argues there will be further spread of AIDS, and intends to campaign on the spread of AIDS, and the growing general fear. . . . He will attack all those who went against the referendum. He will make political capital out of this.

"[LaRouche is] a political paranoiac [who heads] a right-wing political sect, the National Democratic Policy Committee.

"[California authorities] are rightfully trembling with fear that PANIC could be successful. . . . As polls show, the voters do not know enough to guarantee a clear defeat for the referendum. Many [California influentials] regret having played around with the proposal for quarantine, because now, the matter is to be decided upon by popular vote. It is now

becoming clear to politicians, that panic in respect to AIDS must be immediately knocked down, with a quick blow. Now, instead, people are running around with their tongues hanging out, running after a development that could have been stopped in the beginning stages. No matter how this affair goes, it already shows that, today, an information campaign on AIDS can never be too necessary, and too broad. . . .

"Economists have calculated how much [screening] would really cost, and the estimate is, $19 billion in the first year. In short, the whole project, for financial reasons alone, is not discussable."

Tageszeitung, *pro-terrorist paper of West Berlin, Oct. 30*

The initiative is attributed to "polit-bizzaro" Lyndon LaRouche, who supports nuclear power and "Star Wars" and opposes the "communist world conspiracy." Proposition 64 will be defeated, because its foes have spent nearly $3 million, and because an Oct. 6 raid on LaRouche's publishers, and indictments issued against his associates, have intimidated undecided voters. Still, an estimated 30% of the population supports the initiative, which is "an awful lot."

Italy

La Repubblica, *socialist-influenced Rome newspaper, one of Italy's three national dailies, Oct. 30*

"The referendum touches a problem of enormous social and public-health importance. Its result will be very important also for the rest of the United States, because California has often started nationwide trends."

France

Le Monde, *Paris "newspaper of record," Bernard Guetta, Oct. 31*

Proposition 64 is "a sign of the times." What is occurring in California is a process of "putting to death the liberalism of the '60s." Despite this, the ballot initiative will be defeated, because of opposition by state medical officials.

Spectacles du Monde, *French monthly, René Bernex, October*

The authority to quarantine is included in the public-health guidelines which Proposition 64 would mandate California authorities to implement. "Nobody is shielded from AIDS. . . . The problem is planetary. The only remedy: quarantine."

Sweden

Dagens Nyheter, *Stockholm liberal "newspaper of record," Oct. 30*

"The report [of the National Academy of Sciences] to a certain extent, puts wind in the sails of the right-wing extremist Lyndon LaRouche. He wants to quarantine all AIDS victims and is spreading scare-propaganda in California, where the AIDS proposition is up for a referendum vote."

Who ran opposition to Proposition 64

The opponents of Proposition 64 are controlled by an institution based in New York, which has been running the AIDS cover-up from the beginning, as well as the "homosexual political movement" generally. The key figure is **Dr. Armand Hammer,** longstanding "business partner" of the Soviet KGB, who is a powerful figure in U.S. business and cultural affairs, and heads Occidental Petroleum.

In 1981 Hammer began funding the **New York AIDS Foundation,** headed by **Mathilde Krim.** That foundation merged with the Los Angeles-based **Rock Hudson AIDS Foundation** in 1985, changing its name to the **American Foundation for AIDS Research (AFAR),** headed by Krim and **Dr. Mervyn Silverman,** chief spokesman of the **California Medical Association.** The national chairman of AFAR became actress **Elizabeth Taylor,** who headed fundraising for the sundry "No on 64" homosexual-activist groups of California, which spent an estimated $3 million.

The following array of individuals and organizations were deployed in public opposition to Proposition 64:

"Hollywood Stars" led by Bob Hope and Elizabeth Taylor; The Centers for Disease Control; The California Medical Association; The California Public Health Association; The American Red Cross; Deans of the state's public health schools; Gov. George Deukmejian; Sen. Alan Cranston; Sen. Pete Wilson; Lt.-Gov. Leo T. McCarthy; Attorney-General John Van de Kamp; Controller Kenneth Cory; Schools Superintendent Bill Honig; Mayor Tom Bradley of Los Angeles; Rep. Ed Zschau (Republican candidate for U.S. Senator); The Los Angeles City Council; The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors; Archbishop Roger Mahoney of Los Angeles; The Rev. Oliver Garver, Acting Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles; The American Jewish Congress; The California Chamber of Commerce; The Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; The California Labor Federation; The *Los Angeles Times*; The *Los Angeles Daily News*; former Senator Adlai Stevenson; The *Washington Times*; Surgeon-General C. Everett Koop; The American Civil Liberties Union; California Catholic Bishops Conference.