

## Editorial

### *Two policies on AIDS*

The editors of *Executive Intelligence Review* hereby endorse what has been called "son of Prop. 64" in California. A renewed effort is now under way, led by associates of Lyndon LaRouche, as the last time, to place on the ballot in that state an initiative identical to last year's Proposition 64, to make AIDS a designated communicable and reportable disease, implicitly requiring health authorities to act in the interest of public health, rather than in the imagined interest of suicidal hedonism.

In issuing this endorsement, we find ourselves in editorial opposition to the budget-cutters once again. And that is the issue: Are we going to spend the money to beat this awesome pandemic?

The *Los Angeles Times* took the exact opposite position in an editorial entitled, "New Risks on AIDS." The newspaper tried to make its primary reason for opposing public health measures sound like an afterthought. Public health measures of quarantine and prevention against AIDS risk "the diversion of the energy and resources of the state from the serious business of controlling the pandemic," the newspaper pontificated.

Then, they got to the point: "It is all the more dangerous as the crisis in public finance has placed extreme constraints on public-health programs, including those addressing AIDS."

The same *Los Angeles Times* recently reported—we don't know if approvingly or not—the statements of one of the leading Dutch pro-euthanasia doctors, proclaiming that economic necessity will dictate euthanasia measures over the coming decades.

The budget-cutting lunatics are willing to risk everybody's life to avoid spending the money! But more, they are willing, and planning, to *take* a lot of lives rather than spend the money: the Nazi practice of euthanasia.

This, in fact, is the real issue raised by the spread of AIDS, and by the return of "Proposition 64" to the California ballot. Are we going to act like human beings, or are we going to start behaving as Nazis again?

No one knowledgeable of the nature of this disease, anywhere in the world, can honestly believe that a cure

will be available for AIDS, or a vaccine available to prevent AIDS, in any period shorter than 10 years from today—provided we do decide to spend the money.

Therefore, the question posed is: Are we going to spend the \$100,000 per person that it costs now, to treat an AIDS patient, according to the best available estimates, knowing that we may have 20 million AIDS patients in the 1990s, perhaps many more before a vaccine or cure is found?

Or are we going to do what is being done in the Netherlands (see page 47) and elsewhere? Are we going to allow doctors to treat AIDS with lethal injection, knowing that by killing 10 AIDS carriers once they become symptomatic, you may save the government \$1 million?

For an extended period of time, we have been moving toward euthanasia toward AIDS patients, indistinguishable from the euthanasia practiced by the Nazis in the 1930s, for which we joined in hanging some German doctors at Nuremberg.

AIDS is spreading very rapidly, and the perception of cost is primary among those who already know very well that their propaganda concerning "risk groups" and "safe sex" will shortly be scoffed at by everyone. Anyone can, anyone will, catch this disease. Surgeon General Koop in desperately sticking to his "safe sex" line, as he has said many times, because he wants to prevent citizens from realizing that enormous sums of money must be spent against AIDS. His attitude is, we can't afford to spend that much money.

We say we can't afford to become a Nazi nation. We're going to have to spend the money. We say no: We are going to have to spend the money to take care of AIDS patients, not murder them. That means it's going to cost a great deal of money.

The problem now is, that the economic policies of the past 20 years have caused the United States to become a nation that can no longer afford to survive as a nation. To defeat AIDS means giving up the post-industrial, services economy, and going back to becoming a powerful industrial economy again, that can meet the needs of its own citizens.