BOSTON—A formal complaint has been filed with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination by a man who alleges that he was fired from his job after it was learned that he was taking part in a research study for an AIDS vaccine. Tom Crehore said he was dismissed from Sentry Bank June 1 when the company learned he was part of an experimental vaccine test program sponsored by the U.S. National Institutes of Health.

"Even though Crehore does not have AIDS, his participation in the vaccine trial was interpreted to mean that he had AIDS or that he was at high risk for contracting the disease," said Denise McWilliams of Gay and Lesbians Advocates and Defenders' (GLAD) AIDS Law Project, who is representing Crehore.

She said that because "Sentry Bank let him go only two weeks after becoming aware of his enrollment in the program, we believe there is a connection between these two events."

According to McWilliams, this is the first AIDS discrimination case in the U.S. based on a person's involvement in a research program.

Crehore is involved in a year-long study funded by the NIH. To take part in the program, Crehore underwent extensive tests to ascertain that he was not infected with HIV.

The NIH has offered legal assistance to GLAD in the matter. "No one has ever before been fired or otherwise penalized for participating in an [NIH] trial," said Richard Davey of the NIH.

GLAD filed its action Aug. 1. It is now up to the state agency to investigate the complaint. McWilliams said that the investigation could take from five weeks to several months.

—Gay Community News (Boston)
Argument in Favor of Proposition 102

Do you believe that infection by the AIDS virus should be treated like any other communicable disease and reported to the health department?

PROPOSITION 102 is specifically designed to stop the spread of AIDS. It does this by requiring confidential reporting to public health authorities.

Although AIDS is treatable, there is no cure—yet. But we can stop it from spreading.

Currently, doctors are required to confidentially report to public health authorities cases of venereal disease, such as syphilis. But, if a doctor were to report all who are infected with the AIDS virus, he would be subject to a $10,000 fine and/or up to a year imprisonment.

In short, UNDER CURRENT LAW, IF A DOCTOR TREATS AIDS INFECTION LIKE HE WOULD ANY OTHER DISEASE, HE WOULD COMMIT A CRIME.

Under PROPOSITION 102, persons found to be infected with the AIDS virus would be interviewed by the health department so that others with whom they have had sexual contact or shared drug needles can be confidentially counseled.

PROPOSITION 102 does not call for the quarantine of people with AIDS.

While AIDS is not curable, it is preventable, which is why it is so important to have the health department contact those who have been unknowingly exposed as well as those who have been unknowingly exposing others.

Current AIDS-related public health laws have been politically motivated and simply don't work.

One fact says it all: THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF THOSE INFECTED BY THE AIDS VIRUS ARE UNAWARE OF THEIR CONDITION OR THE POTENTIAL THREAT THEY MAY POSE TO OTHERS.

For many decades, our public health officers have been confidentially testing, tracing and counseling those with communicable diseases. THE SYSTEM WORKS.

Has “contact tracing” driven people “underground,” away from treatment? Of course not. Experience in Colorado with similar laws has shown that many more people have undergone voluntary testing than here in California.

Persons who believe that they may have been exposed to any disease have been able to turn to the public health department in complete reliance upon the time-honored system of confidentiality.

PROPOSITION 102 will enhance confidentiality by expanding the legal definition of the AIDS test.

PROPOSITION 102 will not give your employer the right to test you for AIDS without your consent.

Health and life insurance premiums will likely increase as a result of the AIDS epidemic. PROPOSITION 102 will help keep the cost of insurance down.

With AIDS, the only way to save a life is to prevent infection. That's what PROPOSITION 102 is all about.

PROPOSITION 102 is both reasonable and effective.

It will help stop the spread of a killer disease while respecting the confidentiality of those affected. It will save lives while providing early detection for countless thousands of victims.

That's why thousands of California physicians support PROPOSITION 102.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION 102.
It's GOOD MEDICINE.

WARREN L. BOSTICK, M.D.
Former President, California Medical Association
Former Dean of the College of Medicine, University of California, Irvine

LAWRENCE J. MCNAMEE, M.D.
President, California Physicians for a Logical AIDS Response
Member, Los Angeles County Medical Association Committee on AIDS

PAUL GANN
President, People's Advocate, Inc.

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 102

Proposition 102 isn’t “good medicine.” It's a public health nightmare and fiscal disaster.

Don't be fooled by the proponents’ “medical” arguments. The California Medical Association, California Nurses Association and Health Officers' Association strongly oppose Proposition 102 as being counterproductive to the medical fight against AIDS.

The argument for Proposition 102 is based on the simple-minded idea that AIDS is “like any other communicable disease.” But all diseases aren't alike, and public health officials have special strategies for dealing with each of them. Proposition 102 would destroy important policies designed by health experts to stop the spread of AIDS.

The argument for Proposition 102 is packed with mistruths. Proposition 102 wouldn't “enhance confidentiality”—it actually repeals California's AIDS confidentiality law. Anonymous AIDS testing has been highly successful in reducing the rate of new infections in high-risk communities. Proposition 102 would reverse this important progress.

Proposition 102 wouldn’t keep insurance costs down. It would shift millions of dollars of health care costs to the taxpayers.

Proposition 102 wouldn't prevent employers from forcing their employees to be tested—it repeals the law which prevents involuntary testing.

Proposition 102 would drive potentially infected individuals away from voluntary testing which is linked to counseling to educate them about how not to spread AIDS.

Proposition 102 would cost California taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars and would only make the epidemic worse.

Vital research, treatment and education programs on AIDS would be closed down, endangering the lives of all Californians.

Vote NO on Proposition 102!

LEO MCCARTHY
Lieutenant Governor

LAURENS F. WHITE, M.D.
President, California Medical Association

ROBERT J. MELTON, M.D., M.P.H.
President, Health Officers' Association of California
Reporting Exposure to AIDS Virus: Initiative Statute

Argument Against Proposition 102

AIDS is a serious public health crisis. It should not be a political football.

Twice before, Californians have overwhelmingly rejected a misguided initiative on AIDS that was proposed by a politician with no medical expertise. We must do so again.

Proposition 102 must be defeated for the health and safety of all Californians.

This initiative would cripple the efforts of physicians, researchers and public health officials to halt the spread of AIDS. It would only make the epidemic worse.

Proposition 102 is as extreme and irrational as the AIDS Quarantine Initiative (Propositions 64 and 89), which voters defeated by margins of two to one. In fact, the proponent of Proposition 102 was the only major public official to support the Quarantine Initiative.

Like the AIDS Quarantine Initiative, Proposition 102 could cost California taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars to enforce—money that would be far better spent on legitimate needs, including the prevention and treatment of AIDS. Worse yet, this initiative could cost many Californians their lives by creating a climate of fear that undermines research to find a vaccine and cure for AIDS.

Like the AIDS Quarantine Initiative, Proposition 102 would strongly discourage people from getting tested for AIDS because they could lose their jobs, homes or health care. Thus more people will unknowingly transmit the virus to others and more infected blood will be donated to blood banks. Fewer volunteers will participate in vital research studies and fewer infected people will receive the early treatment which could save their lives.

Proposition 102 is NOT about the reporting of AIDS cases. The law already requires that this be done. Rather, this initiative would require the public reporting of all persons who have positive AIDS antibody tests, tests which aren’t even always accurate.

Public health officials agree that voluntary, anonymous AIDS testing is one of the single greatest factors contributing to the reduction of new infections in high-risk communities. Proposition 102 would take away from medical professionals this vital tool to control the epidemic.

Like the AIDS Quarantine Initiative, Proposition 102 could force thousands of Californians out of their jobs in our schools and food service industries. It could throw many students out of school. None of them are any threat to the public health because medical science has proven that AIDS is not casually contagious.

Like the AIDS Quarantine Initiative, Proposition 102 would create disruption and division in our workplaces, all for no legitimate public health purpose.

Like the AIDS Quarantine Initiative, Proposition 102 would authorize widespread “witch hunts” and invasions of the privacy of Californians. The lives of even those who are perfectly healthy could be ruined by misguided people making irresponsible charges.

Proposition 102 is a punitive, political approach to AIDS that is totally at odds with modern medicine and science.

Join us once again in supporting a sane, effective AIDS policy. Send the message again that California voters want medical solutions to AIDS, not politics.

Vote NO on Proposition 102.

LAURENS P. WHITE, M.D.
President, California Medical Association

MARTY RODGERS
President, California Nurses Association

TOM BRADLEY
Mayor, City of Los Angeles

Rebuttal to Argument Against Proposition 102

Quarantine is not necessary to stop the spread of AIDS. That’s why PROPOSITION 102 says “nothing contained in this section shall be construed to require the use of quarantine or isolation.”

The record is clear.

PROPOSITION 102 is not an AIDS quarantine initiative. To suggest otherwise only adds to the fear and confusion experienced by the victims of this terrible disease. Haven’t they suffered enough?

The purpose of reporting and contact tracing is to let those who are infected know that they pose a risk to others.

Current law calls for reporting of AIDS patients because that is good public health policy. But there are hundreds of thousands of others who carry the AIDS virus, and are contagious, but have not developed the advanced disease, yet.

Doesn’t it make sense for doctors to report these cases, too? Confidential contact tracing is a fair and effective way to balance the rights of victims with the rights of the public. That’s why the nation’s largest medical association has recommended that all states do it.

Opponents to PROPOSITION 102 say that contact tracing will lead to “witch hunts.” We say it’s time to stop peddling such fear and panic.

California’s present AIDS policy was proposed by the current mayor of San Francisco, a “politician without medical expertise.”

It is a miserable failure.

PROPOSITION 102 was developed by doctors practicing in communities throughout California. It represents doctors doing what they do best—saving lives.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION 102.

LARIMORE CUMMINS, M.D.
Chairman, Santa Cruz County Medical Society AIDS Task Force

Former President, Santa Cruz County Medical Society

WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER
United States Congressman, California

LAWRENCE J. MCNAMEE, M.D.
President, California Physicians for a Logical AIDS Response

Member, Los Angeles County Medical Association

Committee on AIDS
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INITIAL FAVORABLE VOTER REACTION TO TWO NEW AIDS INITIATIVES, PROPS. 96 AND 102.

By Mervin Field
Director, The California Poll

There is initial favorable voter reaction to two November ballot initiatives dealing with the reporting of and testing for the AIDS virus.

Proposition 96 would require AIDS testing for defendants in criminal and juvenile cases where police officers, fire fighters or medical personnel believe they have been exposed to AIDS through the transfer of bodily fluids.

Proposition 102 would require doctors, blood banks and others to report to local health officials any patients or blood donors whom they feel might have AIDS or have tested positive for the disease.

The California Poll, in a statewide survey completed in late July, found that when the two initiatives are described in these terms, there is initial overwhelming support—79% in the case of Prop. 96 and 72% in the case of Prop. 102.
INFORMATION ABOUT THE SURVEY

SAMPLE DETAILS

The survey was conducted among a representative sample of 1,002 California adults, of whom 809 were registered to vote. Interviewing was conducted by telephone between July 22 and July 29, 1988 during the late afternoon and evening on weekdays and all day on weekends. The sample was weighted to bring it into conformity with parameters of the adult and registered voter populations statewide.

Previous survey data were conducted from similar surveys conducted in a comparable manner.

QUESTIONS ASKED

(ASKED OF REGISTERED VOTERS ONLY):
Two initiatives having to do with AIDS will appear on the November statewide election ballot. After I read each one, please tell me whether you would vote YES or NO on each initiative if the election were being held today. If you were voting today, would you vote YES or NO? (SEE RELEASE FOR WORDING) (ITEMS ROTATED TO AVOID POSSIBLE SEQUENCE BIAS)

(ASKED OF ALL ADULTS):
How worried are you that you or someone who you are close to might get AIDS -- very worried, somewhat worried, not too worried or not at all worried?

I am going to read a list of ways that some people say you can get AIDS. As I read each one, please tell me whether you think it is very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely or not at all likely to get AIDS that way. Do you think a person can get AIDS by ... (SEE RELEASE FOR ITEMS) (ITEMS ROTATED TO AVOID POSSIBLE SEQUENCE BIAS)

Do you approve or disapprove of offering special sex education classes in the public schools to teach students about precautions they can take to avoid getting AIDS?

(IF APPROVE):
At what grade level should these special sex education classes begin?
Prop. 96 was placed on the ballot by Sheriff Sherman Block of Los Angeles County.

Prop. 102 is backed by Republican Congressman William Dannemeyer and Dr. Lawrence McNamee, both of Orange County.

In the November 1986 election and again in the June 1988 election, California voters soundly rejected Prop. 64 and Prop. 69, two other AIDS initiatives. However, those two measures, backed by associates of political extremist Lyndon LaRouche, required doctors and local health officials to report to state health agencies the names of AIDS patients and people who test positive for AIDS antibodies and make them subject to state quarantine and isolation requirements.

The California Poll has periodically tracked public opinion and reaction to the AIDS epidemic since its emergence. In this survey, people were asked how worried they were that they or someone close to them might get AIDS. About one in seven Californians (15%) said they were very worried and another 25% said they were somewhat worried. These findings are virtually identical to those found in an earlier 1985 survey.

The current survey measured public opinion as to whether special sex education classes in public schools should be offered to teach students ways to avoid getting AIDS. Over nine in ten residents (92%) approve of such special sex education classes.

When asked when such instruction should take place, more than four in ten (43%) approve of starting AIDS sex education classes as early as the fifth grade or sooner. Another 35% suggest starting them in the sixth or seventh grade. Thus, more than three-fourths (78%) of the public would like these classes to begin in the primary grades.

In the 1985 and 1988 surveys, The California Poll also explored the public's feeling about the likelihood of getting AIDS from various sources.

In both surveys, virtually everyone thought it very or somewhat likely that a person would get AIDS from having sexual relations with a person who has the disease (98%), using the same hypodermic needle that a person who has AIDS just used (99%), or receiving a blood transfusion from a donor with AIDS (98%). These are the sources of AIDS infection that the medical community, state and local health officials have stressed in their massive public education efforts.
There has been a decline in the public's belief that AIDS can be transmitted through six other sources. Listed below are those sources, the current proportion of the public who now believes it is very or somewhat likely to get AIDS from the source, and the percentage who felt this way in 1985 when the same question was asked.

Table 1
Proportion of Californians who believe a person is very or somewhat likely to get AIDS from this source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kissing a person who has AIDS</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating food that has been handled by a person who has AIDS</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving blood to a blood bank or a hospital</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using unclean public toilets</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in the same office with someone who has AIDS</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaking hands with a person who has AIDS</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Current voter sentiment toward concepts embodied in Props. 96 and 102

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop. 96</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An initiative to require AIDS testing for defendants in criminal and juvenile cases where police officers, fire fighters or medical personnel believe they have been exposed to AIDS through the transfer of bodily fluids</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop. 102</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An initiative to require doctors, blood banks and others to report to local health officials any patients or blood donors whom they feel might have AIDS or have tested positive for the disease</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
How worried are you that you or someone close to you might get AIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very worried</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat worried</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too worried</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all worried</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Likelihood of getting AIDS from various sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Some-what likely</th>
<th>Not too likely</th>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving a blood transfusion from a blood donor with AIDS</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through sexual relations with a person who has AIDS</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the same hypodermic needle that a person who has AIDS has just used</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving blood to a blood bank or a hospital</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissing a person who has AIDS</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using unclean public toilets</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating food that has been handled by a person who has AIDS</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in the same office with someone who has AIDS</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaking hands with a person who has AIDS</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Less than one-half of one percent
### Table 5

When special sex education classes in public schools should be offered to students to teach them how to avoid getting AIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>92%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades K-2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 3-5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 10-12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know what grade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Disapprove            | 7    |
| No opinion            | 1    |

---

The findings on Props. 96 and 102 are based on interviews with a representative sample of 809 registered voters and are subject to a sampling tolerance of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points. Findings concerning the likelihood of getting AIDS and when AIDS prevention courses should be taught in the schools were asked of a representative sample of 1,002 adults and are subject to sampling tolerances of plus or minus 3.2 percentage points.

Interviewing was conducted by telephone between July 22 and 29, 1988. There are other possible sources of error for which precise estimates cannot be calculated. Different results could occur because of different question wording, sequencing, or undetected flaws in sampling, interviewing or data processing.
SACRAMENTO -- Lieutenant Governor Leo McCarthy today joined leaders of major statewide organizations representing doctors, nurses and county health officers in denouncing the AIDS ballot initiative sponsored by Representative William Dannemeyer (R-Fullerton).

McCarthy, co-author of ballot arguments against Proposition 102 on the November 8 ballot, said passage of the initiative will seriously interfere with state efforts to control the spread of AIDS, and compared it to two previous initiatives sponsored by political extremist Lyndon La Rouche, both of which were defeated by California voters.

"This initiative is a nightmare. It will be an irresponsible dismantling of our progress in the war against AIDS. It unravels the carefully-crafted AIDS policies we have enacted -- following public debate and on the advice of health experts," McCarthy declared.

"Fortunately, voters now are very familiar with tactics used by La Rouche and Dannemeyer. La Rouche-sponsored AIDS initiatives have been overwhelmingly rejected and I'm confident Proposition 102 will meet the same fate," McCarthy said.

While a recent California Poll suggests voters lean in favor of the
Dannemeyer plan, McCarthy attributed the sentiment to confusion over what the initiative actually will do.

He added the California Poll figures are similar to those that had been reported for La Rouche's Proposition 64 on the November 1986 ballot, and Proposition 69 on the June 1988 ballot -- both defeated by voters despite the favorable pre-election surveys.

If successful, McCarthy said Proposition 102 would mandate sweeping changes in current AIDS policy, including elimination of state-sponsored confidential AIDS-antibody testing.

He said confidential testing is regarded by federal and state disease control experts as the most effective means of monitoring and controlling the spread of AIDS. By ensuring test subject confidentiality, the program encourages more widespread testing and provides an opportunity for risk-reduction and behavior modification counseling.

In addition, Proposition 102 would require health officials to conduct contact-tracing and notification of all persons believed to have been infected, even if there has not been a confirmatory test. It also would allow the use of test results to determine employment eligibility.

McCarthy said the initiative will draw strong and visible bipartisan opposition from other California elected officials.

He noted the State Legislature week approved a measure protecting employment rights of those with AIDS and those infected with HIV (AB 3795, Vasconcellos).

(END)
> "Koop's study should have been emblazoned on the cover, 'Warning! The Surgeon General's Report on AIDS may be hazardous to your health.'"

Rep. William Dannemeyer
Congressional Record
February 18, 1987

> "It is truly a sad day that there are some in this body who are stonewalling any effort to deal with this issue as a public health issue and are attempting ... to treat it as a civil rights issue."

Rep. William Dannemeyer
Congressional Record
July 28, 1987

> "Of course it [AIDS] is a political issue."

Rep. William Dannemeyer
Congressional Quarterly
December 5, 1987

> Koop and other top health officials who have formed the government AIDS response "should be thanked for their service and given the retirement they richly deserve."

Rep. William Dannemeyer
Orange County Register
May 5, 1988

> "It is one thing to spend millions of taxpayers dollars to educate the public about AIDS, and quite another thing to make these expenditures spreading questionable and misguided information."

Speaking on the Surgeon General's Report
Rep. William Dannemeyer
Orange County Register
May 5, 1988

> [Dannemeyer] once placed in the Congressional Record a statement by a man he described as a "world-renowned author focusing on the role of proper nutrition in our daily diet." Among the recommendations was that persons with HIV should
"take a glass of water upon arising with 7 or 8 squirts of liquid garlic."

Congressional Record
June, 1987

> "I believe that it [Prop. 64, the LaRouche Initiative] is sound public health policy."

Rep. William Dannemeyer
Letter to Elected Officials
July 10, 1986

> "A person afflicted with AIDS emits spores that have been known to cause birth defects."

Rep. William Dannemeyer
Orange County Register
December 12, 1985

> "In addition, we are talking about paying for a drug known as AZT that costs $10,000 a year for each of these patients. It does not cure, but it prolongs life, which presents a very good ethical question for the people of this society. To what extent should we taxpayers provide for the cost of a drug that does not cure a terminal disease."

Rep. William Dannemeyer
Congressional Record
July 28, 1987

> "Homosexuality is a behavioral pathology which doesn't seek education, only self-perpetuation. Like their disease-ridden comrades, the I.V. drug users, homosexuals have proven they would just as soon sacrifice their lives than to sacrifice their lifestyle."

Rep. William Dannemeyer
KNX-Radio, Los Angeles
November 13, 1987

> "He [Dannemeyer] has engaged in a campaign of hate and bigotry, a campaign which exploits the present hysteria surrounding a serious health crisis in our country."

State Senator Ed Davis
December, 1985

> "Affirmation of the heterosexual ethic or the desire to maintain a drug-free workforce should not be confused with
discrimination on the basis of HIV infection."

Rep. William Dannemeyer
in a Congressional Letter
August 2, 1988

> "He has a reputation even among Republicans for going too far."
Almanac of American Politics
1988 Edition

> "I believe such school children [HIV-positive] should be prohibited from attending school."
Rep. William Dannemeyer
Summary of Legislative Package

> Sponsored an amendment that would have reduced appropriated monies for AIDS research by $100 million.
Human Rights Campaign Fund
Voting Summary
June 15, 1988

> "Opposition to the campaign to promote the use of condoms was led by William E. Dannemeyer, who insisted it was a 'delusion' to present condoms as a means of protection from AIDS. 'Encouraging frightened citizens to buy condoms and be safe can only result in devastating consequences.'"
New York Times News Service
February 11, 1987

> "I think you can't rule out the possibility that deep kissing can cause AIDS."
Rep. William Dannemeyer
Orange County Register
May 5, 1988

> "[Dannemeyer] introduced an amendment to the 1988 Budget to drop all health provisions that increased spending."
Congressional Quarterly
August 8, 1987

> "Not only have they [Dannemeyer and Helms] stalled action on key pieces of AIDS legislation, but they have
slowed progress on other health-related bills as well."
Congressional Quarterly
December 5, 1987

> Dannemeyer has backed away from some of his early and
most controversial statements about the disease."
Dave Ellis, former press
secretary to Rep. Dannemeyer
Orange County Register
September 10, 1988

> "He's known as an AIDS wacko."
Harvey Englander
Orange County Political
Consultant
Orange County Register
September 10, 1988

> "An example of how not to approach [AIDS] is
Congressman Dannemeyer. At a meeting two weeks ago, he was
terrifying--practically foaming at the mouth anytime anyone
made even a sympathetic reference to people with AIDS.
Someone like Dannemeyer is a live grenade on this issue and
far too emotional to do any good."
Chuck Rund
Republican Political Consultant
Harper's Magazine
February, 1988

> [Dannemeyer] "planned to introduce legislation making
it a federal crime for AIDS victims and those infected with
the virus to have sex, kiss, or give blood."
Los Angeles Herald-Examiner
July 3, 1986

> Dannemeyer "sponsored an amendment requiring all
homeless persons seeking health care to be tested for HIV."
Congressional Quarterly
March 7, 1987
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BACKGROUND

Since 1981 when the first cases of Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) were diagnosed in California, great strides in research have been made. For example:

* Scientists identified the cause—The Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV);

* Health professionals have ascertained the modes of transmission—sexual intercourse, sharing of blood products, or infection during pregnancy or birth;

* Researchers established protocols for testing treatments and vaccines;

* Public health officials implemented strong preventative educational programs that have proven effective.

Even with seriously limited resources, during the past seven years health professionals, researchers and public officials have structured a thoughtful and sound public health policy to slow the spread of this catastrophic epidemic.

The National Academy of Sciences, the Public Health Service, the United States Surgeon General, the Presidential Commission on the HIV Epidemic, along with myriad state
agencies, health professionals and scientists determined that the most effective ways of slowing the spread of HIV are with preventative education; research to find a vaccine and cure; and encouraging those most at risk to seek voluntary and confidential testing by instituting strong anti-discrimination laws to protect seropositive individuals from losing their homes, jobs and insurance; and offering them the opportunity to access investigational treatments.

Debate on these vital issues in California has constantly been clouded by political elements seeking to undermine these policies by resorting to voter initiatives that, in actuality, slow the forward thrust in finding solutions to the AIDS crisis.

First, political extremist Lyndon LaRouche sponsored Prop. 64, which California's voters soundly defeated by a two-to-one margin (71%-29%) in 1986. LaRouche's followers again attempted in 1988 to pass the same initiative, Prop. 69 or "Son of LaRouche." With no significant opposition campaign, voters again refused LaRouche's extreme measure by a similar margin (65%-35%).

Now, Congressman William Dannemeyer (R-Fullerton), who was one of only three elected officials in California to support Prop. 64, is attempting to confuse the electorate
with Prop. 102. If passed, this "Illegitimate Son of LaRouche" measure will undo seven years of carefully deliberated public health policy on AIDS and at the same time destroy essential AIDS research projects in California.

Prop. 102's provisions for requiring reporting of "suspected" HIV-positive individuals to public health officers, and for contact tracing (and disclosing the patient's name) to their sexual and/or needle-sharing partners will discourage participation in research projects and will discourage people at risk from seeking early, life-saving treatment, when both are essential to continue the progress in slowing the spread of AIDS.

In addition, experts agree that contact tracing is the least cost-effective option available in stopping AIDS and would use up money badly needed for the very education and research projects that seven years' experience has demonstrated are effective.

Moreover, the policies promulgated by Prop. 102 are unworkable; and the cost of the Initiative's proposal could actually weaken non-AIDS-related public health programs in California.

Dannemeyer's proposals are unnecessary. Public health officials and medical professionals have never been reluctant
to ask for whatever measures they deemed necessary to protect the public from disease. If they believed any of these LaRouche-type measures were essential or productive, they would have demanded them seven years ago.

As co-sponsors of the Stop Dannemeyer/No on 102 campaign, all of California's leading medical organizations (California Medical Assn., California Nurses Assn., Health Officers Assn. of California, and the Hemophiliac Council of California) oppose this dangerous, expensive and unnecessary ballot proposition.

They do so because they know that Prop. 102 will, in actuality, destroy the prudent course of action they have carefully developed since 1981. They also know that in an era of limited time, energy and funding, it is essential to invest these resources wisely.

#####
Questions & Answers for Topic Sheets

WHY DOES STOP DANNEMEYER/NO ON 102 OPPOSE THE INITIATIVE?

In general because it would disrupt seven years of thoughtful public health policy developed by the scientific and public health communities to stop AIDS. And, continued AIDS research will become seriously endangered in California if this measure passes.

All the state's leading medical organizations--the California Medical Assn., the California Nurses Assn., the Health Officers Assn. of California, and the Hemophilia Council--co-sponsor the Stop Dannemeyer campaign.

While parts of the measure may appear appealing, they believe that Prop. 102 is unnecessary, needlessly expensive in an era of limited resources, and dangerous to finding solutions to the AIDS crisis.

HOW WOULD PROP. 102 HAMPER AIDS RESEARCH PROJECTS?

First, by requiring that any research project conducting "linked" testing (that is, where the researchers know the names of their subjects) report those names to health authorities, who would then be required to trace the sexual and needle-sharing partners. Not only is this a serious official dilemma for the researcher, but also seropositive individuals simply would not be inclined to take the risk of losing their homes, jobs and insurance by participating in these studies.
Second, by requiring contact tracing of "anyone believed to have been exposed" means that health officers would have to track not only the 300,000 to 500,000 HIV-positive people in California, but also their partners. That would divert enormous amounts of money away from research for treatments and vaccines.

The research currently underway for AIDS treatments and vaccines will lead us to the medical breakthrough of the 20th Century. In this century we have already found medicines to prevent bacteria from killing people. AIDS research will lead us not only to a treatment and vaccine for AIDS but also to other viruses that kill people. Anti-viral research is the next essential step in improving the overall quality of human life.

WHY NOT REPORT THE NAMES OF PEOPLE WITH AIDS TO HEALTH OFFICERS?

Congressman Dannemeyer's argument that AIDS is not reportable is a red herring designed to confuse the voters and create fear around the issues of AIDS. AIDS is already a reportable disease throughout the United States. Strict procedures were set up by the Centers for Disease Control early on to report cases of AIDS.

The CDC does not believe it is essential to report the names of persons who test positive for the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV). First of all, it would be
illogically expensive to determine who those people are. It would require widespread, mandatory testing of all Americans to find everyone who is positive because of the long incubation period (as high as ten years) when patients have no symptoms.

Prop. 102 requires notifying health officers, spouses, sexual and needle-sharing partners, and anyone "suspected" of being in these categories. It goes far beyond traditional public health standards, even those relating to sexually transmitted diseases. Even with syphilis and gonorrhea, the patient's name is not disclosed to contacts.

The funding for contact tracing would better be invested in finding a vaccine or cure. When we have that, people at risk will voluntary rush to be tested.

**WHY IS CONSENT NECESSARY BEFORE TESTING FOR HIV?**

This initiative says that "this consent shall be no different than is required for any other diagnostic blood test." That can be interpreted as not even telling the patient that specific tests are being conducted. The CDC guidelines on HIV testing call for a minimum of "informed" consent for this test.

Treating the HIV test like any other blood test subverts the real purpose of testing, which is to counsel and educate people about what the results mean. Seven years' experience has clearly demonstrated that pre- and post-test counseling
are powerful tools to educate people about how to protect themselves and others from infection. There are no provisions for such counseling in this measure.

**WHY OPPOSE CONTACT TRACING?**

A study by the Hastings Center in New York shows that the public health benefits of contact tracing are marginal and have not produced results commensurate with the cost of such programs. Contact tracing consumes enormous time and funding resources that public health officers believe—and rightly so—could better be spent on research and preventative education.

Since HIV-positive people may be asymptomatic for years before showing signs of the disease, traditional methods to identify and isolate simply won't work with HIV infection.

Contact tracing destroys the climate of trust between patients and health-care professionals, and discourages voluntary testing, which when coupled with pre- and post-test counseling, has proven to be an effective educative and behavior modification tool in slowing the spread of AIDS.

This Initiative would mandate "investigation and notification of these findings to ... any other know sexual partners of the test subject and to any other person the public health officer has reasonable cause to believe has been exposed...." That means that anyone who has a blood transfusion between 1980 and 1985 (when doctors began
screening blood and blood products) would have to be investigated along with all of their sexual partners. This is an expensive, marginally productive and time-consuming undertaking.

**WHAT ABOUT THE CLAUSE THAT WOULD CLASSIFY AIDS AS A "FATAL, INFECTIOUS, AND COMMUNICABLE DISEASE"?**

Dannemeyer copied that language from the two LaRouche Initiatives (Props. 64 and 69). He was one of only three elected officials in California to associate himself with LaRouche's outlandish measures by endorsing Prop. 64.

Health officers have never ever been reluctant to use whatever methods they deemed necessary to stop society from being infected with disease. Indeed, they now have all the necessary powers to implement some of the proposals in this Initiative. They have chosen not to do so because the measures in Prop. 102 are unnecessary and will not stop the spread of AIDS.

Dannemeyer supports this language because it would exclude children with AIDS from schools and create the kind of hysteria and fear that forced Ryan White and his family out of their hometown; and caused the Ray family in Florida to be firebombed out of their home and driven into exile.

This language would also exclude food workers and school employees "suspected" of being infected from their jobs when there is no evidence that AIDS can be transmitted in this
manner. The National Restaurant Assn. has opposed excluding seropositive workers from their jobs.

Such provisions demonstrate how little Dannemeyer understands about AIDS and its transmission. For example, he has said that AIDS patients "emit a spore than can cause birth defects," which is an unconscionable distortion of fact. He also inserted in the Congressional Record a statement by a "nutritionist" that said that people with AIDS should "drink a glass of water with 10-12 drops of garlic upon arising."

Allowing Dannemeyer to dictate policy on AIDS is like hiring an auto mechanic to perform brain surgery.

WHAT ABOUT THE INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS?

Of course we oppose using HIV status to determine insurability and employability. This provision would needlessly remove up to half a million Californians from their jobs and access to insurance. While they are still able to work and function in society, they would be forced onto Medi-Cal, welfare or disability and enormous and pointless cost to the taxpayers.

After careful study of AIDS and insurance, The New York Times asserts that the insurance industry has been "crying wolf" about AIDS costs. The industry's own magazine, California Broker, said, "Health insurance can be written profitably with no AIDS-related modifications in either
underwriting or benefits."

And Princeton economist Uwe Reinhardt observed that if AIDS grows according to Public Health Service estimates, by 1991 it will account for less than two percent of national health expenditures.

One must wonder why the insurance industry has not used its considerable lobbying power to encourage more research funding into finding the epidemic's ultimate solution or used its considerable financial resources to fund life-saving research and prevention programs.

President Reagan recently ordered that all federal agencies implement the policies of the Office of Personnel Management that read: "Therefore, HIV-infected employees should be allowed to continue working as long as they are able to maintain acceptable performance and do not pose a safety or health threat to themselves or others in the workplace."

Additionally, the CDC states, "The kind of nonsexual person-to-person contact that generally occurs among workers and clients or consumers in the workplace does not pose a risk of transmission of [AIDS]."

Also the section about "allowing employees to wear protective gear" is in direct contradiction to what public health officials, the Office of Personnel Management, and the CDC believe are necessary to protect workers. This could
create a ludicrous "Moon Walk" atmosphere in the workplace.

WHAT OTHER PROVISIONS DO YOU OPPOSE?

Of course the "criminalizing" provisions are totally out of place because they actually punish the individual for having HIV. Sentence enhancement has never been used for other communicable diseases, such as tuberculosis and syphilis, both of which can also be fatal if not diagnosed and treated.

Further, this calls for testing individuals only "charged"--not convicted--of certain crimes. That goes against the concept of criminal law in this country, where there is a presumption of innocence. Two of the states that do test--Georgia and Washington--only do so after conviction.

Experience shows that there are only a few isolated cases of individuals intentionally transmitting the disease and the factual background of those incidents clearly shows that if those individuals had had access to treatment and care they would not have been participating in those activities.

The section requiring a "biological hazard label on all items known to be soiled by, or containing, body fluids of patients...infected by HIV" is another red herring touted by the proponents of Prop. 102. This is an area that is already well-regulated by the state of California.

Such provisions only serve to create fear among
California voters that state officials are not doing their jobs in curbing the spread of AIDS, when in fact they are taking all the steps deemed necessary by public health officials, scientists and health-care professionals.

SUMMARY

Prop. 102 is a conglomeration of proposals that California voters have wisely refused in the form of the two LaRouche Initiatives. It shows that once again an extremist politician—who understands little about AIDS—is trying to foist on the voters bad public health policy. These policies will endanger the vital research and education programs that public health and health-care professionals have worked so hard for the past seven years to establish.

The people who know what to do about AIDS, including all of the state's leading medical organizations—medical, nurses, health officers—support the No on 102 campaign because they know that if this Initiative passes, there will be more HIV infections, more suffering, and more deaths.
PROPOSITION 102 IS OPPOSED BY
THE CALIFORNIA CONFERENCE OF LOCAL HEALTH OFFICERS
AND
THE HEALTH OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA

The opposition of Local Health Officers to Proposition 102 is based on the following considerations:

* The response to the AIDS epidemic must be timely, flexible, and responsive to new scientific information. The initiative process is inflexible, cumbersome, and cannot adjust to new medical developments. If laws and regulations related to the transmission of HIV must be changed, the changes should take place in the regular legislative process which allows for debate, careful consideration, and modification related to new scientific information.

* The initiative directs local Health Officers to take all measures "reasonably necessary" to prevent the transmission of infection when individuals who are suspected of being infected with HIV are reported. Health Officers agree that the only measure which is "reasonably necessary" to prevent the transmission of HIV is community education. Local efforts and scarce funds will be better spent in educating the community about how to avoid infection with the virus than in tracking down all people who have been named as contacts to an individual who is suspected of being infected with HIV.

* The initiative destroys the system of alternative test sites which have been successful in (1) protecting the blood supply, (2) providing access to individuals at risk for education and counselling, and (3) providing indispensable information about the epidemiology of the disease.

* The reporting of HIV status to insurance companies will deny health care to all individuals who are infected with HIV and transfer the burden of care for these citizens to the local tax payer.

The leaders of both of these organizations are available for comment on Proposition 102.

9060 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite #106, Los Angeles, California 90069     (213) 278-9355
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
August 19, 1988

CONTACT: Don L. Volk
213/278-9355

AIDS Research Will Be Hampered

CALIFORNIA POLL RESULTS CONCERN PROP. 102 OPPONENTS

LOS ANGELES -- While the results of a recent California Poll showing that 72% of California voters initially favor Proposition 102 concern the Initiative's opponents, they are neither totally surprised nor discouraged by the results.

"We are concerned," said State Controller Gray Davis who co-chairs the Stop Dannemeyer/No on 102 campaign, "but the high number who favor Prop. 102 will decrease significantly once the voters learn that the Dannemeyer Initiative will devastate our AIDS research programs."

Davis added, "This measure will ultimately be defeated when they see that the California Medical Assn., the California Nurses Assn., the Health Officers Assn. of California, and the California Hemophilia Council, and every other responsible medical professional organization in the state opposes Prop. 102.

"The poll shows that California voters are highly educated about AIDS; and having resoundingly defeated the two previous LaRouche AIDS Initiatives, they will similarly defeat this 'Illegitimate Son of LaRouche,'" Davis continued.

Beyond simply requiring doctors and blood banks to report HIV-positive individuals (and those "suspected" of being HIV positive) to public health officials, the
Initiative violates the time-honored ethics of medical research by requiring reporting of infected individuals who agree to participate in research projects designed to find a vaccine and effective treatments for the deadly disease.

"This measure will drive those people we most need for research away from the very programs that will help them and that will facilitate finding other treatments and vaccines," said Michael Gottlieb, MD, an eminent California AIDS researcher. "Research in California will be irreparably hampered if this Initiative passes."

Co-sponsored by California's leading medical organizations and statewide opinion leaders, the Stop Dannemeyer/No on 102 campaign will educate the public about the underlying implications of the Initiative, which extend far beyond the mere "reporting" of HIV-positive individuals.

Said Helen Miramontes, past president of the California Nurses Assn., "While individual parts of the Initiative may appear reasonable, when voters have the opportunity to examine it as a whole, we are confident they will agree with California's doctors, nurses, public health officers, and virtually every other health professionals organization that the Prop. 102 goes way overboard. It is an unnecessary, expensive and dangerous over-reaction to the problem by a few mean-spirited individuals."

#####
Reporting Law Would Hurt AIDS Studies, Scientists Say

By VICTOR F. ZONANA, Times Staff Writer

SAN FRANCISCO—Some of the nation's leading AIDS researchers gathered here Tuesday to condemn Proposition 102, the latest California AIDS ballot measure, as a dangerous and politically motivated intrusion into their efforts to quell the epidemic.

"This single piece of legislation will have more to do with prolonging the epidemic than anything I can imagine," said Dr. Mervyn Silverman, president of the American Foundation for AIDS Research.

"If LaRouche was Peter Pan, then this is Frankenstein," Silverman added, comparing the November ballot measure to the twice-defeated AIDS initiative backed by political extremist Lyndon LaRouche.

By mandating the reporting to state officials of the names of all those who test positive for the AIDS-causing human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), "Prop. 102 would scare away re-search subjects and drive the epidemic underground," said Dr. Paul Volberding, editor-in-chief of the Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes and head of AIDS programs at San Francisco General Hospital.

"Clinical research in California could come to a grinding halt," added Volberding, who is conducting trials of several potentially promising drugs and depends upon a steady stream of volunteers to test their efficacy.

State law already mandates the reporting of the names of people with clear symptoms of AIDS. Besides extending the reporting provision to those carrying the virus, the measure, backed by Rep. William Dannemeyer (R-Fullerton), would shut down anonymous testing centers for HIV and allow employers and insurers to test for the virus.

Proposition 102

The measure would also require doctors to report to the government the names of those they reasonably believe to be infected with HIV, a provision that Silverman called "Orwellian, to say the least."

Opponents of the measure say it runs counter to the proven public health strategy of encouraging members of high-risk groups to come forward for voluntary anonymous testing without fear of losing their jobs and health insurance.

People have come forward for testing and counseling "because they trust us not to put their names on government lists," said Dr. Andrew Moss, an epidemiologist at San Francisco General. He noted that the rate of new infection in San Francisco's gay community "is extremely low and going down," as a result of the city's anonymous testing, counseling and education programs.

"This is not a conflict between public health and civil liberties," added Silverman. "Public health officials already have all the power necessary to cope with this epidemic," he continued, noting that HIV cannot be transmitted through casual contact.

The researchers at the press conference said they were alarmed by the California Poll released last week that showed 72% of those polled in favor of Proposition 102, 22% opposed and 6% undecided.

Opponents of the measure say their best hope is to persuade Californians that the initiative is bad medicine and cite endorsements of their position by the California Medical Assn., the California Nurses Assn. and the Health Officers Assn.

Sen. Wilson Opposes Initiative Requiring AIDS Test Disclosure

By Jerry Roberts
Chronicle Political Editor

California Republican Senator Pete Wilson announced his opposition yesterday to Proposition 102, a conservative-backed ballot measure to require doctors to report the names of all those who test positive for the AIDS virus.

In San Francisco campaign appearances, Wilson also attacked rival Leo McCarthy on Mideast policy, accusing his Democratic foe of turning "a deaf ear and blind eye" to threats to the security of Israel.

On the AIDS issue, Wilson found himself in a rare agreement with McCarthy, who denounced the so-called Dannemeyer initiative last week.

Sponsored by Orange County Representative William Dannemeyer, it would require doctors and blood banks to report to public health officials the names of patients or donors who have AIDS or who test positive for the human immunodeficiency virus, even if they are not diagnosed as having AIDS.

Wilson yesterday agreed with the measure's opponents, who say that such requirements, which would prohibit the current practice of anonymous and confidential testing, could discourage people at risk from being tested.

"As a practical matter, the requirement to identify those who test positive is going to avert the trend of people coming in and seeking counseling," Wilson said.

Wilson said he supports Proposition 96, sponsored by Los Angeles County Sheriff Sherman Block, which would require AIDS testing for defendants in criminal and juvenile cases when law enforcement, fire or medical personnel believe they have been exposed to the virus by the defendant.

"I think it's only fair that people who are in a situation of being put at risk have the opportunity to determine whether they have been infected," Wilson said.

McCarthy, while condemning Proposition 102 as an "irresponsible dismantling of our progress in the war against AIDS," had until yesterday taken no position on Proposition 96.

Both AIDS testing measures, which are opposed by gay and civil rights groups, were favored by a large percentage of voters in the most recent California Poll.

Wilson's comments on the initiatives came in an interview just after he delivered a speech on Israel to members of the Concordia Club in San Francisco.

The speech was closed to reporters because of club rules prohibiting the press from attending its functions, a move that embarrassed Wilson campaign officials who had invited reporters to attend.

"McCarthy can't get away with making speeches to Jewish audiences about the cost of indifference and then himself turn a deaf ear and blind eye to clear threats to Israel and the American Jewish community," the senator said. The speech was the latest attempt by Wilson to outflank McCarthy among Jewish voters, a traditionally Democratic group that the Republican has been courting assiduously.

Specifically, he criticized McCarthy for not speaking out against the Democratic Party platform, adopted at last month's convention in Atlanta, and for not criticizing Jesse Jackson, who has a pro-Palestinian tilt in his Mideast policies.

"Both McCarthy and the Democratic platform stood mute on the critical threat to Israel's security posed by those insisting upon a Palestinian homeland on the West Bank," Wilson said, "just as McCarthy in the past has refused to repudiate Jesse Jackson's inexcusable anti-Semitism."

The Republican platform flatly opposes a Palestinian state and a U.N. resolution saying that Zionism is racism. The Democratic platform is silent on both issues.

"Leo McCarthy has always been a strong supporter of the state of Israel," responded McCarthy campaign director Darry Sragow. "Although Pete Wilson during the 1982 campaign expressed support for the sale of arms to the Saudis, since moving to Washington, he has said all the right things about Israel. This race is basically between two candidates who are both supporters of Israel."

Sragow also accused Wilson of being inconsistent, citing a 1982 radio appearance in which he said Wilson stated his hopes for achieving "a Palestinian homeland that we can be assured won't be used for terrorism."

As for Jackson's views, Sragow said that "we all await Pete Wilson's repudiation of Pat Robertson's assertion that Jews are not equal in the eyes of God," a reference to controversial statements by television evangelist and former GOP presidential candidate Robertson.

Wilson also said he opposes Proposition W, a San Francisco ballot measure calling for a Palestinian homeland. McCarthy earlier announced his opposition to the initiative.
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Bi-Partisan Opposition Mounts

Legislators and Health Professionals Say Dannemeyer AIDS Initiative Will Endanger Research and Blood Banks

SACRAMENTO -- In a bi-partisan move, Assemblymen William Filante (R-San Rafael) and Johan Klehs (D-San Leandro) today denounced Prop. 102, the Dannemeyer AIDS Initiative, in a joint press conference with California's leading health organizations.

"If this Initiative passes, California's leadership role in AIDS research will be lost," said Klehs.

"The prevention of research under this Initiative is too onerous for us to allow it to pass," said Filante.

The Capitol press conference was hosted by Dr. Laurens P. White, president of the California Medical Association, and included representatives from the statewide organizations of health professionals that co-sponsor the Stop Dannemeyer/No on 102 campaign committee: The California Nurses Association (Marian Gillan); the Health Officers Association of California and the California Conference of Local Health Officers (Dr. Carl Smith); California State Psychological Association (Joan Amundsen); and the California Association of Hospitals and Health Systems (Sally Wright).

Dr. White pointed out that blood donations in California have dropped by 20 percent because people falsely fear they can contract AIDS from donating
blood and that professionals believe Prop. 102 will exacerbate that situation. "This Initiative cannot have anything but a deleterious effect on this state's blood supply."

Unanimously the health professionals on the panel condemned the Initiative for setting back vital AIDS research and treatment programs in California.

"Instead of this ineffective Initiative," said Gillan, vice president of the California Nurses Association, "we need a non-judgmental and supportive environment that will encourage participation in more research projects. This is dangerous and costly and will undermine that strategy."

Dr. Smith, who heads the Alameda County Health Department and co-chairs the Testing Subcommittee of Governor Deukmejian's California AIDS Leadership Committee, said the Initiative removes all discretion from public health officers to undertake their jobs in the most effective way. "This measure paralyzes local health departments. The only measure that is reasonable and necessary is community education."

Amundsen, representing the California State Psychological Association, noted that the costs of the extensive contact tracing mandated by Prop. 102 would set back the thoughtful policies that have been developed in California. "Prop. 102 will reverse the gains made in education and research. Further, we know that this proposition will deflect badly needed funding from these programs."

UC-Davis AIDS Researcher Neal Flynn, noted that the loss of confidentiality will discourage individuals from participating in treatment and research programs. "I have seen my patients injured by a loss of confidentiality. This Initiative will actively discourage people from participating in AIDS research and prevention programs; and these are the very people we need most."

######
Hard words for AIDS initiative

By Stephen Green
Bee Capitol Bureau

Speakers for the state's largest health organizations Tuesday denounced an AIDS initiative on the November ballot, calling it worse than either of the failed AIDS initiatives promoted in past elections by political extremist Lyndon B. Johnson.

"It's got a lot of cockamamie ideas ... that will seriously undercut a lot of the progress we've made in fighting this disease," Dr. Laurens White, president of the California Medical Association, said at a Capitol press conference.

The measure, Proposition 102, would cause sweeping changes in state laws on confidentiality and AIDS testing. Blood banks and health officials would be required to report anyone they suspect of carrying the AIDS virus, even if the person has not been diagnosed as having AIDS.

Health officers would then trace and test anyone who may have had contact with the suspected carrier. And both employers and insurance companies would be allowed to test potential employees and customers for AIDS.

Its sponsor, Republican Rep. William Dannemeyer of Fullerton, claims the health establishment is too timid in promoting measures that would protect the public from acquired immune deficiency syndrome.

But Carl Smith of the Health Officers' Association of California said Proposition 102 would break the budgets of local health offices and take away their discretion to respond to the epidemic.

And Neal Flynn of the California Association of Hospitals and Health Systems said it would "scuttle innovative research and education programs" that rely on people volunteering for testing.

Also among the opponents is Assemblyman William Filante, R-Greenbrae, the only physician in the Legislature.

There are some positive aspects to the Dannemeyer measure, he said, but they include already accepted practices or have been written into pending legislation.

Reflecting the bipartisan opposition to the initiative, Filante was joined at the news conference by Assemblyman Johan Klehs, D-San Leandro. Both major U.S. Senate candidates, incumbent Republican Pete Wilson and Democratic Lt. Gov. Leo McCarthy, oppose Proposition 102.
Another bad AIDS initiative

After beating LaRouche proposals, voters now must deal with flawed Prop. 102

WOULD THE average person unhesitatingly allow his or her blood to be tested for the AIDS virus, knowing that a positive result could threaten that person's job or health insurance? No.

That is one reason why citizens should vote "no" on Proposition 102, the "Reporting Exposure to AIDS Virus" initiative on the Nov. 8 ballot. Purportedly offered as a measure to stop the AIDS spread, Prop. 102 would be counterproductive. It is a political answer to a public health problem. It would cripple effective testing and education programs, strip away civil rights protections, subject AIDS patients to vast anguish and chase many people underground.

And all this would cost money, "possibly tens or hundreds of millions of dollars," according to the Legislative Analyst. Yet Prop. 102 could pass. It could pass despite opposition by the California Medical Association and the overwhelming majority of AIDS experts. Prop. 102 could pass though it contains provisions opposed by Surgeon General C. Everett Koop and the President's AIDS Commission. Prop. 102 could pass because it responds to fear.

It was put forward by Republican Congressman William Dannemeyer of Orange County. Unlike extremist Lyndon LaRouche, whose two initiatives were easily defeated, Dannemeyer commands some mainstream support. He has been joined by tax crusader Paul Gann, who suffers from AIDS as a result of a tainted blood transfusion. Dannemeyer or Gann can garner significant power and sympathy. Meanwhile, the opposition among AIDS organizations is not as yet well organized.

Dannemeyer contends that Prop. 102 treats AIDS like any other communicable disease. This assumes that all communicable diseases are similar, which they are not. AIDS isn't even like other sexually transmitted diseases, as it is passed between consenting adults and also by use of tainted needles or transfusions. It remains centered among high-risk groups. Prop. 102 terrorizes rather than treats these persons.

Current policies encourage at-risk individuals to be tested without fear of discrimination. (Experience has shown that the number being tested drops significantly when people are asked to waive confidentiality.) Those testing positive are brought into education programs in order to alter sexual or drug-use behavior. Education has brought new infection among San Francisco gay men to a virtual halt. As Prop. 102 would discourage testing in the first place, it could make the epidemic worse.

- Prop. 102 requires doctors, blood banks and others to report patients they reasonably believe to be infected. Thus, someone who looked gay could be reported by name, to local authorities. Prop. 102 goes on to allow health officials to take "all measures reasonably necessary to prevent transmission" of the disease. Authorities already have such power. The combination of these two phrases, however, seemingly would allow anyone suspected of carrying the AIDS virus to be quarantined.

- Prop. 102 removes restrictions on using HIV-antibody test results. The measure would allow tests to be used in pre-employment physicals, though AIDS is not spread in the workplace. Prop. 102 would allow testing to obtain health insurance, ignoring pending legislative bills that address this complex issue. The cost to government health care programs could run into untold millions of dollars and personal suffering could be immense if insurance companies could eliminate AIDS coverage.

- Prop. 102 confuses those who test positive for the virus with those sick with full-blown AIDS. While it is believed that most of those who test HIV-positive eventually will become ill, the transition from one stage to the other can take a decade or more. This measure could allow discrimination in employment and housing against those who otherwise can enjoy many more years of symptom-free life.

Prop. 102 implies that government has been hamstrung in its ability to treat the AIDS epidemic. This is simply false. Public health officials have enormous power and flexibility under current statutes. Physicians now can inform the spouse, for example, that a partner has AIDS. And AIDS cases today are reported to local health authorities.

Prop. 102 is dangerously regressive. It is a threat not just to gay men, but to other people who may be infected through transfusions and/or through heterosexual transmission. Laced with seemingly credible arguments, it contains punitive aspects rejected by voters when they turned down the LaRouche measures in earlier elections. On Prop. 102, The Examiner urges a "no" vote.
AIDS: Clearing the Air

The appearance of sponsors of Proposition 102, the mandatory AIDS-reporting initiative, before the California AIDS Leadership Committee on Wednesday was, in the words of one of the co-chairmen, "useful and enlightening." It served above all to expose the fundamental flaws in the initiative—flaws that have led the California Medical Assn. and most health-care and public-health officials to oppose it.

Rep. William E. Dannemeyer (R-Fullerton) and Dr. Larimore Cummins, chairman of the Santa Cruz County Medical Society AIDS Task Force, were the advocates for the initiative. They made the familiar arguments, asserting that the national and state policies now in place have failed and that the time has come to use the techniques of mandatory testing and contact tracing that have been effective in public-health campaigns against other infectious diseases, including venereal diseases. If mandatory reporting works for syphilis, which is not necessarily a fatal disease, why not for AIDS, which is all the more dangerous because there is no known cure?

The very simplicity of the argument is beguiling, but it masks fatal flaws. In the first place, the existing national and state policies are proving effective by the one test that counts: The rate of new infections is dropping in areas of high prevalence. In the second place, the voluntary reporting and contact tracing that are now in place are also proving effective. The superior effectiveness of anonymous-test centers in reaching high-risk persons has been confirmed in a recent study in Oregon reported last month in the Lancet.

But the anonymous-test centers would be barred by the reporting initiative, to be replaced by a mandatory system that the state's most senior health officer has concluded will not work. The confidential mandatory reporting system that is proposed in the initiative as an alternative already has created problems for public-health officers, committee members have reported. Their reports confirm fears of public-health officials that the mandatory program would drive away the high-risk populations that the present program has been effective in reaching. An official of the Centers for Disease Control reported that some research programs involving volunteers already are in jeopardy because those who are within the programs have said that they will quit if their HIV-positive status is reported by name, as required in the initiative. A county health officer said that his work would be paralyzed by the requirements of the initiative.

Two other flaws emerged as the committee reviewed the proposition. One is the incredible cost that is implicit in the reporting and contact tracing at a time when counties are running out of funding for basic programs, including money to provide AZT for AIDS patients. The other is the provision in the initiative that would bar any amendment by the Legislature, requiring re-submission to the voters of the state for any change, which would make adaptability to changing conditions difficult if not impossible.

The statements to the committee by Dannemeyer and Cummins were troubling in another way. They displayed significant ignorance of what has been accomplished, including the policies endorsed by the Presidential AIDS Commission, the National Academy of Sciences, the World Health Organization and virtually every health-care expert involved in the pandemic. They offered no convincing scientific evidence to support their claim that the initiative contains a better program than those in place. There was an ideological cast to some of their arguments. And their treatment of information was so casual at some points that Dr. Donald P. Francis of the Centers for Disease Control, an expert in the field, concluded: "At best I would call it a deception of facts."

The California AIDS Leadership Committee postponed until later this month formal action on the initiative. But, significantly, it reaffirmed the stand that it took two months ago in opposing mandatory reporting of HIV-positive test results—a critical element of Proposition 102. That reaffirmation, coming after hearing the sponsors of the proposition, is significant. It represents the views of many of the most expert and best informed concerning AIDS in the state. It is a message that emphasizes the fundamental defect of Proposition 102 and the grave damage that it would do to the continuing effort to contain AIDS.
Dangerous Direction on AIDS

The AIDS reporting initiative, Proposition 102, has now qualified for California's November ballot, stirring deep concern among many doctors and public-health workers. The concern is appropriate. This is a dangerous and potentially costly proposal that would undermine the present effective strategy for controlling AIDS.

There are two major provisions of the initiative:

—Requiring that all persons who test positive to the presence of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) that causes AIDS report themselves or be reported to public-health officials. The change would amend the elaborate rules of confidentiality now in place and terminate anonymous testing that has proved to be an effective control strategy.

—Ordering public-health officers to pursue the at-risk contacts of those who are infected, a project that could cost billions of dollars while serving, in most cases, only limited public-health purposes.

In limiting provisions for confidentiality and substituting mandatory for voluntary testing, the initiative challenges a basic finding of the Presidential Commission on the HIV Epidemic. "Rigorous maintenance of confidentiality is considered critical to the success of the public-health endeavor to prevent the transmission and spread of HIV infection," the commission concluded. "Current public-health strategies for fighting the spread of HIV infection are entirely dependent on voluntary cooperation."

In commanding an extensive program of partner tracing and notification, the initiative would impose a diversion of money from other more urgent needs identified by public-health officials in the areas of education and treatment. Indiscriminate tracing would cost millions, probably billions, of dollars. The wholesale-notification provisions contrast with the carefully crafted recommendations on notification of unsuspecting partners of infected persons developed by the American Medical Assn. and the presidential commission.

There appear to be many motives behind Proposition 102. Some doctors who are supporting the initiative are frustrated by existing laws restricting the ability of doctors to share AIDS test results with other health-care providers. That problem is now being addressed with legislation. Some of the sponsors, believing that AIDS has become a "politically protected" disease, argue that the existing policy is "ill-conceived and self-defeating," and that it is high time that HIV infection should be treated like other communicable diseases. That is the view of one sponsoring organization, California Physicians for a Logical AIDS Response, headed by Dr. Lawrence J. McNamee. He is a member of the Los Angeles County Medical Assn. AIDS Committee, but the committee itself has voted to oppose his initiative. Another sponsor, Rep. William E. Dannemeyer (R-Fullerton), has been a vigorous critic of proposals to protect AIDS-infected persons from discrimination on grounds that these are programs that encourage homosexuality and intravenous drug use because a majority of AIDS victims in the United States are male homosexuals and intravenous drug users. In making their criticisms, unfortunately, the sponsors of the initiative have offered no evidence that their sweeping proposals in the initiative would strengthen the efforts to contain the disease. In fact, they would not.

The careless, counterproductive proposals of the initiative are particularly evident when its provisions are compared with the constructive proposals of the presidential AIDS commission, headed by Adm. James D. Watkins. Taken as a whole, the initiative would do great harm to the basic strategy supported by the presidential commission. The breaches in confidentiality alone could destroy the voluntary cooperation of high-risk populations that the presidential commission cited as essential. There are, no doubt about it, problems and imperfections in the AIDS program. The presidential commission identified two basic shortcomings in the present approach: an absence of anti-discrimination laws that would protect victims of the deadly disease, and inadequate funding of efforts to control the disease, including treatment for drug users. But the initiative addresses neither of these problems. Indeed, if adopted, Proposition 102 would exacerbate them. Dannemeyer has emphasized his opposition to anti-discrimination legislation. And the mandates for wholesale contact tracing would squander the already limited resources available.

It is not surprising, in the face of such flagrant defects in the initiative, that the California Medical Assn. and the California Nurses Assn. have gone to court seeking to bar the initiative from the ballot. Proposition 102 would appear to violate constitutional restrictions that initiatives be limited to a single subject. Regardless of the outcome of the suit, the challenge at least makes clear the depth of opposition by many of the best-informed health-care professionals, including most of those directly involved in the effort to contain the AIDS pandemic.

"The initiative is bad medicine and bad public health," according to Dr. Laurens White, president of the California Medical Assn. We agree.
Fighting AIDS Discrimination

New laws and court decisions help those singled out by tests

When James Dorsey, an unemployed teenager from Detroit, packed his bags to go to Dayton last summer, he looked forward to a promising new beginning. He enrolled in classes at a U.S. Job Corps residential training center, hoping to qualify for a clerical job. But Dorsey had hardly started classes when he was summoned to the program's medical office for an unpleasant surprise. He was informed that he had tested positive for AIDS antibodies during his required physical exam, then dropped from the program. "The world was pulled out from under me," Dorsey recalls, who has no symptoms of AIDS. Last month he filed suit in federal court in Washington demanding reinstatement.

Dorsey, who is mounting the latest major challenge to the use of AIDS testing, is one of an estimated 1.5 million individuals known as "healthy seropositives." These are people whose blood indicates infection with the AIDS virus but who have not developed the debilitating disease that has now attacked 71,171 nationwide. His situation places him among a growing group of Americans who have difficulty finding work, housing and even medical care solely because of their test results. Reports abound of individuals who have been forced to resign from jobs, threatened with loss of a lease, or rejected for health or life insurance.

Safety is usually the cited reason for setting apart those who test positive. Job Corps Director Peter Rell explains that his agency's exclusionary policy is meant to secure "as healthy and disease-free an environment as possible." All 36,000 participants in the agency's residential programs are warned of the test on enrollment forms, he says, and are provided with counseling if they are rejected because of the results. The high costs of treating AIDS patients is an actuarial problem for insurers, who routinely reject seropositives seeking life or medical coverage. "Once we sign on, we're there for the duration," says Emily Crandall, vice president of the Guardian Life Insurance Co. of America.

Victims of these practices counter that testing positive does not necessarily mean a person will develop AIDS. Nor does the presence of carriers, or even those who have come down with AIDS, endanger the workplace, critics insist, because medical evidence indicates that the virus cannot be transmitted by casual contact. Discrimination on the basis of the blood tests may actually harm public health, they warn. "If you fear you are going to lose your job and just about everything else in your life," says Katherine Franke of the New York City Human Rights Commission, "there is no incentive to take the test and get information about safe sex and needle use." Last week, reacting to concerns about confidentiality, the Centers for Disease Control announced that starting next year it would routinely survey one-third of the nation's newborns for AIDS antibodies, but no names will be attached to the blood samples analyzed.

The law is starting to bend in favor of those who have been singled out by the tests. Forty-two states and the District of Columbia have antidiscrimination laws against the handicapped; some state courts and executive actions have extended the protections of these statutes to people branded by their blood-test results. Delaware's attorney general recently forced the Nemours Foundation to drop its policy of transferring out seropositive patients from its Wilmington hospital. Municipalities have also been using their antidiscrimination ordinances. In New York City last March, an administrative judge awarded $26,647 to a man who was refused treatment by his longtime dental clinic. Some states, including California, Florida, Massachusetts and Wisconsin, have laws restricting the use of AIDS tests as an employee-screening device and directing that lab results be kept confidential. Last week New York joined the list by completing action on its version of a confidentiality bill.

Test victims are also getting help from the federal courts. Although last year one federal bench rejected a Fourth Amendment challenge to a State Department employee-testing policy, in March another decided that the mandatory testing of workers by a Nebraska health agency violates the amendment's ban on unreasonable searches. In June a federal district court in Los Angeles produced a major victory for foes of AIDS tracing in addressing the claim of a gay man who was tossed out of an alcohol rehabilitation program at Centinela Hospital in Inglewood, Calif. Judge Pamela Ann Rymer ruled that a person fingered by an AIDS test can be protected by the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which bars discrimination against the handicapped by institutions receiving federal funds. "For the first time, a federal court has ruled that fear of contagion cannot form the basis for discrimination against seropositives," says Mickey Wheatley of the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, a gay-rights group.

Predictably, such legal developments have encouraged a backlash. One of the most volatile battles is now raging in California. The state's stringent confidentiality law is being challenged by a proposition on the November ballot. It would require that public-health officials be informed of all positive AIDS tests and that all sexual partners of those who test positive be traced and alerted. The measure's chief proponent, Republican Congressman William Dannemeyer, says he wants to correct the state's "absurd policy" of turning a "public-health issue into a civil rights issue." But Benjamin Schatz, a lawyer with National Gay Rights Advocates, calls the proposition an "AIDS hysteria law." The referendum measure, which has a good chance of passing, could affect the antidiscrimination movement nationwide. Few things are as influential in framing a developing legal landscape as some solid election returns.

—By Alan L. Sanders. Reported by Dan Cook/Los Angeles and Barbara Goldberg/New York

The AIDS antibody test: a move from the lab to the courtroom
The AIDS scare on the ballot

By David L. Kirp

The worried calls come to the San Francisco AIDS hotline from places hundreds of miles away, from men and women living in towns where the dread disease remains potently stigmatizing. “Here’s what I’ve done; here’s how I’ve lived my life,” they say in long and anguished conversations. “Could it be that I have AIDS?”

These callers often are eager to be tested, but only if they’re sure the AIDS test is confidential. They are panicked into playing Deep Throat because of the ostracism that can follow public exposure. In some places, even asking about AIDS remains risky business.

“How do you know someone isn’t taping this call?” they ask. “How can you be sure that someone isn’t checking the car registration plates of people going in for testing?”

The hotline tells them about the state-financed AIDS testing centers, which are entirely confidential. Yet, to feel doubly secure, the callers will frequently choose a clinic miles from home.

Proposition 102, on California’s November ballot, is designed to shut down these testing sites. It’s part and parcel of a move to abandon the prevailing principle that a person’s AIDS status should be confidential. In doing so, the proposition would waste tens of millions of dollars and scare off people, like the hotline callers, who most need medical counsel.

In 1986 and again this past June, Californians rejected AIDS reporting schemes propounded by extremist Lyndon LaRouche. The measures were bad enough — they could be read as calling for the quarantine of those with the AIDS virus. But they were so opaquely worded that no one knew what they really signified.

Prop. 102 is crystal clear, and clearly dangerous. It’s also a disquietingly popular idea. A new California Poll reports that 72 percent of those surveyed support the measure.

Why so? Advocates insist the proposition merely treats AIDS like any other sexually transmitted disease. But that’s plainly untrue.

The reporting scheme the measure would set up would require doctors, under threat of criminal penalty, to inform health officials about anyone with a positive AIDS test result, as well as anyone they “reasonably” suspect of carrying the AIDS virus. Anyone in a high-risk AIDS category, and that includes all gay men, could wind up on the not-so-short list.

Health authorities would then be obliged to learn the identities of others who might have been infected, doing whatever they believe “necessary” to prevent the spread of AIDS. This kind of forced contact-tracing is almost never used with other sexually transmitted diseases, because sensible public health officers know that, if it were, no one with VD would ever be tested.

Contact-tracing would cost a bundle to implement, an estimated $7.5 million in San Francisco alone. Worse, that’s money that would otherwise pay for AIDS patient care in these times of pinched government budgets.

The mandated searches would no doubt turn up some people with the AIDS virus. But what help could they be offered?

“We should worry less about the sick, more about protecting the healthy,” the Rev. Pat Robertson preached at the GOP convention. Yet, confidentiality for people carrying the AIDS virus disappears, then no one — sick or healthy — is protected unless guarantees against discrimination are put in place.

Prop. 102 doesn’t create that protection. Quite the contrary. It gives insurance companies and employers permission to test for AIDS and use those results as they please. In a world according to Prop. 102, those undone by the physical effects of the disease get wiped out again, potentially losing their health benefits and their jobs overnight.

Knowing these new rules of the game, few people at risk would come within a mile of an AIDS test. AIDS research would be undermined — for who would volunteer to be a public guinea pig? — and many people with AIDS would go underground. That’s why the California Medical Association and the California Nursing Association are on record opposed to the measure.

Viewed with 20-20 hindsight, it’s easy enough to understand why California voters said no to the earlier AIDS initiatives. Then, the dread word “quarantine” hung in the air. Also, the campaign against Prop. 64 was a highly personal attack on its chief sponsor, LaRouche, a political loonie with a penchant for foot-in-mouth disease.

This time, with LaRouche out of the picture, it’s the proposition’s backers who are relying on personalities. Prop. 102 is known as the Dannemeyer initiative. While Bill Dannemeyer swims far to the right of the political mainstream, the very fact that he’s a GOP congressman gives him a certain legitimacy.

More significant, the proposition’s real front-man is Paul Gann, Mr. Public Frugality, an avuncular figure of considerable popularity who, sadly, happens to have AIDS. That circumstance doesn’t make Gann an authority, but it buys him sympathy and discourages opponents from speaking out. It also seduces voters.

Unless Californians abandon the habit of voting the personality and take a look at the ideas incorporated in the measure, Prop. 102 will pass. If that happens, the state with the most enlightened AIDS policy will be transformed into a symbol for AIDS backlash.
Educating the California Voter: Results of a Poll on Prop. 102

Have you heard of something called Proposition 102 (also known as the Dannemeyer initiative)?

- Yes .................. 22%
- No .................. 64%
- Not sure .................. 14%

Proposition 102 was written with the intent to stop the spread of AIDS by requiring doctors to report to public health authorities anyone who tests positive to the AIDS virus, much as they currently do for venereal disease cases. Knowing this and nothing else, would you say you favor or oppose Proposition 102?

- Favor .................. 60%
- Oppose .................. 25%
- Not sure .................. 16%

Now suppose you learned that Proposition 102 would outlaw all anonymous testing sites, cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars to implement and allows insurance companies to deny medical coverage if a person tests positive, even though the person may never develop the disease. Now knowing this, would you say you favor or oppose Proposition 102?

- Favor .................. 18%
- Oppose .................. 65%
- Not sure .................. 17%

*Poll conducted September 2 by Dresner Sykes of New York using a statewide sample of 1,000. The margin of error is ±3.2%.

Political analysts say that the results of the third question prove that a well-educated public will vote against Prop. 102.
PROP. 102 WOULD NOT STOP THE SPREAD OF AIDS, HEALTH PROFESSIONALS SAY

ORANGE -- Presidents of both the California Medical Assn. and the Orange County Medical Assn., Dr. Laurens P. White and Dr. Russell Ewing, respectively, denounced Prop. 102, the Dannemeyer AIDS Initiative, in a press conference at the Orange County Medical Assn.

"This Initiative would not help stop the spread of AIDS," said Dr. White, "It does the opposite of what it pretends to do."

White added that Prop. 102 "would strike a mortal blow at research." He indicated that by requiring reporting of research test subjects, volunteers would be inhibited from coming forth for research projects involving treatments and a vaccine."

While parts of Prop. 102 may appear attractive on the surface, careful examination shows that it will have the opposite effect, said the health professionals.

Dr. Ewing said, "I have great worries that our blood supply will drop and there will be many people who might have to forego treatment for heart disease and surgeries if this
Proposition passes."

Ewing pointed out that where there is mandatory reporting, those being voluntarily tested decreases considerably.

Dr. Don Hagan of the Orange County Medical Assn. AIDS Committee, reiterated, "Mandatory reporting deters antibody testing. Four separate scientific studies presented at the Fourth International Conference on AIDS in Stockholm clearly indicate that those who are at highest risk will forego testing when the law requires names and addresses."

While the Initiative purports to require reporting of HIV-positive individuals, the speakers stressed that it is the Initiative's underlying implications that concern them most.

Said Pearl Jemison-Smith, AIDS Coordinator for the University of California/Irvine Medical Center, "We cannot afford the passage of Prop. 102. This initiative would mandate the tracing of every sexual contact of all persons infected with HIV since at least 1979.

"A very conservative estimate of Orange County citizens infected with HIV is 6,000. At two contacts per year, going back for five years, our public health officer would have to
track down at least 60,000 people. With an estimated cost of at least $440 per contact, the minimum cost to Orange County would be $26.4 million."

The speakers stressed that her figures are "very conservative."

Dr. Charles Plows, Vice-Speaker of the CMA House of Delegates, stressed that by effectively abolishing anonymous testing sites drug treatment centers would be seriously impaired in treating drug abuse.

"This Initiative will bring such a mass exodus away from the drug treatment programs that we cannot afford to support Prop. 102," said Plows.

Another major issue is that the Initiative process is not the way to formulate sound AIDS policy. "Our legislative program in Sacramento has responded to the pressure of the people to do something about AIDS. Sledge-hammering the process is not the way to deal with AIDS," said Plows.

Fran Carman, president of the Orange County Mother of AIDS Patients (MAP), said, "We are here as mothers. Our children need their dignity--not the loss of their insurance and their jobs."

Carman concluded, "These are our kids. They are not
outcasts. We are mothers of AIDS patients in Orange County; and we will continue to speak out on behalf of our children. We will be silent no more!"

#####
MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OPPOSE PROP. 102 AT LOS ANGELES LUNCHEON

WEST LOS ANGELES -- Anchored by a $5,000 contribution from the Burroughs Wellcome Co., the Stop Dannemeyer/No on 102 campaign, raised over $25,000 at a private luncheon honoring Congressman Barney Frank (D-Mass.) and hosted by State Controller Gray Davis. Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi (D-San Francisco) introduced the visiting congressman.

"Dannemeyer's ideas about AIDS have been rejected by the medical profession, the public health profession, both Houses of Congress, Ronald Reagan's Commission on AIDS, Ronald Reagan's Surgeon General and Ronald Reagan's Director of the Office of Personnel Management," said Frank.

"There is no reason for the voters of California to break Dannemeyer's losing streak," concluded Frank.

Los Angeles' five Congressional Representatives, Anthony Bielenson, Howard L. Berman, Julian C. Dixon, Mel Levine and Henry Waxman, co-chaired the fundraising event.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi of San Francisco introduced the Massachusetts representative "as one of the most effective members of the Congress."

Further, she told the group, "This Initiative is deadly. It will halt research and divert funds necessary to really
stop this epidemic and divert them in such a manner that discriminates against people who are sick."

As host of the luncheon, State Controller Gray Davis introduced the two members of Congress and urged the attendees to support the Stop Dannemeyer/No on 102 campaign, which he co-chairs.

"Prop. 102 is deceptive and mean-spirited. It would set back by decades the efforts to find both a cure and a vaccine for AIDS," said Davis.

Pelosi also announced that the California Democratic Caucus will hold a press conference in Washington, DC, to announce its opposition to the Initiative.

Frank concluded the luncheon by saying, "If California's voters don't beat this referendum, the damage will not be confined to California. It will have an immediate negative impact in the Congress."

Said Los Angeles physician, Dr. Michael Roth, "We are very grateful to Burroughs Wellcome for their $5,000 contribution. If the provisions of this Initiative had been implemented three years ago, we would not have AZT to use as a treatment that saves the lives of countless Americans.

"We cannot allow Prop. 102 to become law because it will stop the development of the next generation of medications for treating those who are ill."
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DANNEMEYER AND AIDS:
PRESCRIPTION FOR DISASTER

Congressman William Dannemeyer (R-Fullerton), the sponsor of Proposition 102 (the "Reporting Exposure to AIDS Virus" Initiative), has achieved more notoriety for his controversial statements on AIDS than he has for his thoughtful deliberation of the issues.

Like most of his public statements, Prop. 102 repudiates the findings of the National Academy of Sciences, the Public Health Service, the Surgeon General, and the President's AIDS Commission, the Centers for Disease Control, and every reputable health professionals organization in the country.

He has been quoted as saying that "a person afflicted with AIDS emits spores that have been known to cause birth defects," which he later clarified by citing that he was mistakenly speaking of CMV (cytomegalovirus) not HIV (human immunodeficiency virus).

Furthermore, in the Congressional Record, he read a statement by an unnamed nutritionist suggesting that people with HIV should take a "glass of water with 7 or 8 drops of
While most elected officials in California and, indeed, in the nation, sought the reputable advice of public health officials, scientists and health-care professionals to advise them on AIDS, Dannemeyer in 1985 hired a controversial Nebraska psychologist Paul Cameron.

Two years before Dannemeyer retained Cameron in August 1985 for a fee of $2,000 per month, Cameron had been expelled by the American Psychological Association on December 2, 1983 for "a violation of the Preamble to the Ethical Principles of Psychologists."

Additionally, in 1984, Cameron was censured by the Nebraska Psychological Association, saying, "The science and profession of psychology in Nebraska, as represented by the Nebraska Psychological Association, formally disassociates itself from the representations and interpretations of scientific literature offered by Dr. Paul Cameron."

Furthermore, a decision promulgated by the United States District Court, Northern District of Texas, on July 1, 1985 (a full month before Dannemeyer retained Cameron), reads:

"In contrast, Dr. Paul Cameron ... has himself made misrepresentations to this Court. ... There has been no fraud
or misrepresentations except by Dr. Cameron, the supposed 'expert' for District Attorney Hill." [106 Federal Rules Decisions, pp. 526, 536].

Dannemeyer, however, continued using Cameron as his AIDS advisor; and, as late as February 18, 1987 was citing him as an authority: "Psychologist Paul Cameron, who chairs the Institute for the Scientific Investigation of Sexuality, wonders, 'Why would anyone believe that education only will accomplish the task?" [Congressional Record, February 18, 1987].

Public health officials and health-care professionals have spent seven long years developing a thoughtful, carefully deliberated public health policy for this nation and state to deal with the AIDS epidemic. Dannemeyer has consistently disputed the data that has been developed and has consistently taken a strong political stance in dealing with the epidemic, while offering little data to support his positions.

For example:

> He voted this year to oppose the establishment of an on-going National AIDS Commission to advise the Administration and Congress on AIDS.
He said that "I believe that Prop. 64 [the LaRouche Initiative] is sound public health policy."

He sponsored for an amendment that would reduce appropriated monies for AIDS research by $100 million (vote on June 15, 1988).

He voted to restrict the use of federal funds for voluntary testing, counseling and prevention programs (vote on May 25, 1988).

He sponsored an amendment requiring all homeless persons seeking health care to be tested for HIV (Congressional Quarterly, March 7, 1987).

He opposed distribution of the Surgeon General's Report on AIDS to every household in America because he maintained that it promotes sodomy.

With such evidence, it is not surprising that Dannemeyer is viewed as "beyond the fringe" on AIDS issues. While on the one hand, he has decried those who seek to make this a civil rights issue, he himself on has said, "Of course, it [AIDS] is a political issue." (Congressional Quarterly, December 15, 1987.)

His expertise (and that of his colleague Sen. Jesse Helms) has been severely questioned throughout the epidemic
because of their "politicalization" of the disease. The Congressional Quarterly said, "Unable to move their own AIDS bills, they have concentrated on efforts to attach the proposals to bills on the floor. ... Not only have they stalled action on key pieces of AIDS legislation, but they have slowed progress on other health-related bills as well."

Even among his own party members, Dannemeyer has been discounted as a source of information on AIDS. A memo by Republican political consultant Chuck Rund was excerpted in Harper's Magazine in February, 1988:

"An example of how not to approach it [AIDS] is Congressman Dannemeyer. At the meeting two weeks ago, he was terrifying--practically foaming at the mouth anytime anyone made even a sympathetic reference to people with AIDS. Someone like Dannemeyer is a live grenade on this issue and far too emotional to do any good...."

The provisions of Prop. 102 reflect Dannemeyer's ill-conceived and poorly drafted concepts of stemming the spread of the epidemic. The Initiative is opposed by all of California's leading health professional organizations: Included are the California Medical Assn., the California Nurses Assn., the Hemophilia Council of California, the
California Assn. of Hospitals and Health Systems, the California Dental Assn., the California State Psychological Assn., the Health Officers Assn. of California, California Assn. for Practitioners in Infection Control, California Assn. of School Health Educators.

Public health officials, scientists and health-care professionals have never been reluctant to use whatever means they believe appropriate to protect the public from disease. It is no different now.

As this information (and the attached "Dannemeyer Sampler") demonstrates, allowing Congressman Dannemeyer to make AIDS policy is like hiring an auto mechanic to perform brain surgery -- stupid!

####
AIDS-reporting plan slips in poll
58% back Prop. 102, down from July

By Thorne Gray
Bee Capitol Bureau

Public support is declining for Proposition 102, an initiative to expand reporting on AIDS victims and their sexual or drug-use contacts, a new California Poll shows.

In a statewide telephone survey of 773 registered voters earlier this month, 58 percent said they would favor the proposal, down from 72 percent in July. The newest poll showed 31 percent opposed to the proposition and 11 percent undecided.

Voter support for Proposition 96, an initiative designed to require AIDS testing of people charged with sex and assault crimes, remained strong at 76 percent, with 14 percent opposed and 10 percent undecided. That is only slightly down from the 79 percent who favored the proposition in July.

One reason for the decline in support for Proposition 102 seems to be increasing awareness that expanding the state's AIDS reporting system could be costly, said poll director Mervin Field.

Field said reports have estimated the annual cost of tracing the sexual contacts of those who carry the acquired immune deficiency syndrome virus at more than $772 million a year.

Proposition 102 is sponsored by Rep. William Dannemeyer, R-Fullerton, tax critic Paul Gann and Physicians for a Logical AIDS Response, who argue that contact tracing would save the state money by slowing the spread of the disease.

Opponents include the state's health officers, the California Medical Association, the California Association of Hospitals and Health Organizations, who argue that contact tracing and reporting would drive the disease underground because victims fear discrimination if their names become known.

Field said that, according to the ballot description, Proposition 96 would cost state and local governments about $1 million a year. The initiative is sponsored by Los Angeles County Sheriff Sherman Block, who said it is an effort to protect law enforcement personnel and firefighters; among others, from the disease.

On other issues, the poll found the public reacting favorably to nine bond issues totaling nearly $4 billion in borrowing that the Legislature and Gov. Deukmejian placed on the November ballot. Support for the measures ranged from 57 percent to 77 percent, Field said.

The bonds would raise money for schools and universities, prisons, libraries, housing for the homeless, jails, juvenile shelters, and water conservation and reclamation systems.

### AIDS initiatives

Trend in voter sentiment toward concepts embodied in Propositions 96 and 102

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSITION 102</td>
<td>Sept. 58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require the reporting of people exposed to AIDS to health officers and notifying others.</td>
<td>July 72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSITION 96</td>
<td>Sept. 76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require court-ordered AIDS and communicable-disease testing of people charged with sex and assault crimes.</td>
<td>July 79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Californiaians Mull Proposed AIDS Law

Proposition 102 Would Curtail Carriers’ Rights

By MARILYN CHASE
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

When it comes to protecting the rights and privacy of those infected with acquired immune deficiency syndrome, California has seen a pacesetter. But the state’s voters could soon order a radical change of course.

A citizen’s initiative prepared by U.S. Rep. William Dannemeyer, a conservative Orange County Republican, and by Whittier radiologist Lawrence McCaslin is promoting passage of a law requiring that doctors report patients or blood donors with positive AIDS-test results to state health officials or be fined $250.

The proposed law, to be voted on in November, would also require that anyone known or “reasonably believed” by doctors or health authorities to be infected with AIDS must divulge a list of intimate partners to the state or be charged with a misdemeanor.

Chain Reaction

Just as California’s Proposition 13 stimulated a tax-revolt movement around the country a decade ago, the enactment of Proposition 102 could have considerable nationwide influence. That enactment is a distinct possibility. Although California voters have twice rejected AIDS-insurance measures offered by right-wing extremist Lyndon LaRouche, findings of the California Poll indicate they currently favor Proposition 102’s core provisions—reporting and contact-tracing—by 56%, with 31% opposed and 11% undecided.

Proposition 102, however, has other far-reaching provisions. It would permit use of the AIDS antibody test by insurers and employers and would allow doctors to use the same test on a patient’s blood without the patient’s written consent. It would make willful transmission of the virus a crime and would stiffen sentences for rape or assault by AIDS-virus carriers.

The measure, if passed and upheld in court, would make the nation’s most populous state a leader in a legal counterattack against AIDS—focusing on the rights of employers and insurers over patients’ rights.

No states have passed laws as sweeping and restrictive as the California proposal.

THE MEASURE, if passed and upheld in court, would make the nation’s most populous state a leader in a legal counterattack toward favoring alleged public interests and the needs of employers and insurers over patients’ rights.

The measure, if passed and upheld in court, would make the nation’s most populous state a leader in a legal counterattack toward favoring alleged public interests and the needs of employers and insurers over patients’ rights.

No states have passed laws as sweeping and restrictive as the California proposal.

Levi Strauss & Co. The companies cite reasons ranging from humanitarian concerns to the belief that the proposed law would be counterproductive in the fight against AIDS.

THE MEASURE, if passed and upheld in court, would make the nation’s most populous state a leader in a legal counterattack toward favoring alleged public interests and the needs of employers and insurers over patients’ rights.
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Flouting the Law

Proposition 102 party represents a backlash against state policies viewed by some voters as overly restrictive, such as the ban on tests by insurers and the stringent confidentiality measures. A doctor reporting a patient for surgery, for example, is currently forbidden to tell the surgeon if the patient is infected.

Notwithstanding threats of a $10,000 fine, Proposition 102 proponents have asked firemen, police, and firefighters in Los Angeles to flout the law and report their colleagues to authorities. Mr. White, a lawyer who represents the National Fire Protection Assn., says such a move would be an example of illegal threats.

Proposition 102 proponents have been hampered by predictions that the measure will be overturned by the California Supreme Court, which has upheld similar laws.

But whatever the reasons undermining the initiative, the gay community regards Proposition 102 as “a nightmare,” says Benjaminschmidt, San Francisco attorney and head of the AIDS Task Force of the American Law Institute.

THE MEASURE, if passed and upheld in court, would make the nation’s most populous state a leader in a legal counterattack toward favoring alleged public interests and the needs of employers and insurers over patients’ rights.

No states have passed laws as sweeping and restrictive as the California proposal.
AIDS Measure Is Costly, Researchers Say

By RICH CONNELL, Times Staff Writer

Two UC Berkeley economists warned Wednesday that Proposition 102, a November ballot measure that would mandate far-reaching new controls in the fight against AIDS, would place massive new costs on taxpayers.

The initiative's one-time cost of tracking and reporting on the hundreds of thousands of Californians thought to be infected with the HIV virus—but who have not yet developed the disease—was "conservatively" estimated by the researchers to be $765 million or 10 times the current state budget for AIDS education and study programs.

And, depending on how the initiative is interpreted by the courts and public health workers, the costs could be as high as $1.76 billion the first year and at least $168 million a year after that, according to the team of professors Robert M. Anderson and John W. Quigley.

"Large Numbers"

"We are looking at staggering ... extraordinarily large numbers," Anderson told reporters at a press conference at the UCLA School of Public Health where the team presented an unpublished "working" research paper prepared under the auspices of Berkeley's Graduate School of Public Policy. A public relations representative for opponents of Proposition 102 circulated at the press conference, but Anderson and Quigley said their research was independent of the campaign.

Proposition 102, which is opposed by the California Medical Assn. and a bipartisan array of political leaders, public health officials and AIDS researchers, would require doctors and other health-care providers to report to public health officials anyone infected with the human immunodeficiency virus. Health officials would be required to conduct immediate investigations to identify sex partners and other contacts of the infected person who may also be carrying the virus.

Sponsored by Rep. William E. Dannemeyer (R-Fullerton) and anti-tax crusader and AIDS patient Paul Gann, the measure is the latest in a series of state initiatives that have sought to force highly controversial changes in the way the AIDS epidemic is being addressed by public health officials.

The new analysis predicting high costs if Proposition 102 passes drew criticism from initiative backers, saying it failed to project the possible long-term savings that could result if the tracing and identification of infected persons slows the spread of the disease.

"You are not only going to be saving lives, but money in the long run," said Kent Barbre, a spokesman for Dannemeyer. Barbre said he could not dispute the Berkeley researchers' figures. "We have no way of knowing what the [cost] figures are," he said, "because we don't know how many people are infected."

The nonpartisan state legislative analyst has estimated that there are 500,000 California residents infected with the virus and the public costs of the measure could be in the "tens to hundreds of millions of dollars annually."

The Berkeley cost analysis is likely to be relied on heavily by Proposition 102 foes in the weeks ahead. The report comes at a time when some polls show Californians favor Proposition 102.

In addition to requiring reporting and investigation of those infected with the virus, the measure would remove restrictions on AIDS testing in hiring and granting insurance, according to the legislative analyst. It would also make it a felony to engage in prostitution or other sex crimes once persons know they have the virus.

Anderson and Quigley, in arriving at their estimates, calculated the cost of investigations. AIDS treatment costs that would be shifted from private insurance companies to public health systems and higher prison costs for those convicted of spreading the disease.

The higher range cost projections included "possible" lost-tax income and schooling expenses should health officials interpret the measure to classify AIDS as a communicable disease. In that case, thousands of school and food-handling workers who have the virus might have to be dismissed, the researchers said, and schoolchildren with the virus might have to be segregated.

Barbre called this "hysteria" on the part of the opponents.
AIDS Study Group Donates $50,000 to Fight Prop. 102

By VICTOR F. ZONANA,
Times Staff Writer

SAN FRANCISCO—The American Foundation for AIDS Research is donating $50,000 to defeat Proposition 102, underscoring the fears of scientists that the measure would seriously hurt their ability to control, and ultimately cure, the fatal syndrome.

The research foundation's foray into California politics highlights the group's concern that Proposition 102 would kick off a trend toward sweepingly restrictive AIDS legislation.

The measure would require doctors and others to report to health authorities the names of patients they know or "reasonably believe" to be infected with the AIDS-causing human immunodeficiency virus. California law already requires reporting the names of patients with AIDS. The measure also would eliminate restrictions forbidding the use of HIV test results by employers or insurers.

"It bothers me no end that money and energy that could be devoted to research, education and care must be spent to defeat this retrogressive legislation," said Dr. Mervyn Silverman, foundation president. "But we have little choice."

"If 102 passes, we fear there will be a domino effect across the nation," said Dr. Joel D. Weisman, a Sherman Oaks physician and researcher who serves as chairman of the foundation's board. "The confidential doctor-patient privilege would be rendered null and void... It would turn physicians into policemen and discourage patients from participating in research projects.

Foundation Executive Director Scott Tilden said the nonprofit charitable organization's legal counsel scrutinized Internal Revenue Service regulations to make certain that the political contribution does not imperil the foundation's tax-exempt status.

IRS spokesman Frank Keith declined comment on the specifics of American Foundation's contribution. He noted, however, that tax-exempt organizations may spend money for political lobbying as long as their expenditures represent an "insubstantial" part of their total budgets. The foundation's contribution is less than half of 1% of its 1988 budget, Tilden said.

Dana Van Gorder, Northern California coordinator for Californians Against Proposition 102, said American Foundation's contribution "sends an important signal and makes a major difference in our ability to conduct a serious radio campaign." The foundation's gift represents a bit less than 10% of the campaign's receipts to date.

In Los Angeles, Jewish, Roman Catholic and Episcopal leaders spoke out against Proposition 102.

Rabbi Allen L. Frehling said that in addition to the nearly $2 billion that the proposition would cost to implement, "the possibilities of a police state will be very real."

"Father Brad Dusak of St. Matthew's Catholic Church in Long Beach, representing Archbishop Roger M. Mahony, called the proposition "morally flawed as well as unsound from a public health perspective."

The Right Rev. Oliver B. Garver Jr., suffragan (associate) bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles, called Proposition 102 "deceptive, dangerous and diabolical."

The latest Teichner poll, released Oct. 9, showed Proposition 102 ahead, 36% to 27%, although 37% of those surveyed were undecided. Teichner's sounding from a month earlier had found 47% in favor of the measure, indicating that the measure's opponents—which include leading California corporations and the California Medical Assn.—are beginning to get their message across.

Proposition 102's backers, who include Rep. William Dannemeyer (R-Pullerton) and anti-tax crusader Paul Gann, who contracted AIDS from a blood transfusion, had little comment on the foundation's gift. "I don't know anything about [the foundation]," said Ted Costa, Gann's principal assistant.

"It's the usual crowd," said Paul Mero, Dannemeyer's press secretary, referring to the foundation's board of directors. "They are all in bed together, so to speak."
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PRESIDENT AND MRS. FORD CALL FOR DEFEAT OF PROP. 102

LOS ANGELES -- Showing strong bi-partisan opposition to Proposition 102, Former President and Mrs. Gerald R. Ford today joined Democratic Presidential Candidate Governor and Mrs. Michael Dukakis, Senators Alan Cranston and Pete Wilson, Lt. Governor Leo McCarthy, Assemblyman William Filante, MD, State Controller Gray Davis, and Mayor Tom Bradley in opposing the Initiative.

They are also joined by the California Black Republican Council, the California Democratic Party, the California Republican League and 60 other elected officials in California who oppose the Dannemeyer AIDS Initiative.

In their letter to Bruce Decker, formerly a member of President Ford's White House staff and a member of the Stop Dannemeyer/No on 102 campaign, they said, "We are most appreciative of your efforts around AIDS issues and are most pleased to assist with your efforts to defeat Proposition 102, the Dannemeyer AIDS Initiative."

In addition to the Fords, Prop. 102 is opposed by all of California's responsible health professional organizations, (California Medical Assn., California Nurses Assn., California Blood Bank Society); statewide business and professional organizations (the California Chamber of Commerce, the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, the California State Psychological Association, Hemophilia Council of California, California Assn. of Hospitals and Health Systems, Health Policy & Research Foundation of California...
Commerce); religious leaders and organizations (California Catholic Conference); labor/trade organizations (California Labor Federation AFL-CIO; and local government associations (County Supervisors Assn. of California and the League of California Cities).

"Prop. 102 is bad medicine and public public health policy," said Laurens P. White, President of the California Medical Assn.

While the Dannemeyer Initiative's ostensible purpose is to require reporting of all persons who are HIV-positive, its opponents are concerned about the underlying ramifications of its passage. For example, it would:

> Disrupt California's innovative research programs to find treatments and vaccines for AIDS by requiring the reporting of the names of research subjects;

> Divert tens to hundreds of millions of funds from research and prevention programs to implement its measures;

> Tie the hands of public health officers who need maximum flexibility to respond to the ever-changing scientific and medical information about AIDS, and how to respond to it.

> Jeopardize the state's blood banks by discouraging people from donating blood; and by closing test sites that provide alternatives to people at risk from seeking tests at blood banks.

> Disrupt the carefully deliberated, thoughtfully constructed programs that have made California the leader in responding to AIDS.
Prop. 102 Backer Told Birch Society to Make Political Use of AIDS Crisis

By VICTOR F. ZONANA, Times Staff Writer

A Republican candidate for Congress and key backer of Proposition 102 wrote a letter last November urging the leader of the John Birch Society to make political use of the AIDS epidemic to "rejuvenate" the extremist organization.

Copies of the three-page letter written by Dr. Stanley K. Monteeith, a Santa Cruz orthopedist and ardent campaigner for the AIDS Reporting Initiative, were distributed Thursday by opponents of the November ballot measure.

The Monteeith letter alleges that there is a "specific plan to keep us from doing anything about the epidemic. Part of this is engineered by the homosexuals, but part of this is definitely engineered by the subversive element within our nation."

Monteeith said Proposition 102's opponents either want to "destroy America" or have been "duped" by those who do.

Monteeith, who resigned from the Birch Society last year after 25 years as a member and once headed the group's Santa Cruz County operation, said in an interview that his personal letter had been stolen.

"Those intent on discreditting 102 have people planted everywhere," he charged.

"There is nothing in this letter I am ashamed of," he added.

A John Birch Society official said the conservative organization supports Proposition 102 but does not consider it one of the group's major issues.

Opponents of Proposition 102 denied that they had stolen the letter, adding that the document had been leaked to them by someone close to Monteeith who had found the letter's implications "frightening."

"The letter makes transparent what we had long suspected—that Prop. 102's backers are right-wing zealots using AIDS for the basest of political purposes," said Mark Cloutier, an aide to Rep. Barbara Boxer (D-Greenbrae).

"They appear willing to exploit AIDS—and to throw away peoples' lives to do it," added Dana Van Gorder, Northern California coordinator of Californians Against Proposition 102.

"This is much too important a health crisis to politicize from either the left or the right," added Rep. Leon E. Panetta (D-Monterey), who is defending his 16th Congressional District seat against the challenge by Monteeith.

"This is a time to unify all segments of society in a common effort to deal with AIDS with compassion and good sense," added Panetta, who is expected to retain his seat. The coastal district stretches from Santa Cruz to San Luis Obispo.

Proposition 102 would require health officials to gather the names of everyone who has tested positive for the human immunodeficiency virus that leads to AIDS and investigate their sexual contacts, perhaps as far back as 1979. State laws that allow anonymous testing, forbid testing without consent and bar using the test to deny insurance or jobs would be repealed.

Proposition 102 would require health officials to report the identities of persons who test positive for the human immunodeficiency virus that leads to AIDS.

Proposition 102's backers were dismayed that Monteeith's letter had emerged as an issue in the statewide campaign.

"I'm sure Dr. Monteeith wrote this, and I'm sure it is from the heart, but I don't think it is relevant to Proposition 102," said Brett Barbre, special assistant to Rep. William E. Dannemeyer (R-Fullerton).

Monteeith is listed on the letterhead of the initiative's sponsor, California Physicians for a Logical AIDS Response, as a "patron," indicating that he was an early financial supporter of the initiative drive.

Proposition 102's principal supporters are Dannemeyer—a harsh critic of AIDS policies and gays and the only major elected official to back two earlier AIDS initiatives by extremist Lyndon LaRouche—and Paul Gann, who contracted AIDS through a blood transfusion before a screening test had been devised.

Charles Armour, president of the John Birch Society, said in an interview from his office in San Marino that the group had hosted Monteeith for a speech to its leadership council and had circulated petitions on behalf of Proposition 102. Birch Society publications have also published such articles as "The Truth About AIDS," Armour said, though he denied that the group had put the AIDS issue "on the front burner."

Like the two LaRouche initiatives before it, Proposition 102 has drawn the strong opposition of AIDS researchers and organizations representing the state's doctors, nurses, hospitals and county health officers.

The measure has also been denounced by statewide officeholders in both parties.

Stanford University President Donald Kennedy also announced his opposition to Proposition 102 as a threat to AIDS research. In recent days the initiative has also been opposed by former President Gerald R. Ford and his wife, Betty, and by religious leaders in the state including all of the Roman Catholic and Episcopal bishops in California.

Some of California's large corporations—including Wells Fargo Bank, Levi Strauss and Pacific Gas & Electric—have criticized Proposition 102 as costly and counterproductive in the fight against AIDS.

Gann has called for a boycott of Wells Fargo Bank and other corporations that have donated money to the campaign against the measure. The bank contributed $5,000 to the Californians Against Proposition 102 campaign at a fund-raising dinner in San Francisco last week.

The nonpartisan legislative analyst in Sacramento has estimated the measure's costs at "possibly tens or hundreds of millions of dollars."

The initiative's backers are betting that voters are unhappy about AIDS being given special handling under public health laws while opponents insist that AIDS is a unique emergency that calls for a unique response and that present public health measures are succeeding.

Times staff writer Kevin Roderrick contributed to this article.
Support slips for Prop. 102

AIDS reporting measure hurt by financial impact

By Michael Smolens
Staff Writer

SACRAMENTO — Proposition 102, the AIDS reporting measure, has lost considerable support and now fails to gain majority backing when voters are informed of its financial impact, according to a California Poll released today.

Meanwhile, the poll shows that Proposition 96, which would require court-ordered AIDS testing of persons charged with sex or assault crimes, still has majority support, though its popularity also has slipped.

Pollster Mervin Field conducted the survey between Oct. 10 and 16, less than four weeks before the Nov. 8 election.

Proposition 102 would require doctors to report patients or blood donors with positive AIDS test results to health officials. It also would repeal certain laws protecting confidentiality of persons afflicted with AIDS and require officials to contact persons who have had sex with the infected patients.

According to the state, the fiscal impact of tracing an AIDS patient's sexual partners is unknown, but could be as high as tens or hundreds of millions of dollars.

Given that information, 44 percent of the voters surveyed supported the initiative, 32 percent were opposed and 24 percent were undecided.

However, when voters were told just the basic ballot synopsis of the initiative without the fiscal impact, 51 percent supported the measure, 28 percent were opposed and 21 percent were undecided.

That compares with 72 percent support in a July Field poll and 58 percent backing in a September survey.

While there has been little paid advertising on either side of the initiative, increasing media exposure in both California and across the nation of Proposition 102 has led to its shrinking popularity, according to Mark DiCamillo, managing director of the California Poll.

"There's also been a large amount of the establishment taking a position, mostly against it," he said.

Those groups include virtually all of the state's organized public health professionals, such as physicians, nurses, hospitals and county health officers. However, Proposition 102 is backed by a group called "Physicians for a Logical AIDS Response."

The question of financing also swayed voters who were surveyed, DiCamillo said.

"Proposition 102 has an open-ended kind of fiscal impact. It does have an effect," he said.

Proposition 102 is sponsored by U.S. Rep. William Dannemeyer, R-Fullerton, and Paul Gann, the anti-tax crusader who contracted AIDS through a blood transfusion.

Proposition 96, sponsored by Los Angeles County Sheriff Sherman Block, has generated less opposition than Proposition 102.

Some aspects of Proposition 96 have already been passed by the Legislature and signed into law by the governor. That has prompted opponents to argue that Proposition 96 is not needed.

The poll showed Proposition 96 was supported by 59 percent of the voters surveyed, even after being told the measure could cost up to $1 million annually.

Twenty-one percent were opposed and 20 percent were undecided.

When not told of Proposition 96's fiscal impact, 65 percent of the voters supported the initiative, 16 percent were opposed and 19 percent were undecided.

That's down from 79 percent support in July and 76 percent support in September.

This is the third time in two years that AIDS initiatives have been on the statewide ballot. Proposition 64 in 1986 and Proposition 69 in June were soundly defeated. Both measures were supported by political extremist Lyndon LaRouche.

Field said sponsors of Proposition 102, Gann and Dannemeyer, have more credibility with voters.

The poll interviewed 892 registered voters, who were divided into two groups to test the fiscal impact of the initiatives. The poll has a margin of error of plus or minus 4.7 percentage points.
Open letter to the people of California:

In two weeks you will be making a decision which will not only affect the lives of many Californians, but will also have implications nationwide for the course of the AIDS epidemic. Proposition 102 and Proposition 96 are, as the President of the California Medical Association has said, "bad law and bad medicine." As organizations working nationally to develop medically sound, compassionate, and comprehensive federal AIDS policies, we urge you to vote no on both Propositions 102 and 96.

The requirements that these referendums would impose have been rejected over and over by the public health community, in part, because they are unwarranted, intrusive and expensive. More importantly, such measures are seen as presenting serious deterrents to arresting the progress of the epidemic.

This is not a fight between civil libertarians and the medical profession. As you can see by the undersigned list, the medical community, the education and counseling professions, and those working most closely with the challenges of AIDS stand clearly in opposition to this effort. It was less than a month ago when all but a handful of your state Congressional Representatives, likewise stood in opposition to the same proposals on Capitol Hill. An overwhelming three to one majority of their colleagues joined in that effort.

As you go to the polls in November we urge you to put aside the fears which this unfortunate campaign has exploited. Your vote should be based on the sound and careful consideration Californians have already shown in the battle against AIDS.

We urge you to show the rest of the nation that California will continue to provide the medically sound and compassionate policy leadership it has offered so far in the battle which is AIDS. Vote NO on Propositions 102 and 96.

Sincerely,

AIDS Action Council
AIDS National Interfaith Network
American Association for Counseling and Development
American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors, & Therapists
American Civil Liberties Union
American College Health Association
American College of Physicians
American Foundation for AIDS Research
American Jewish Committee
American Nurses Association
American Psychological Association
American Public Health Association
Americans for Democratic Action
Association of Schools of Public Health
Catholic Health Association of the United States
Child Welfare League of America
Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Information Institute, Inc.
Committee for Children
Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Inc.
Human Rights Campaign Fund
National AIDS Committee of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations
National Association for Home Care
National Association of Community Health Centers, Inc.
National Association of Counties
National Association of People with AIDS
National Association of Social Workers
National Association of Public Hospitals
National Council on La Raza
National Gay and Lesbian Task Force
National Hospice Organization
National Lesbian and Gay Health Care Foundation
National Mental Health Association
National Minority AIDS Council
National Network of Runaway and Youth Services
Planned Parenthood Federation of America
Southern California Americans for Democratic Action
United Church Board for Homeland Ministries
United States Conference of Local Health Officers
United States Conference of Mayors
OPEN LETTER TO
CALIFORNIA'S VOTERS

As health professionals and scientists conducting research to find a vaccine, treatment or intervention as it relates to HIV infection, we fear that Proposition 102, the Dannemeyer AIDS Initiative, would effectively bring meaningful research to a stop because it violates the tradition of confidentiality for volunteer research subjects.

As a result of the ethical dilemma in which its passage would place us, and as the threat of breached confidentiality for volunteer research subjects will discourage participation, it will have a devastating effect on what we otherwise view as a promising research program.

Please join us in opposing this unnecessary, dangerous, and expensive political intrusion into the scientific process. It will divert vital funds from research into very expensive, unproven programs, which we believe will disrupt the continued development of sound action to control the AIDS epidemic.

We concur with the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences, the Surgeon General, the Public Health Service, the World Health Organization, and the Presidential Commission on the HIV Epidemic and join our colleagues who unanimously represent California's responsible state-wide organizations of health professionals in forcefully opposing this Initiative.

WARREN WINKELSTEIN, Jr., M.D. MPh
Professor of Epidemiology
School of Public Health
University of California Berkeley

MARK JACOBSON, M.D.
Clinical Instructor - Division of Infectious Disease
University of California - San Francisco General Hospital

DOUGLAS D. RICHMAN, M.D.
Professor of Pathology and Medicine
Infectious Disease Section
Veterans Administration Medical Center / San Diego

NEIL FLYNN, M.D.
Associate Professor of Clinical Medicine
Director, Clinic for AIDS / University of California, Davis
Chairperson, Sacramento County AIDS Advisory Board

THOMAS J. COATES, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Director, Behavioral Medicine Unit
University of California, San Francisco

PAUL A. VOLBERDING, M.D.
Associate Professor of Medicine UES7
Chief Medical Oncology and AIDS Activities Divisions, S7GR

MARK JACOBSON, M.D.
Clinical Instructor - Division of Infectious Disease
University of California - San Francisco General Hospital

DOUGLAS D. RICHMAN, M.D.
Professor of Pathology and Medicine
Infectious Disease Section
Veterans Administration Medical Center / San Diego

THOMAS J. COATES, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Director, Behavioral Medicine Unit
University of California, San Francisco

ALEXANDRA M. LEVINE, M.D.
Professor of Medicine / UCLA
Executive Associate Dean
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OPPOSITION ENDORSEMENTS
November 4, 1988

President and Mrs. Gerald Ford
Presidential Candidate

Governor & Mrs. Michael Dukakis

HEALTH & MEDICAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Foundation For AIDS Research
American Cancer Society
American Red Cross
California Medical Association
Health Officers Association of California
California Dental Association
California Nurses Association
California State Psychological Association
California Pharmacists Association
California Psychiatric Association
Los Angeles County Medical Association
Orange County Medical Association
Butte-Glenn Counties Medical Society- Chico
California Blood Bank Society
California Podiatric Medical Association
California Association of Hospitals and Health Systems
Hemophilia Council of California
Hemophilia Foundation of Southern California
Hemophilia Association of San Diego County
National Hemophilia Foundation
Hospital Council of Northern California
Hospital Council of Central California
California Association for Practitioners in Infection Control Coordinating Council
California Association of School Health Educators
California Association of Public Hospitals
California School Nurses Organization
California AIDS Leadership Committee
California Public Health Association-North
American College of Emergency Physicians, CA Chapter
Association of Bay Area Health Officials
Southern California Public Health Association
San Diego State University Grad. School of Public Health
Los Angeles County Health Officer Robert Gates
Orange County Health Officer Rex Ehling
San Diego County Health Officer J. William Cox
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ELECTED OFFICIALS

U.S. Senator Alan Cranston
U.S. Senator Pete Wilson
U.S. Senator Albert Gore, Jr.
U.S. Senator John Kerry
Lt. Governor Leo McCarthy
State Controller Gray Davis
Attorney General John Van de Kamp
Secretary of State March Fong Eu
State Super. of Public Instruction Bill Honig
Board of Equalization Conway Collis
State Senate President David Roberti
Assembly Speaker Willie Brown
Los Angeles County Supervisor Ed Edelman
Los Angeles County Supervisor Deane Dana
Los Angeles County Supervisor Kenneth Hahn
Orange County Supervisor Tom Riley
Orange County Supervisor Harriet Wieder
San Mateo County Supervisor Ann Eschau
San Mateo County Supervisor Tom Nolan
Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley
San Francisco Mayor Art Agnos
San Jose Mayor Tim McEnery
Congressman Glenn Anderson
Congressman Jim Bates
Congressman Anthony Beilenson
Congressman Howard Berman
Congressman Douglas Bosco
Congresswoman Barbara Boxer
Congressman George Brown, Jr.
Congressman Tony Coelho
Congressman Ronald Dellums
Congressman Mervyn Dymally
Congressman Julian Dixon
Congressman Don Edwards
Congressman Vic Fazio
Congressman Augustus Hawkins
Congressman Robert Lagomarsino
Congressman Tom Lantos
Congressman Richard Lehman
Congressman Mel Levine
Congressman Matthew Martinez
Congressman Robert Matsui
Congressman George Miller
Congressman Norman Mineta
Congressman Leon Panetta
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ELECTED OFFICIALS (continued)

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
Congressman Edward Roybal
Congressman Pete Stark
Congressman Esteban Torres
Congressman Henry Waxman
Senator Marian Bergeson
Senator Ralph C. Dills
Senator Barry Keene
Senator Bill Lockyer
Senator Milton Marks
Senator Dan McCorquodale
Senator Becky Morgan
Senator Herschel Rosenthal
Senator John Seymour
Assemblywoman Lucille Roybal-Allard
Assemblyman Rusty Areias
Assemblyman Tom Bates
Assemblyman John Burton
Assemblyman Pete Chacon
Assemblyman Lloyd Connelly
Assemblyman Bill Duplissea
Assemblywoman Delaine Eastin
Assemblyman Bill Filante, M.D.
Assemblyman Terry Friedman
Assemblyman Tom Hayden
Assemblyman Phil Isenberg
Assemblyman Pat Johnston
Assemblyman Johan Klehs
Assemblyman Richard Polanco
Assemblyman Mike Roos
Assemblyman Byron Sher
Assemblywoman Jackie Speier
Assemblyman John Vasconcellos
Assemblywoman Maxine Waters
Sacramento Mayor Ann Rudin
Berkeley Mayor Loni Hancock
Milpitas Mayor Robert Livengood
Pittsburg Mayor Richard Lettman
Sunnyvale Mayor Larry Stone
Santa Clara Mayor Eddie Souza
Santa Cruz Mayor John Lairds
Los Angeles City Attorney James Hahn
Los Angeles City Councilmember Gloria Molina
Los Angeles City Councilmember Michael Woo
Los Angeles City Councilmember Zev Yaroslavsky
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BUSINESS/PROFESSIONAL

California Chamber of Commerce
LA County Bar Association
Burroughs Wellcome
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Pacific Gas and Electric Co.
Levi Strauss & Co.
AT&T
Arthur Andersen
Bank of America
Apple Computers
Bechtel
Wells Fargo
Levis Strauss & Company
The Gap
Chevron, USA
Kaiser Permanente
Genentech, Inc.
Seton Medical Services
Syntex
Pacific Telesis
West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce
Valley Business Alliance

RELIGIOUS

California Catholic Conference
Bishop John Quinn
The Right Rev. William E. Swing, Bishop of the Episcopal
Diocese of California
Rev. Rodney J. DeMartini, Catholic Archdiocese of San
Francisco, Dir. of AIDS Education
Rabbi Robert Kirschner, Congregation Emanu-El
Rabbi Allen I. Freehling, LA County Commission On AIDS
Bishop Oliver B. Garver, AIDS Interfaith Council Of
Southern California
Bob Nelson, Prog. Dir., Catholic Charities of San
Francisco
The Rev. Lauren Artress, Canon Pastor, Grace Cathedral
Rabbi Charisse N. Kranes
Father Robert Arpin
Bishop Lyle Miller, Evangelical Church of America
Bishop Roger Miller, Evangelical Church of America
Bishop J. Roger Anderson, Evangelical Church of America
Rev. Victor Carpenter, First Unitarian Church of San
Francisco
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RELIGIOUS (continued)

Sister Judy Cannon, Sisters of Mercy
Andy Rose, Jewish Emergency Services Network
Dale Meyer, Catholic Charities of San Francisco
Lutheran Social Services of Northern California

NEWS/MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS

Los Angeles Times
San Francisco Examiner
San Francisco Chronicle
San Diego Tribune
San Diego Union
Los Angeles Herald Examiner
Santa Rosa Press Democrat
Los Angeles Daily News
The Oakland Tribune
Sacramento Bee
San Jose Mercury News
Bakersfield Californian
The Fresno Metro News

LABOR/TRADE ORGANIZATIONS

California State Employees Association
California Organization of Police & Sheriffs
California Labor Federation AFL-CIO
Teamsters Public Affair Council
National Association of Colored People
American Civil Liberties Union - Northern & Southern CA
California Teachers Association
California Faculty Association
California Federation of Teachers, AFT, AFL-CIO
California Professional Firefighters Association
California School Employees Association
Communication Workers of America -Dist. 9, AFL-CIO
United Farm Workers
A.F.S.C.M.E.
San Francisco Labor Council

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

County Supervisors Association of California
League of California Cities
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT (continued)

Alameda County Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Monterey County Board of Supervisors
San Diego City Council
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors
Sacramento City Council
Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors
Marin County Board of Supervisors
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
San Diego County Board of Supervisors
Association of Bay Area Governments
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Jose City Council
West Hollywood City Council

STATEWIDE OPINION LEADERS

California Taxpayers Association
League of Women Voters of California
National Organization for Women
Police Officers Research Action Committee
Los Angeles County Commission on AIDS
AIDS Project Los Angeles
San Francisco AIDS Foundation
San Mateo County AIDS Task Force
Being Alive (United AIDS Coalition of Los Angeles County
California Black Republican Council
California Republican League
California Democratic Party
California Parent Teacher Association (PTA)
California Women Lawyers
Lobby For Individual Freedom & Equality

INDIVIDUAL

Prof. Ruth Roemer, Imed. Past Pres., American Public Health Association
Richard J. Hernandez, Chairman, California Republican Hispanic Council
Elizabeth Taylor
Jesse Jackson
Dr. Mathilde Krim, Founder, American Foundation For AIDS Research
Dr. David Werdegar, San Francisco Health Director
Working with limited resources, California's public health and health care professionals have spent seven years developing workable and effective policies to stem the spread of AIDS. It has been based on the findings of the National Academy of Sciences, the Public Health Service, the Surgeon General, and the Presidential AIDS Commission.

If passed, Prop. 102, sponsored by Congressman William Dannemeyer, would torpedo those efforts and repudiate the carefully deliberated, thoughtfully constructed programs that have made California the leader in responding to AIDS.

This Initiative would specifically:

>Undermine research on AIDS by discouraging subjects from volunteering for programs which will ultimately provide a vaccine and treatment for the disease.

>Divert already limited resources by mandating questionably cost-effective programs without allocating the necessary funding for programs which are not effective in containing the epidemic.

>Jeopardize the state's blood banks by discouraging people from donating blood; and by closing test sites that provide alternatives to people at risk from seeking tests at blood banks.

>Create a new subclass of unemployable and uninsurable individuals who are otherwise healthy by allowing HIV testing to determine insurability and employability.

>Remove traditional standards of confidentiality of medical records; create an environment of suspicion and an adversarial relationship between individuals at risk and health professionals.

>Institute a bureaucratic morass of labor and cost-intensive record keeping and tracing which are only marginally effective in slowing the spread of AIDS.

>Tie the hands of public health officers who need maximum flexibility to respond to the ever-changing disease by only allowing changes by the time-consuming initiative process.

>Like the twice-rejected LaRouche Initiative, Prop. 102 is bad public health and bad medicine.
INFORMATION EMBARGOED UNTIL 12 NOON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1988
(The following information will be released at a press conference at 12 noon, Saturday, November 5, 1988 on the front steps of County/USC Medical Center, 1200 N. State Street, East Los Angeles.)

Enclosed you will find a printed copy of a statement made on Thursday, November 3, 1988, by Dr. Jonas Salk, stating his opposition to Proposition 102, the HIV Reporting Initiative.

Dr. Salk has authorized us to share this statement with you. He expressed to us his great concern about the disruptive effect this Initiative would have on the promising AIDS research programs currently being conducted in California, but he has specifically requested that no further comment be sought from him as it relates to this matter.

We have also attached an "Open Letter" to California voters signed by eight of the state's top AIDS researchers reiterating Dr. Salk's concerns. Included, too, is a copy from N.O.R.A. (National Organizations Responding to AIDS) indicating that not only is the California health professional establishment unanimously opposed to Prop. 102, but they are joined by all of the major national health professional organizations involved in implementing our national AIDS response program.

Because of Dr. Salk's busy research schedule, all press inquiries to the Salk Institute will be directed to Bruce Decker or Don Volk at 213/278-9355.
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INFORMATION EMBARGOED UNTIL 12 NOON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1988

(Following is the printed text of Dr. Jonas Salk's taped statement.)

In English:

This is Dr. Jonas Salk. For all the right reasons the California Medical Association, the California Nurses Association, and the health officers of California strongly oppose the passage of Proposition 102.

I, too, will vote "No" on 102 because it will disrupt promising research toward stopping this epidemic. The programs mandated by this initiative would cost hundreds of millions that could be put to far better use.

I urge you to vote "No" on Proposition 102.

En Espanol:

Les habla Dr. Jonas Salk. Con todos los mejores motivos, La Asociacion de Medicos de California, La Asociacion de Enfermeras de California, y Los Officiales de Salud de California, se han declarado en contra de la Proposition 102.

Yo, tambien, voy a votar "NO" a la Proposition 102, porque al implementarse la Proposition 102, se causaria un desorden total de las buenas y prometedoras investigaciones que se estan llevando a cabo con fin de acabar con el epidemic de AIDS.

Los programas mandados por esta proposition tendrian costo de cienes de millones de dolares, fondos que pueden aprovecharse de mucho mejor manera en la lucha contra el AIDS.

Yo les pido que voten "NO" a la Proposition 102. Muchas gracias.
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(Following is the printed text of Dr. Jonas Salk's taped statement.)

In English:

This is Dr. Jonas Salk.
For all the right reasons the California Medical Association, the California Nurses Association, and the health officers of California strongly oppose the passage of Proposition 102.
I, too, will vote "No" on 102 because it will disrupt promising research toward stopping this epidemic. The programs mandated by this initiative would cost hundreds of millions that could be put to far better use.
I urge you to vote "No" on Proposition 102.

En Espanol:

Les habla Dr. Jonas Salk.
Con todos los mejores motivos, La Asociacion de Medicos de California, La Asociacion de Enfermeras de California, y Los Oficiales de Salud de California, se han declarado en contra de la Proposition 102.
Yo, tambien, voy a votar "NO" a la Proposition 102, porque al implementarse la Proposition 102, se causaria un desorden total de las buenas y prometedoras investigaciones que se estan llevando a cabo con fin de acabar con el epidemico de AIDS.
Los programas mandados por esta proposition tendrian costo de cienes de millones de dolares, fondos que pueden aprovecharse de mucho mejor manera en la lucha contra el AIDS.
Yo les pido que voten "NO" a la Proposition 102.
Muchas gracias.
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