

LaRouche attacks Moscow's AIDS disinformation

On Sunday, Aug. 2, 1987, Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. issued a stinging rebuke to the editor of the Soviet monthly journal *International Affairs*. The candidate's letter was prompted by an article, entitled "The Mystery of Skull Valley," blaming the United States for creating AIDS as a military weapon. That article appeared in the June 1987 edition of the publication.

We publish a synopsis of the Soviet article, followed by the full text of the candidate's letter of reply.

In an article titled "The Mystery of Skull Valley," the Soviet monthly *International Affairs* (No. 6, 1987, page 124) writes that the chemical and bacteriological experiments conducted by the U.S. Defense Department in 1968, near Skull Valley, Utah led to the creation of the AIDS virus. The article is written by Nikolai Filippov, who gives a detailed account of the experimentation and the incident which led to the deaths of approximately 6,500 sheep, nothing that "it is reasonable to suppose that during that test use was made of biological agents based on a virus [which] . . . could be visna, a virus which has been intensively studied since the late 1950s in several research centers, including Fort Detrick [sic], Maryland, then the main U.S. center for the development of germ weapons."

The article concludes, "The mystery of those criminal experiments has begun to come to light in recent years. Competent scientists consider that visna was used in the United States for genetic engineering work which resulted in creating HIV [Human Immunodeficiency Virus], a chimeric virus causing an incurable infectious disease in man known as AIDS. Research into HIV at the molecular level has shown that 60 per cent of its genome is identical with that of visna and the rest is built-in nucleotide sequence isolated from the genome of another retrovirus, HLTV-I. HIV, the pathogen for AIDS, was designed in U.S. engineering laboratories on instructions from the Pentagon. The purpose of this virus was to augment the U.S. germ (biological) warfare potential by acquiring a capability for depriving an enemy population of vitally important immunity at the threshold of a major or local armed conflict.

"The conclusion about the complicity of the U.S. military authorities in the appearance of AIDS, the new dangerous disease which affects humans, is shared by John Siale [sic—the author refers to Dr. John Seale] of Britain, Jakob Segal of



Soviet propaganda churns out the line that AIDS was created at Fort Detrick, Maryland. Shown is a cartoon in Pravda, Oct. 31, 1986. The caption above the cartoon states: "The AIDS virus, a terrible disease for which up to now no known cure has been found, was, in the opinion of some Western researchers, created in the laboratories of the Pentagon." The flag on the beaker reads, "Virus 'AIDS' " The label below the cartoon says, "Pentagon AIDS specialists."

the G.D.R., Robert Streker of the United States, and other noted scientists and experts who have carefully analyzed available scientific data. For the time being, they have discounted the events and facts connected with the Skull Valley incident. Nevertheless, they have come to the unanimous conclusion that in designing HIV visna was made use of. Dr. Siale [sic] has said that a scientist who wanted to evolve a virus capable of destroying man's immune system and provoking a disease similar to AIDS would have to resort to visna.

"The 'patent' for inventing HIV should be issued to the United States because it was there that the virus was developed and also because Americans were the first victims of AIDS. The disease, which broke out in New York, was carried to other big cities in the United States and then to other countries and continents. Its virus was transmitted by infected Americans serving at overseas military bases. Besides, AIDS was contracted in the United States by Australian and European tourists vacationing there. HIV spread to the Middle East and other Arab countries which imported blood from donors stricken with AIDS.

"In October 1986, John Siale [sic] quoted during an interview with the *Guardian* an extract from a report prepared by the Pentagon in 1969. It said that in the next five to ten years an infective micro-organism might be evolved that would differ substantially from all pathogens known so far. Its most important property, the report said, would consist in attacking the immune system and internal organs on which

the ability of the human body to resist infectious diseases depends. Consequently, the AIDS pathogen was deliberately created and development was planned and funded. The test at Dugway [Utah] that killed so many sheep in Skull Valley turned out to be part of the Pentagon's program for designing a new biological agent, the AIDS pathogen."

Leesburg, Virginia
August 2, 1987

Editor
International Affairs
Moscow, U.S.S.R.
SUBJECT: "Mystery of Skull Valley," No. 6, 1987

Dear Sir:

Your cited article is the latest incident to come to my attention in continuing Soviet circulation of the allegation, that human AIDS was synthesized by U.S. governmental laboratories for the purpose of creating a biological agent of chemical-biological warfare.

This Soviet campaign began many months ago as a response to my sponsorship of reports exposing two facts: a) That Soviet officials assigned to the World Health Organization (WHO) had acted as accomplices of certain U.S. institutions in spreading misinformation about the nature and extent of the AIDS pandemic; b) That Soviet activists at relevant international conferences sought to induce govern-

ments of Africa to suppress facts respecting the extent of the AIDS pandemic in Africa.

This Soviet campaign made use of misrepresentations of statements issued by a distinguished British physician, Dr. John Seale, a noted figure associated with my efforts to stimulate appropriate public health measures against the spread of the AIDS pandemic. Dr. Seale, who has repeatedly expressed concern that human AIDS might have been the result of one or more laboratory accidents conducted, during the 1960s, in connection with cancer research, was misrepresented to have implied that the United States developed AIDS as a biological agent of chemical-biological warfare.

For reasons which I believe your government understands very well, the notorious Mr. Herbert Romerstein, of Mr. Charles Z. Wick's U.S. Information Agency, and linked to the scurrilous Mr. Roy Godson, chose to amplify Soviet propaganda against me and Dr. Seale on this specific issue.

In spite of this Soviet conduct, I have acted as a 1988 Democratic presidential candidate, to state that I am committed to seeking U.S. cooperation with the Soviet government against the common enemy of all mankind, AIDS. I have caused that proposal to be made known to my government, since prior to the October 1986 "Reykjavik summit," and later made my policies in this matter known to relevant channels and institutions of the Soviet government.

I argue that the kind of Soviet propaganda typified by the cited, recent item in your publication is directly counter to the vital interests of the Soviet state. I identify some relevant points of background, including my own hypothesis on the economics of AIDS epidemiology, and then show the fallacy of the leading argument contained in the cited article.

The first portion of this communication is lengthy, but the importance of including this summary will become obvious. This will tend to be understood more clearly among sections of the mathematics and physics sections of the Soviet Academy of Sciences who have examined my work in economic science, and other features were perhaps grasped more immediately among Soviet biophysicists working in the Vernadsky-Gurwitsch tradition.

1. The epidemiology of AIDS

For reasons understood by Soviet biophysicists, AIDS is a family of human, slow-incubating "retroviruses," for which at least three species are now known. This family has an extraordinarily high rate of mutation and quasi-mutative adaptation to opportunities for infectious transmission.

I situate my views on this in terms of an epidemiological study which my associates conducted during 1973-74, leading to a now-historic report published at the beginning of 1975. This study was conducted in elaboration of an hypothesis which I had submitted to my associates, in written and oral forms, during March and April of 1973. The premises for, and nature of that hypothesis, are of direct relevance to the policy-issues now confronting both of our governments,

and the world in general.

It is widely known that my original work in economic science emerged during 1948-52 as a by-product of my zeal to refute the dehumanizing, false, and mechanistic "information theory" propagated by Prof. Norbert Wiener. My work is situated chiefly in the branch of political-economy known, since the work of Leibniz, as "physical economy." My original discoveries, deal with the problem of intelligible representation (e.g., measurability) of the cause-effect relationship between a quantifiable advance in applied technol-

Using classical epidemiology, our 1973-74 study had forecast, that under a continuation of then-established policy-shaping trends in monetary and economic policies, the eruption of global pandemics was to be expected during the 1980s, marked by the outbreak of a cholera epidemic in the Sahel region of Africa. . . . I argued that, because of the intensity of economic shock expected, such an outbreak of global pandemics must be associated with the eruption of new species of viral pandemics. . . .

ogies and a resulting increase in the (physical) productive powers of labor.

It is relevant to the matter at hand, that my discovery was accomplished in two steps. The first step, was to show that this causal relationship could be so represented. Since the representation defined, implicitly, a nonlinear function, I was obliged to accomplish a second step, that of selecting a mathematical physics program suited for representation of functions of this type. Through exhaustive reexamination of the 1871-83 work of Georg Cantor, I was led to my relevant, correct appreciation of the contributions of Prof. Bernhard Riemann.

Some Soviet scientists, such as the famous Academician Vernadsky, appear to have understood more or less clearly, that Riemannian physics, comprehended from the standpoint in constructive geometry employed by Riemann, permits intelligible representation of true nonlinear functions, as the case of the Riemann Surface illustrates the point most direct-

ly. No competent assessment of medium- to long-range trends in physical economy can be accomplished except by resorting to such nonlinear methods of a Gauss-Riemannian physics. This physics must be comprehended from the standpoint of a complex domain defined by methods of constructive geometry, in terms of multiply-connected, self-similar-spiral action, as the definition of least action.

My 1973 hypothesis on epidemiological forecasting, was premised upon this work in physical economy. That hypothesis was prompted by my knowledge of the policy-shaping trends in U.S. and international monetary and economic policies growing out of the developments of 1967-72; the purpose was to forecast the epidemiological impact of a continuation of such policy-shaping trends into the 1980s.

During 1985-86, my associates and I reexamined our published forecast of early 1975, and found the forecast to have been horrifyingly accurate. My policies respecting public health measures and biological research in the matter of the AIDS pandemic, are based on that reexamination of the 1973-74 study.

Using classical epidemiology, our 1973-74 study had forecast, that under a continuation of then-established policy-shaping trends in monetary and economic policies, the eruption of global pandemics was to be expected during the 1980s, marked by the outbreak of a cholera epidemic in the Sahel region of Africa. On the basis of my hypothesis, which included a Riemannian approach to biology, I argued that, because of the intensity of economic shock expected, such an outbreak of global pandemics must be associated with the eruption of new species of viral pandemics, to become a dominant feature of the pattern of global epidemiology during the 1980s. This warning was included prominently in the forecast published at the beginning of 1975.

That warning is the crux of the problem of defining global policy for combatting the AIDS pandemic. Some added summary of the LaRouche-Riemann method is needed, to make the epidemiological argument clear.

The raw statistical measure used for my measurements in physical economy is "population-density." This compares actual population-density with potential population-density. By "potential population-density," I signify the density of population, per square kilometer of average land-area, which can be physically self-sustaining at some defined level of technology of practice. It is the correlation between an increase (rate of increase) of the level of technology applied, and increases in the productivity of labor, which leads to the notion of a variable "rate of increase of potential population-density," relative to an existing level of technology and population-density.

This leads to a nonlinear function, an array of nonlinear inequalities defined in terms of six primary constraints: 1) per capita market-basket values, 2) energy-density per per-capita unit of population-density, 3) energy-flux density of production modes relative to a standard of coherent radiation, 4)

urban/rural employment, 5) capital-goods/households-goods employment, and 6) level and rate of increase of technology.

Note: Linear econometrics of the Leontief/von Neumann matrix form breaks down in the cases, either that the economic process is undergoing technological progress, or devolving technologically. In fact, a technologically stagnant, or nearly stagnant economy is a devolving one, for reasons of depletion of primary resources as defined by an existing level of technology of production. Not only are the constraints of each matrix-cell variable, under these conditions; the array of rows and columns undergoes structural changes: discontinuities in the linear functions which merely reflect, crudely, the non-linearity of the process as a whole. The image of the Riemann Surface function, as a conceptual model of solutions, is implied.

The question posed to epidemiological forecasting, is the following. What is the result, if the potential population-density continues to fall significantly below the actual population-density? This question, I posed as a retrospective view, from a Riemannian standpoint, of the collaboration between Luca Pacioli and Leonardo da Vinci.

As Soviet historians of science should know, the following is the setting to be considered. On the basis of the work on scientific method by Nicolaus of Cusa, beginning with his 1440 *De Docta Ignorantia*, Pacioli undertook a reconstruction of the proof of the Platonic solids, to replicate a lost proof, by a mathematician at the Cyrenaic temple of Ammon, to which Plato refers in the *Timaeus* dialogue. As Euler and others showed more rigorously, the existence of the five Platonic solids is a limiting condition of intelligible representation in Euclidean space; the meaning of this limit is defined in terms of the Golden Section employed to construct the dodecahedron, from which the other four Platonic solids are derived.

From this vantage-point Pacioli and his collaborators, including Leonardo, reexamined Leonardo of Pisa's Fibonacci series as a model for growth of populations of living individuals (and, implicitly, populations of micro-organisms such as cells). The fact that the Fibonacci series is an harmonic arithmetic series, converging upon the harmonic series defined by the Golden Section, was the premise of the empirical researches reflected in Pacioli's *De Divina Proportione*.

Since Cusa had already established a rigorous basis for a true non-Euclidean geometry, beginning with his anticipation of the isoperimetric theorem in his *De Docta Ignorantia*, Pacioli and Leonardo viewed these matters from the standpoint of a radically constructive geometry, rather than an axiomatic-deductive schema, such as those of axiomatic arithmetic or Euclid's *Elements*. Thus, the kernel of scientific method presented by Cusa, began to emerge as the notion of a universal principle of least action in physics.

In short, today, we know that, between the extremes of astrophysics and subatomic microphysics, all processes which

show the harmonic characteristics of morphology of growth and function congruent with the Golden Section, are either themselves living processes, or are objects produced by a certain kind of action of living processes.

From the standpoint of Gauss's work, beginning his treatment of the elliptic, constructive-geometric determination of the arithmetic-geometric mean, there is no mystery in the role of the Golden Section as such a characteristic of living processes. The Golden Section is merely the characteristic of projections of least action in the Gauss-Riemann domain upon the discrete manifold, as the function of the "fine structure constant" is another reflection of this.

The proper definition of the phenomena labeled "negentropy," is (contrary to Wiener's reliance upon the mechanistic, axiomatic-deductive, statistical methods of Boltzmann): processes of development harmonically ordered in congruence with the Golden Section of constructive geometry. "Negentropy," so rightly defined, is measurable as a function in terms of harmonically ordered increase of the density of singularities within an arbitrarily small interval of action. (The interpretation of this function's effects, from the standpoint of Gaussian, constructive-geometry approach to probability, rather than LaPlace's, leads to a correct view of the statistical result.)

In the LaRouche-Riemann method, as identified above, the proper function for economic growth defines an harmonically ordered series congruent with the Golden Section, a function expressed in terms of increasing density of singularities. Devolution, stated in terms of the same function, is also harmonically ordered, and may be expressed in terms of a decreasing density of singularities. This is true not only theoretically, but in actual cases.

This connection to biological processes is not accidental. My attack on Wiener's "information theory" was premised upon my earlier objections to the leading theses of the Kantian system, as summed up in Kant's *Critique of Judgment*. Kant, as you may recall, argued that the creative processes of thought, as typified by scientific discovery, are not themselves susceptible of intelligible representation. Wiener merely reasserted that in statistical language, from the same axiomatic-deductive standpoint as Kant. Naturally, for reason of what Russell and Whitehead define as the "hereditary principle" of all axiomatic-deductive systems, no creation within the terms of any axiomatic-deductive system is possible. The fault, on this account, lies not with "creation," but with the intrinsic defects of all axiomatic-deductive thinking.

Creative mentation may be described, formally, as susceptible of intelligible ("constructible") representation, in terms of changes in the axiomatics of physical space-time, in the sense of increasing density of singularities. This is a more general statement of the same point introduced by Riemann, in such locations as his inaugural dissertation, *On The Hypotheses Which Underlie Geometry*, and on the feasibility of representation of an arbitrary function as a trigonometric func-

tion in the Gauss-Riemann complex manifold. This coincides with the generation of discontinuities by a continuous function in terms of multiply-connected self-similar-spiral least action.

In scientific discovery, especially those discoveries bearing upon "new physical principles," what occurs, relative to notions associated with axiomatic-deductive systems, is a radical change in at least some among the ontological assumptions underlying an entire body of extant scientific opinion. By restating all elementary scientific propositions in terms of the Gauss-Riemann complex manifold, the act of discovery can itself be given an intelligible representation, as the action lying between the previous and new elementary expression of the function. This approach provides an ontologically intelligible form of representation of the act of fundamental discovery.

Statements in this form, are also, of course, statements in terms of Gauss-Riemann least action. Such statements are the proper, implicitly measurable representation of technological progress. Since ideas for practice, so represented, are statements of mankind's action upon physical space-time, they are of the form of cause-effect functions showing the efficient connection between scientific discovery and increases in the physical productivity of labor.

Yet, this function is also an elaboration of the notion of negentropy in general, and therefore bears implicitly upon that which distinguishes living processes axiomatically from non-living ones.

Hence, if we replace a notion of molecular biology based on axiomatic-deductive methods, with a Riemannian (optical) biophysics, we are able to establish congruence between the progressive or devolutionary impact of economic developments and epidemiology. Those Soviet biophysicists working in the tradition of Vernadsky and Gurwitsch will tend to recognize most quickly the import of what I have just summarized.

Since my critical study of the work of Nicholas Rashevsky, in connection with researches leading into my 1952 discoveries, I have recognized that the flaws within Rashevsky's method, which lead him to a dead-end in perturbation hypotheses, are removed by restating the problems in Riemannian terms. Thus, the standpoint from which to examine the relevant matters, includes a definition of the existence of the cell in a Riemannian way. The function must adopt the mitotic processes as the definition of the existence of the cell as a singularity of the cell process, subsuming parent and daughter cells under a generalized function for mitosis.

To accomplish this, it is essential to make the primary subject-matter that aspect of the mitotic process which can not be intelligibly represented in axiomatic-deductive terms of reference, and which is, nonetheless, that characteristic of the mitotic process which defines the cell as a living process, rather than a statistical proposition in molecular biology. From the standpoint of a Gauss-Riemann manifold, the im-

Visna—the sheep viral model for AIDS

The best model for the devastating way in which a “slow virus” (or lentivirus) like AIDS can spread throughout a community is the case of the maedi-visna epidemic which wiped out the sheep population of Iceland between the 1930s and 1950s. *Maedi* is the Icelandic name for the condition of difficult or labored breathing; *visna* is the Icelandic word for wasting, which is the name given to the slow, progressive viral inflammation of the brain and spinal cord. In other words, the combined disease state of “maedi-visna” is a basic biological model for what in an AIDS victim is a combination of primary pulmonary disease and primary neurological disease.

The disease had been unknown in Iceland until it was introduced by the importation of 20 apparently healthy Karakul sheep into the country in 1933. The sheep—which two rams were infected with the virus—were sent to 14 farms in various parts of the country. Beginning five years later, after the slow-acting virus had silently spread, the country’s stock of 700,000 plus sheep began dying.

After only five years of the beneath-the-surface spread, there were annual sheep losses of 15-30%.

The reason the disease wiped out so many sheep, is that the long period of the asymptomatic carrier or pre-clinical stage of the disease meant that apparently healthy sheep were in fact busily infecting others. In the winter, the flocks were crowded together, like human beings in underheated dwellings in the poverty ghettos of large American cities today. Then, during the summer, the sheep were let loose to roam and mix together freely.

When the maedi-visna epidemic was at its peak in the early 1940s, the disease was prevalent on most Icelandic farms in approximately 60% of the sheep-raising districts. From 1933 until 1944, the total number of winter-fed sheep in Iceland fell from about 730,000 to 450,000 sheep. In short, 38% of the total sheep population was lost during one decade. The only way the epidemic was halted, was that the Icelandic government in 1941 began to systematically slaughter and restock all sheep in the infected areas. It has been estimated that a combined total of 775,000 sheep had either died of the disease or had been slaughtered to eradicate its spread over a 30-year period. The virus was not isolated until the late 1950s. Today, 54 years after the infected rams landed on Iceland there is still no vaccine and no cure to the slow virus despite massive investment in research.—*Warren J. Hamerman*

plications are elementary, and so is the general direction of the experimental hypotheses in nonlinear spectroscopy to be applied.

The form of action within the mitotic process which is congruent with life, is located ontologically in terms of “non-linear electromagnetic spectroscopy,” as Riemannian electrodynamics, as enriched by the work of Beltrami, as opposed to Maxwell’s reductionist schema, aids us in defining the evidence. So, the significance of the work of Vernadsky, Gurwitsch, and their successors in Soviet biophysics is to be situated: I think that now, the purpose of the foregoing summary begins to come into focus for some Soviet specialists.

A few more summary observations, to bring the kernel of my argument, and proposed policy, into focus.

As a working hypothesis, back in 1973, and still today, I assumed that new viral epidemics of mankind are generated within the mitotic process of human tissue. This depends upon the strong hypothesis, that the characteristics of living processes in the large subsume the lawful characteristics of those processes in the small: that whatever seems to occur in the small, that action’s effect is governed by the lawful result predetermined for the process in the large. Hence, since living processes are Riemannian in the large, the laws of micro-actions are Riemannian in the very small—a kind of

“reverse hereditary principle” of constructive geometry, if you choose to see it so.

Rather than seeing simply the dietary consumption of persons as such, we must see this as “fuel” for the activity-levels of tissue, and adopt the Riemannian electrodynamics of those activity-levels as the primary subject of our inquiry. The issue is not that human beings require certain dietary levels as a minimum for healthy life, but rather that those dietary levels are indispensable to sustain a health-giving level of activity within the organism.

What must occur, if we lower the level of activity within the organism below a minimum required for life, or, similarly, consume the energy of the system of the living process to do external work, to the effect of lowering the level of the energy of the system? Restate this: What must result if we lower the negentropy of the system?

According to Riemannian physics, the system must seek to find equilibrium in a lower state for that ecological phase-space (of the species in its environment), to degenerate in the direction of a lower level of negentropy in that ecological phase-space. This is a matter which suggests immediately appropriate experimental inquiry from the vantage-point of optical biophysics.

In other words, I assumed in 1973, and am more strongly

persuaded by results in “nonlinear spectroscopy” today, that lowering the potential population-density significantly below the actual population-density, for extended periods, must not only increase susceptibility to reproduction of viral infections, but tend to generate new ones through some sort of “recombinant effect” occurring within the mitotic process.

For such reasons, it has been my opinion since first receiving intensive scientific presentation of the characteristics of AIDS, that what we face is not simply one human-specific virus of this sort, but, rather, that this first type of AIDS is essentially a marker for an explosion of entire families of rapidly mutating viral epidemics of similar and other characteristics. This view was based on an updated version of the same hypothesis presented during 1973; what the relevant scientists presented to me, into 1985, had the characteristics of the kind of phenomenon I anticipated in the 1973 hypothesis. Recent investigations, showing other species of the AIDS infection, strengthen my views on this point.

My reasons for proposing, repeatedly, a U.S.-Soviet agreement on a joint program for combatting AIDS, should now be much clearer. We face a threat to the very existence of the human species as a whole, a true, apocalyptic enemy of all mankind. This threat must be the first priority in all policy of nations, subsuming all other strategic considerations. The world, and most of its governments, have been behaving as a pack of petty-minded, suicidal fools on this issue.

As I have proposed earlier, it is my estimate that Soviet biophysics working in the pathway of Vernadsky and Gurtwitsch, has invaluable contributions to make to a general effort, whereas we in some Western nations are better advantaged in means for producing advanced instruments of “nonlinear spectroscopy” research. The matching of capabilities, to offset the deficiencies of each, would best ensure the earliest success.

We must understand, in weighing the adoption of such a policy, that the issue is not simply combatting one infection, but of defining all the measures, and discovering new principles of biophysical means, for containing and combatting a wave of rapidly mutating new kinds of epidemic infections. Although molecular biology will contribute to this needed result, an assured victory demands a rapid explosion in advancement and scale of development of nonlinear optical biophysics.

2. ‘Skull Valley’ as such

I have responded to the cited article, principally because it is the most sophisticated of the Soviet efforts, thus far, to allege that the U.S. Department of Defense created “AIDS” as a biological agent of chemical-biological warfare. In one aspect, the argument presented in the article is all too plausible, if fatally flawed scientifically, and absurd militarily.

As Dr. Seale has stated repeatedly, the inclusion of visna strains for recombinant procedures in cancer research, is the

most probable variant of the known practices of the 1960s which might have led to the accidental production of a human-specific form of AIDS virus. The argument is, that the use of human tissue for such cancer-research procedures—a widespread practice, internationally, during that period—was the means most likely to produce such an unfortunate accident.

For that reason, any investigation of the possibilities suggested by Dr. Seale, would signify looking back into the 1960s, to identify every instance in which a governmental, supranational, or private biological-research organization was conducting experiments using such procedures, and to determine the areas in which this was conducted—such as among prisoner populations, in the Caribbean, in Africa, and so forth.

Such an investigation is not so much a matter of assigning blame. If we knew exactly how human AIDS had been synthesized, in a laboratory accident, or in nature, this would represent valuable knowledge bearing upon research for a cure.

If human AIDS occurred by recombinant action within human tissue, in a laboratory, then your writer might be correct in asserting that visna was employed as one of the ingredients. My best information would suggest that. Yet, if human AIDS were developed in some other way, from different starting-points, the result would still duplicate visna in a significant degree.

However, the idea of a military use of a human-specific derivative of visna is without basis in fact, as any Soviet expert in chemical-biological warfare could explain in detail. The reasons have been known for a long time, to every power familiar with the techniques and hazards of most categories of chemical-biological warfare, especially in the use of inherently unpredictable biological agents. AIDS has all of the characteristics of a biological agent which would never have been considered as an instrument of warfare, overt or covert, at least not by either the United States, or other Western European power, or the Soviet government: not for reason of pacifist sentimentalities, but simply because such an agent would have been an obviously stupid choice of weapon.

The obvious reasons include: 1) Visna-type infections are long-incubation infections, with highly variable rates of incubation: characteristics directly opposite to those for a chemical-biological agent. 2) Viruses of this class are prone to relatively high rates of mutation, and in a way not susceptible of prediction by means available during the 1960s and 1970s. 3) The potential vectors of transmission of the infection are numerous, but not adequately understood even today. 4) The only way devised for stopping a visna-type epidemic, back during the 1960s (when human AIDS probably began), was killing each and every carrier of the infection. Any chemical-biological warfare planner would vastly prefer the deadly, more controllable hemorrhagics or selected mycotoxins; why meddle with something as dangerous, and

unpredictably so, to both attacker and defender?

The possibility of a willful spread of a human AIDS infection, is limited to the specific sort of lunatic whose objective is to exterminate the human species. To unleash such a pandemic, without possessing first an assured cure for an entire family of both known and unknown species and varieties of AIDS-like infections, could have been done only by a Nietzschean madman, such as some among our radical homosexuals of Western Europe and the United States, today, who willfully transmit their deadly infection to others.

The possibility of a willful spread of a human AIDS infection, is limited to the specific sort of lunatic whose objective is to exterminate the human species. To unleash such a pandemic, without possessing first an assured cure for an entire family of both known and unknown species and varieties of AIDS-like infections, could have been done only by a Nietzschean madman, such as some among our radical homosexuals of Western Europe and the United States, today, who willfully transmit their deadly infection to others.

Visna had been studied for about 30 years prior to the date your author assigns to the Skull Valley incident, and, according to my best information, its essential nature was understood by about 1949. On this basis, no military planner would have permitted the notion that a human strain of visna was a weapon which might contribute to winning a war; it would be conceivable only as a "doomsday machine."

Even as a "doomsday machine," it is a terrible choice. The long span of incubation invites the discovery of a cure for general use before a full-scale "doomsday effect" were inflicted upon the conqueror. I need not elaborate further on this point, since the reasoning is well known to Soviet experts.

Your author asserts that the AIDS infection broke out first in New York City; not only is there no scientific evidence to support this, but such an assumption is contra-indicated by evidence so far. The evidence points toward the probability,

that the infection first appeared during the 1960s, possibly as a result of one or more cancer-research or similar programs of the type indicated, and that this infection began more or less simultaneously in various regions of the world, including Africa. This apparent near-simultaneity of spread among several continents, is the strongest probable evidence suggesting a pattern of laboratory accidents, rather than a spontaneous recombinant effect.

The question is, as I indicated above, at what stage in viral experiments in cancer research, did a number of laboratories, with operations on several continents, begin to use visna or similar animal retrovirus types in recombinant experiments using human tissue samples? Such an elementary epidemiological investigation is urgent, as I stated, for the reason that this may assist us in devising tactics for dealing with the infection, and in estimating the chances for other dangerous recombinants in nature.

As for the Skull Valley case, the following point was overlooked by your author. These types of viruses are specific to animal genomes. If it killed sheep, it was not human AIDS; if it were human AIDS, it should not have killed sheep. The generation of a more potent strain of visna, specific to sheep, might be suspected of being a biological agent of warfare. At least, the argument would be plausible, whereas the notion of human AIDS as a biological agent of chemical-biological warfare is not.

Dr. Seale, which he has repeated on a number of occasions, concerned the possibility of a laboratory accident, not a biological-warfare project by any civilized government. I would add the point, that the production of biological agents and biological research for therapeutic and related purposes require the same kinds of skills and facilities, for obvious reasons reflected in the practice of all nations which have conducted chemical-biological warfare programs in the past. Is it any different in the Soviet Union? Thus, even attributing research to a center subsidized by military agencies, is no indication that the research is for an offensive military purpose.

On the surface, the author's sophistry is a more sophisticated one than I have seen from Soviet publications on this subject earlier. Yet, on close examination, it proves to be a propagandistic sophistry, no more.

It is a counterproductive exercise by Soviet publications. It is as much in your government's urgent interests, as ours, that we reach agreement on cooperative efforts to conquer this monstrous infection. Harsh criticism of one adversary power by another, is proper; this article is not "harsh criticism," but rather strategic folly.

It is time that our governments put the facts on table to one another. What can each contribute to a common, general effort to defeat this common enemy, this deadly adversary of the very existence of the human species?

Sincerely,

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.