Release of AIDS policy delayed again

By Asha Badrinath

A campus AIDS policy due out at the end of the 1986 Spring semester may now not come out until the end of this semester, members of the University AIDS committee said yesterday.

Conflicts among members of the committee, which is chaired by Senior Vice President Joseph Mullinix, about appropriate language for a document that would set a uniform policy towards the treatment of affiliates with AIDS have been delaying the report since last April.

The committee, organized in October of 1985, has been revising a policy statement for nearly a year. Despite charges from campus homosexual groups that the committee is stalling, members maintain that
the wording is still the main obstacle to the release of the report.

"I think it's larger language and representation and emphasis," Mullinix said. "It's very difficult language-wise to represent this stuff."

Laura Pinsky, an adviser to the campus Gay Health Advocacy Project (GHAP), agreed that the wording of the statement was very important. "This is an issue where subtle differences make a big difference, so it has to be worked out very specifically," Pinsky said.

"There have been delays because there've been differences of opinion over what the report should say," she said.

According to Mullinix, the committee's report will include an overview of the AIDS issue and its relationship to Columbia as well as a policy statement that says the University will not permit discrimination against people with AIDS or those who have tested positive for HIV or Human Immunodeficiency Virus, the infectious agent associated with AIDS.

Worries over the legality of the policy has also delayed its release as the different drafts of the report have gone back and forth between the committee and the University General Counsel's office.

Last Oct., committee members said the policy statement was near completion. Another version, however, has been drafted since then and the group will review this third version of the report on Tuesday.

After last meeting in early Dec., the committee had hoped to meet again in late Dec. or early Jan., but no date was set because the members were not all available for one day, according to Mullinix.

The changes now being made will not affect the main emphasis of the report, he said. "I don't see that there's any change in the thrust of the document. It's just getting the docu-
ment out,” Mullinix said. “I think it’s very easy to read in more conflict than there is.”

“I would certainly hope that after the next two meetings it would be done.”

Co-Coordinator of GHAP Mike Dowling said that he expected the committee report to be out by the end of April. “That would be the latest,” Dowling said.

“There’s a lot of fact-checking and details and wording that needs to be done just right,” he said.

Recent developments in AIDS research have also changed the focus of certain parts of the report, requiring rewriting. Mullinix explained. “People are beginning to think of AIDS in a different way now.”

Problems over language also occurred with the University’s informational pamphlet on AIDS, according to Mullinix. With heterosexual transmission of AIDS, for example, “How is this portrayed when you talk about ways of transmitting the disease?” he said. “There was some question of how you write that in the pamphlet.”

The road to a report that committee members, who were selected from the student body, faculty, and administration, could agree upon has been a long and arduous one. Originally, committee members said their function was more to educate than to formulate policy.

But after criticism from several members, the committee decided that it would in fact work out some sort of policy for affiliates with AIDS.

The committees one product so far, a 32-page, blue-covered glossy pamphlet entitled “Information About AIDS for the Columbia Community,” was distributed last fall and again earlier this semester.

In October, University Health Services Director Richard Carlson, also a member of the committee, said the final draft of the policy report was just a matter of “dotting some i’s and crossing some t’s.”
BRIGHT LIGHTS, BIG CITY: Isn't 55 m.p.h. the speed limit?