

It's OK to say "no" to someone because they have HIV/AIDS, despite what the current PC campaign says

August 24, 2015 | 20 upvotes | by [should](#)

AIDS was a big deal and a death sentence, and nowadays with the right meds, it seems to be a pain in the ass financially but if you're responsible you should basically be fine, or so they say. I'm pretty uninformed but my understanding is that most people who have AIDS will still die from some form of "AIDS related illness" aka AIDS pressing the off button on your immune system, so AIDS still completely sucks to get.

My Facebook feed has been lecturing gays about **HIV/AIDS "stigma"** and how it is now arrogant to not sleep with someone just because they have HIV/AIDS. Especially if they mention they are "undetectable," which means they are taking their meds enough that they shouldn't be transmitting. Because you should always take a relative stranger's word on their disease-status when your life depends on it, right?

It must suck to have this disease, have to share the news with partners should you decide to, and be inevitably turned down or heartbroken as a result of a dumb past decision, or perhaps be relegated to condom use or only informed gays who take PrEP (which seems to be [86-99%](#) effective). But no means no amirite? And if I had AIDS who am I to lecture responsible men on how they should have sex with me for politeness' sake?

I was doing a voluntary anonymous gay-male-sex study for money when I said something like "protection" referring to condoms and the monitor quipped something about how that word has "stigma" as if AIDS were something someone would want to protect themselves from, so he personally prefers to use another word. I'm not sure if someone is trying really hard to get gay people to keep on fucking AIDS into each other as if it would actually cull our population, or people are really trying this hard to create a world where No One's Feelings Are Hurt Ever. And if hundreds of gays get AIDS in the process and the pharmacists keep making that money, hey we made people feel better!

I am largely beginning to think that there is a large but strong undercurrent of counter-thought to most of these PC campaigns, especially since nowadays you don't hear much from the boogeyman-side that they are shouting against. "Black lives matter, especially when it's a white person killing them (despite 93% of black murder victims being killed by other blacks)!" "Ok." "Her body her choice!" "Ok." "Feminism!" "Mhmm."

RP says, it's your life, not their politeness playground. Your body your choice betch! [blog](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

tygertiger • 4 points • 15 October, 2015 10:23 PM

Of course it is! You have no obligation to have sex with someone and your concern for your own health and welfare is paramount to not hurting someone's feelz.

[deleted] 24 August, 2015 01:13 AM

[permanently deleted]

should_[S] • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 01:15 AM

Yeah I have a lot to learn but I think I'm still making a good point regarding the mainstream trying to override common sense choices. Feel free to fill me in since I'm still interested in learning more bro.

[deleted] 24 August, 2015 01:40 AM

[permanently deleted]

should_[S] • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 01:49 AM

OK, so if you are right, most people with AIDS today die of old age or an unrelated illness such as cancer. I'm not questioning it; I'm just seeking clarification. Is this what you mean?

your whole thing about protection being stigma... what? i can't even, just can't... we've been screaming for decades CONDOMS!!

I wasn't saying protection is stigma. One time, I was talking about protection in the form of condoms and the health guy basically said "wow, don't say 'protection,' that's offensive!"

inevitably turned down?!? not at all

Have you never been turned down for being HIV+? If so, out of curiosity, which city do you live in? How often do you disclose your HIV status to partners?

I think my last two paragraphs are pretty accurate. All I'm saying is "despite what I had thought, it is not just a small group of people who think counter to mainstream PC thought, and it's not just me and a few people on reddit and 4chan."

[deleted] 24 August, 2015 02:03 AM

[permanently deleted]

should_[S] • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 02:11 AM

I explained the second paragraph in my previous reply to you, and regarding the first paragraph you are quoting, I am talking specifically about the health guy's attitude that is being spread around. "Never decide to not have sex with someone because they have HIV. And don't say offensive words like 'prevention' or 'protection' because HIV is nothing that we need to protect ourselves from except sometimes."

[deleted] 24 August, 2015 02:15 AM*

[permanently deleted]

should_[S] • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 04:16 AM

There aren't exactly academic statistics going over the rate at which social media is whipping out the "you better not be saying no to people with HIV," but it has been pervasive enough for me to notice, and the word "protection" seemed like another symptom of this. Regarding this one guy, sexual health clinics are very often echo chambers of political correctness, even with procedures as simple as word usage, so it seemed unlikely to me that my monitor was the only one spouting off on not offending absolutely anyone by saying "Hmm well I don't like to use the word *protection*...."

[deleted] • 5 points • 7 September, 2015 03:59 PM

As someone who studied probability and statistics, just remember that just because the chance of getting HIV is virtually non-existent, *doesn't mean that you won't get it*. My plans in life don't have room for an infected partner. Yes, use a condom if you hook up with someone who is infected, but PrEP has always been a joke to me because of it.

should_[S] • 1 point • 8 September, 2015 09:26 PM

I'm with you, but what do you mean when you say "but PrEP has always been a joke to me because of it"? Is PrEP a joke in this context because it's less effective than a condom, because you can't be sure if your partner is on PrEP, or another reason?

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 September, 2015 09:55 PM*

It protects against HIV, but herpes and HPV are still out there and neither have a cure. It always came off as being dumb, since the drug is not 100% effective, and not only that, but other STDs are on the rise in gay men now. While PREP liberates others from the dreaded bug, it's easy to lie about your status (especially if you don't show symptoms) and it's also easy to lie about taking the drug.

should_[S] • 1 point • 9 September, 2015 12:00 AM

Nice, good things to keep in mind. I'm noticing my sex drive is dipping the more I get involved with my work, so, maybe I should stay on that track in general...

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 September, 2015 12:07 AM

Honestly, go MGTOW if you have to, and save enough to earn a vacation before you burn the fuck out.

formlessphilosophy • 3 points • 28 January, 2016 03:31 AM

At the end of the day, I do not give a flying fuck what society or anyone else says. It is a health decision which ultimately belongs to each person. It's not personal. I will not knowingly have sex with anyone with AIDS.

caius_iulius_caesar • 2 points • 16 November, 2015 05:21 AM

I can't imagine saying yes.

barelyrelevantcab • 2 points • 2 December, 2015 11:26 AM

Wait is this a thing now? Not wanting to sleep with someone because they have HIV/AIDS seems very reasonable to me and I know basically everyone from where I'm from would agree with me. Protecting yourself from a lifetime disease (even if the chance is less than 1% with protection) is worth more than any random fuck.

should_[S] • 1 point • 3 December, 2015 02:02 AM

Their thought process / philosophy is, "But why would you break the heart of someone you barely know because maybe it would work out and you would be together and you're just being snooty about having to take PrEP every day and taking other measures to protect yourself," basically. Their sympathy is with the victim. (And the HIV-negative ones who may catch it are not the victim in this case, slightly ironically.)

subzoid • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 10:00 PM

People who is as uninformed as you, might not know that the risk of infection with a medicated HIV+ person is almost non existant. People can say no, but people shouldn't be stupid. Your ignorant tone calls for action - read up on stuff and then come share your thoughts.

should_[S] • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 12:39 AM

Yeah from the last commenter it seems there is a lot I didn't know, so these campaigns I've been calling "PC" make more sense to me now. But I'm not entirely sure I would trust someone to be on the meds unless I knew them well enough. There was a guy recently on the news who was arrested for infecting a lot of guys with the virus; he may even have told them he was HIV+ but medicated.

subzoid • 5 points • 25 August, 2015 06:17 AM

This is is not extraordinary. If a girl tells you not to use a condom or you can "trust" her being on the pill - You use your brain. Do the same with everything else. Don't be naive, don't be stupid, don't be judgemental, gather knowledge and think for yourself. Then you're well off my man!

should_[S] • 2 points • 25 August, 2015 01:55 PM

This right here