### 1AC – Blood

#### Kiki Mason, a member of the New York AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power wrote the following declaration in July of 1996:

"I am someone with AIDS and I want to live by any means necessary.

I am not dying: I am being murdered. Just as surely as if my body was being tossed into a gas chamber, I am being sold down the river by people within this community who claim to be helping people with AIDS. Hang your heads in shame while I point my finger at you.

'Activists' now negotiate with drug companies just as the Jewish councils in the Warsaw ghettos of World War II negotiated with the Nazis. 'Give us a few lives today,' they insist, 'and we'll trade you even more tomorrow.' AIDS careerists--both HIV-positive and HIV-negative--have exchanged their anger for an invitation to the White House. It is their megalomania and the illusion of power that buys the silence of these so-called community leaders. And where does that leave the rest of us? We're left fighting for our lives while a group of well-educated, affluent white 'homo-sexuals' sit on community boards and advisory councils while we're left to die on the streets.

Our service organizations are a joke. Gay Men's Health Crisis: With all their money and clout, all you get is a free lunch, group therapy and free counseling via my favorite question, 'Have you made out your will yet?' AmFAR? It hasn't funded clinical trials in two years, and when it did, the studies were pathetic. AmFAIL is more like it. Or, how about the AIDS Inaction Council?

Jewish leaders established organizations to run their ghettos--and we do the same--in a desperate attempt to gain some control over a living nightmare. Everyone is selling you out. We refuse to plead with the U.S. government or negotiate with the entire medical-industrial complex for your lives. We have to get what we need by any means necessary.

A wealthy, well-connected hetero friend recently said to me, "I'm amazed that you guys haven't turned to terrorism-everybody's afraid of you anyway. Why not use that fear to save yourselves?"

Make no mistake. This is what we're left with. If you choose to negotiate your life away with scum bags, fine. But I'm going out fighting. This is my message to everyone with AIDS: If you think the end is near, take someone with you. Hold the president of a drug company hostage. Splatter your blood across the desk of a politician. Trash an AIDS researcher's home. When some silly-assed, blow-dried, brain-dead TV reporter asks you a stupid question about living with AIDS, spit in his face. Call the police and tell them you've put LSD in the water supply in retaliation for our genocide. Do it so they'll know what it's like to have your life ripped apart.

Unfortunately, we are a 'gentle, loving people.' Many of us lack the strength and conviction required for these brave actions. A friend of mine said the other day that as long as we were threatening a drug company, get him into its compassionate-use drug trial: 'I'm so tired of what we have to do to stay alive.' Me, too, baby. Me, too. But do it we must.

To all you supportive HIV-negatives: I call on you to make this sacrifice as well. This is not just tough talk. I truly believe that the current state of AIDS will not change unless radical steps are taken immediately. If you don't believe me, then take a good, hard look at the war on cancer.

Creating terror is not just screaming, making an artistic statement or getting in touch with your anger. True anger is not a flame. True anger is ice. True anger is calm and sure. It does not require legions of people to succeed. It requires determination as strong as steel. An act of terror can be large or small, innately personal or massively public. Let's use our queerest gift--creativity--to Do the Right Thing. I know some of you are shaking your heads as you read this. Many of you will no doubt shrug it off. Go ahead. But remember, I want to live. By any means necessary."

(<http://www.actupny.org/diva/CBnecessary.html>)

#### The AIDS epidemic is NOT over and it is NOT an accidental infection brought over from an African green monkey virus: it is a human-made BIOLOGICAL WARFARE WEAPON designed to ensure the extermination of ALL QUEER PEOPLE from this planet. Str8 male scientists have created a drug-resistant virus capable of DESTROYING the human immune system to KILL US because they HATE US and want us PERMANENTLY REMOVED FROM THIS EARTH.

Cantwell 1997 (Alan, Dr., *The Secret AIDS Genocide Plot,* <http://www.whale.to/b/cantwell19.html>)CJQ

Sometimes I wish I could go back to the time when I knew nothing about the man-made origin of AIDS. Before the plague I was more optimistic and hopeful about the future. I believed in the highest ideals of medical science, and I trusted my colleagues to do the night thing. I could never conceive that homosexuals like myself would be targeted for death in another Holocaust, in a new kind of mass killing with man-made biological weapons. But those simpler times of yesterday are a fantasy of a past that can never come again. Now I am more serious, more introspective. Amid the many deaths of friends and lovers, I struggle to discover the meaning of life in a world gone mad. I try to make sense out of the new biologic Holocaust and the secret genocide program so satanic in nature, that even God seems powerless in its wake. The AIDS biologic experiment is a replay of the medical terrors of Nazi Germany, but few people realize that another man-made Holocaust is occurring in front of our eyes. German gays, along with Jews, were Hitler's primary victims. A half century later, homosexuals and other "undesirables" are once again targets for extermination. For a few years I was oblivious to the genocidal plot against homosexuals. As I watched so many gay men die agonizing deaths, I remained totally unaware that they were being systematically murdered, just like the millions exterminated by the German Third Reich. At first, the gays were called victims. The term seemed appropriate for those unfortunate men infected with a mysterious and lethal virus out of Africa. However, it was soon considered politically incorrect to label gay men as "victims." Calling them "PWAs" or Persons with AIDS was preferred. It is a sad irony that gay men themselves chose the appellation, because they believed that the victim label had too negative a connotation, and interfered with their struggle to heal themselves through positive thinking. Nevertheless, it is still politically correct to refer to some AIDS sufferers as victims, particularly if they are "innocent" babies or heterosexuals who acquired AIDS through a blood transfusion. Gays are seldom thought of as innocent. It is much easier to believe that homosexuals are dying because of their promiscuous and sinful lifestyle, than to believe they are being murdered by the new genetic biotechnology. Like the Jews in Nazi Germany, American gays quickly fell victim to government propaganda. It was simple to blame the spread of the new disease on anal sex and designer drugs. Everyone accepted the idea that homosexuals had fucked their brains out in the '70s, and now they were paying for their perversions by suffering the effects of an African virus mysteriously introduced into the gay ghettos. In April 1984, Dr. Robert Gallo officially announced his discovery of the AIDS virus to the scientific world. The topmost AIDS researcher quickly explained that the new virus originated in darkest Africa. Perhaps the strange virus had been there for decades, or for centuries, or even millennia. No one could be sure how long it had been lurking in Africa. Gallo and other leading virologists claimed the virus originated in the African green monkey. In a freak accident of nature, the green monkey virus jumped species and infected millions of African Blacks. How did AIDS come to America? The AIDS experts theorized that Haitians working in Africa brought the virus back to Haiti. Promiscuous Manhattan gays vacationing in Port-au-Prince had anal sex with Haitian men and carried the African virus back to New York City. The African origin of AIDS was readily accepted by the medical doctors; and the government's AIDS officials made sure the media repeated the story over and over again until it became gospel. No one questioned Dr. Gallo's official story. Looking back on the early years of the epidemic, I now see how easy it was to dupe the gays, the doctors, the intellectuals and the media. The leading government virologists were all in accord regarding the African origin of AIDS and the green monkey theory. Those rare scientists who doubted the story were ignored.

#### The United States Federal Government established a medical-industrial complex with financial incentives to target queers for infection with this plague and has a monetary interest in preventing the discovery of a cure.

#### There is a reason that AIDS appeared right at the height of the gay liberationist movement: to prevent the rise of queer power and to stop the sexual revolution against straight supremacy. While heteros have been infected they have not been targeted for extermination: antiqueerness and gross capitalist profit incentives make clear that AIDS is a governmental weapon used to ensure the continuation of mass queer death.

Cantwell 1997 (Alan, Dr., *The Secret AIDS Genocide Plot,* <http://www.whale.to/b/cantwell19.html>)CJQ

The epidemiologists first detected cases of the "gay plague" in the homosexual ghettos of New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. Some of the sick men had purple cancerous skin tumors identical to Kaposi's sarcoma tumors commonly seen in Blacks in Central Africa. This connection between gay Kaposi's sarcoma and African Kaposi's sarcoma was interpreted as further proof that the new homosexual disease had come from Africa. The African origin of American AIDS was readily accepted by the medical community and the general public. Who could argue with the facts presented by the top government AIDS virologists and epidemiologists? Thus, the "facts" of the green monkey theory were set in stone. The idea that the green monkey theory was homophobic and racist never entered my mind. A few of my gay friends never believed the government's story. They insisted AIDS was a government plot to get rid of gay people. I thought this idea was paranoid. By the early 1980s gays and lesbians had become a militant and increasingly powerful political minority. My paranoid friends did not believe it was just a coincidence that AIDS first appeared at a time when gays were demanding civil rights. Political groups, particularly right-wing fundamentalist Christian groups, were determined to quell the rise of gay power. Many Americans wished gays would go back in the closet; some even wished they would disappear permanently. My friends argued that AIDS was a perfect way for the government to kill off "queers." I paid no attention to rumblings about secret gay genocide. As a physician and cancer researcher my mind was closed to the idea that AIDS was a plot against homosexuals. The scientific facts were clear, or so I thought. The AIDS virus was discovered in 1984; and AIDS cases first appeared in 1979. How could homosexuals be deliberately infected with a virus that was unknown in 1979? The idea was idiotic. In the summer of 1986 my logic was challenged when I met Dr. Robert Strecker. It was rumored he was spreading the word that AIDS was a man-made disease with a genetically engineered virus. It was incredible for a physician to be promoting such craziness. Nevertheless, the idea was intriguing and I was curious to meet him. Strecker had impeccable credentials. He was a practicing internist in Los Angeles, had a doctorate in pharmacology, and was also trained in pathology. I found him intelligent, knowledgeable, and thoroughly familiar with the medical and scientific AIDS literature. Supporting his ideas and theories with logic and evidence, Strecker's analysis of AIDS as biowarfare was chilling. And his theory of AIDS origin made more sense than the government's green Monkey scenario. At the first opportunity I asked him why my gay friends ``are dying like flies. How did the AIDS virus get into the gay community? "It's simple," Strecker said. "They put it there." "What do you mean? How in hell could they do that?" I retorted. "The gays were infected during the hepatitis B vaccine trials back in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Check it out yourself and you'll see it's true'" "What about AIDS in Africa?" Strecker insisted that African AIDS was the result of the smallpox eradication vaccine program conducted by the World Health Organization (WHO) during the 1970s. Strecker's accusations were mind-blowing. Was AIDS deliberately introduced into the gay community during the hepatitis experiment? Was the connection between the gay experiment and the "gay plague" covered up? Were gays the victims of a diabolic plot directed against them by the government scientists? My head was spinning. I was angry, depressed and horrified by the implications of Strecker's ideas. I vaguely recalled the hepatitis B vaccine experiment which used gays as guinea pigs in New York City, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. But I was totally ignorant about the details and outcome of the experiment. The concept of AIDS as a covert genocide operation against homosexuals was unacceptable, too painful to investigate, too odious to be true. But I couldn't ignore Strecker's accusations. As a physician, as a scientist, as a gay man, I had to discover the truth. Not knowing would be intolerable. I was determined to prove Strecker wrong, but I couldn't. After countless weeks of reading, studying and correlating published reports obtained from the medical library, I was convinced he was correct. Strecker's belief that AIDS was manmade was the most likely explanation for the origin of AIDS. My research indicated that American AIDS had its roots, 'not in Africa, but in the cities where gays were injected in a futile experiment. The homosexuals never realized they were the victims of a secret biomedical plot directed against them.

#### Vito Russo, one of the leading gay members of ACT-UP, gave the following speech in 1988:

So, if I'm dying from anything, I'm dying from homophobia. If I'm dying from anything, I'm dying from racism. If I'm dying from anything, it's from indifference and red tape, because these are the things that are preventing an end to this crisis. If I'm dying from anything, I'm dying from Jesse Helms. If I'm dying from anything, I'm dying from the President of the United States. And, especially, if I'm dying from anything, I'm dying from the sensationalism of newspapers and magazines and television shows, which are interested in me, as a human interest story -- only as long as I'm willing to be a helpless victim, but not if I'm fighting for my life.

If I'm dying from anything -- I'm dying from the fact that not enough rich, white, heterosexual men have gotten AIDS for anybody to give a shit. You know, living with AIDS in this country is like living in the twilight zone. Living with AIDS is like living through a war which is happening only for those people who happen to be in the trenches. Every time a shell explodes, you look around and you discover that you've lost more of your friends, but nobody else notices. It isn't happening to them. They're walking the streets as though we weren't living through some sort of nightmare. And only you can hear the screams of the people who are dying and their cries for help. No one else seems to be noticing.

And it's worse than a war, because during a war people are united in a shared experience. This war has not united us, it's divided us. It's separated those of us with AIDS and those of us who fight for people with AIDS from the rest of the population.

Two and a half years ago, I picked up Life Magazine, and I read an editorial which said, "it's time to pay attention, because this disease is now beginning to strike the rest of us." It was as if I wasn't the one holding the magazine in my hand. And since then, nothing has changed to alter the perception that AIDS is not happening to the real people in this country. It's not happening to us in the United States, it's happening to them -- to the disposable populations of fags and junkies who deserve what they get. The media tells them that they don't have to care, because the people who really matter are not in danger. Twice, three times, four times -- The New York Times has published editorials saying, don't panic yet, over AIDS -- it still hasn't entered the general population, and until it does, we don't have to give a shit.

And the days, and the months, and the years pass by, and they don't spend those days and nights and months and years trying to figure out how to get hold of the latest experimental drug, and which dose to take it at, and in what combination with other drugs, and from what source? And, how are you going to pay for it? And where are you going to get it? Because it isn't happening to them, so they don't give a shit.

(<http://www.actupny.org/documents/whfight.html>)

#### The Department of Defense uses Congressional funds to prop up a biowarfare industry founded on queer death. First President Reagan, then President Bush I, then Clinton and Bush II and now President Barack Obama have CHOSEN TO IGNORE the ONGIONG AIDS GENOCIDE against queers in this country THAT THEY HAVE MADE POSSIBLE by approving legislation that gives funding to a military-industrial complex with incentives to exterminate each and every queer person. Their willful ignorance is an ACTIVE COMPLICITY with the extermination of queer people ACROSS THE GLOBE. Massive corporate interests guarantee that Congress will never do anything to end the government’s program of queer extermination. We are under attack and nobody gives a shit about it.

Cantwell 1997 (Alan, Dr., *The Secret AIDS Genocide Plot,* <http://www.whale.to/b/cantwell19.html>)CJQ

Is AIDS merely a freak accident of nature caused by an African green monkey virus? Or is AIDS a government-sponsored genocide program that seeded a laboratory virus into select populations for diabolical political and social purposes? In the 1960's the U.S. military biowarfare establishment began to pay serious attention to the new advances in biotechnology and genetic engineering. It was obvious to scientists that infectious agents could be transformed into deadly biologic weapons that could be used against civilian populations in time of war. Much cheaper to produce than atomic and conventional military weapons, bioweapons have the distinct advantage of killing life without destroying property. A group of biowarfare experts, appearing before a United Nations panel in 1969, estimated that the cost of a large-scale killing operation against a civilian population would amount to $2,000 per square kilometer with conventional weapons, $800 with nuclear weapons, $600 with nerve-gas weapons, and $1 with biological weapons. Nobel Prize winner Sal Luria, a biology professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was one of the first microbiologists to speak out against biowarfare. Fleeing Europe shortly before World War II, Luria was keenly aware of how medical science could be used to kill people. He warned that genetically engineered bioweapons had the potential to "degrade the genetic qualities of entire populations." In a 1968 essay entitled The Microbiologist and His Times, Luria implored members of the American Society of Microbiologists to reconsider the ethics of their dangerous participation in covert military research. Beginning in the 1950's, an advisory committee of the Society had been cooperating with the army biowarfare laboratory at Fort Detrick, located in Frederick, Maryland. The biology professor counseled, "The decision as to whether or not to work on biological warfare research, and on war-related research in general, is bound to be a personal one. Consciousness of the difficult issues involved dictates the utmost restraint in making value judgments concerning either those who do carry out such research or those who wish to disassociate themselves from it." Luria's personal opinion was that the Society should not be associated with the Fort Detrick biowarfare lab, and that the committee should be disbanded. In 1969 Dr. Donald M. MacArthur appeared at a Congressional Hearing on Chemical and Biological Warfare. As Deputy Director of the Department of Defense, he was responsible for the management of diverse research and technology programs such as rocket and missile propulsion, materials technology, medical and life sciences, social and behavioral sciences, environmental sciences, and chemical technology. Donald MacArthur declared that biowarfare experts could develop a genetically engineered "super germ" that would be very different from any previous microbe known to mankind. The agent would be a highly effective killing agent because the human immune system would be powerless against this super-microbe. This testimony was delivered in Washington before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Department of Defense Appropriations for 1970, on July 1, 1969. When questioned about the cost and time required to develop this biowarfare program, Dr. MacArthur answered that a small group of molecular biologists had considered the matter and provided the following details... "All biological agents up to the present time are representatives of naturally occurring disease, and are thus known by scientists throughout the world. They are easily available to qualified scientists for research, either for offensive or defensive purposes. 2. "Within the next 5 to 10 years, it would probably be possible to make a new infective microorganism which could differ in certain important aspects from any known disease-causing organisms. Most important of these is that it might be refractory to the immunological and therapeutic processes upon which we depend to maintain our relative freedom from infectious disease. 3. "A research program to explore the feasibility of this could be completed in approximately 5 years at a total cost of $10 million. 4. "It would be very difficult to establish such a program. Molecular biology is a relatively new science. There are not many competent scientists in the field, almost all are in university laboratories, and they are generally adequately supported from sources other than the Department of Defense. However, it was considered possible to initiate an adequate program through the National Academy of Sciences---National Research Council (NAS-NRC). The matter was discussed with the NAS-NRC, and tentative plans were made to initiate the program. However, decreasing funds in chemical/biological (CB) research, growing criticism of the CB program, and our reluctance to involve the NAS-NRC in such a controversial endeavor have led us to postpone it for the past two years.... "It is a highly controversial issue and there are many who believe such research should not be undertaken lest it lead to yet another method of massive killings of large populations. On the other hand, without the sure scientific knowledge that such a weapon is possible, and an understanding of the ways it could be done, there is little that can be done to devise defensive measures. Should an enemy develop it, there is little doubt that this is an important area of potential military technological inferiority in which there is no adequate research program." Not surprisingly, the Department of Defense, with its vast network of hospitals and researchers, is the principal Federal agency involved in AIDS research, with funds allotted by Congress. According to The New York Times , "Congress usually sets the nation's medical-research priorities, often after intensive lobbying by scientists, companies and interest groups." Some AIDS researchers complain that lawmakers let corporate lobbyists determine which AIDS treatments and studies should be supported by tax dollars. Like cancer, AIDS is big business. And with big money interests so heavily involved in the multi-billion dollar AIDS industry, it is likely that politics will continue to override science in the search for an AIDS cure. The U.S. has the world's largest arsenal of chemical and biological weapons. Our biowarfare arsenal contains enough nerve and mustard gas to kill everyone on the planet 5,000 times. However, few people are aware of the covert biowarfare experiments conducted against U.S. citizens by various government agencies, particularly the military and the CIA. Previously classified data obtained through the Freedom of Information Act have revealed over 200 experiments directed against civilians and military personnel.

#### Antiqueerness is an irreducible antagonism of straight civil society—the queer exists in a non-relation with heterosexuality. Occupying the position of the nothing allows for the queer to be bashed, beaten, bruised and killed not only in the moment of queer bashing but also in the systemic and structural types of violence revealed as AIDS is used as a weapon of queer genocide.

Stanley 2011 (Eric, “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture,” Social Text 107 s Vol. 29, No. 2 s Summer 2011)CJQ

If for Agamben bare life expresses a kind of stripped- down sociality or a liminal space at the cusp of death, then near life names the figuration and feeling of nonexistence, as Fanon suggests, which comes before the question of life might be posed. Near life is a kind of ontocorporal (non) sociality that necessarily throws into crisis the category of life by orientation and iteration. This might better comprehend not only the incomprehensible murders of Brazell, Paige, and Weaver, but also the terror of the dark cell inhabited by the queer survivor of the Holocaust who perished under “liberation.”33 Struggling with the phenomenology of black life under colonization, Fanon opens up critical ground for understanding a kind of near life that is made through violence to exist as nonexistence. For Fanon, violence is bound to the question of recognition (which is also the im/possibility of subjectivity) that apprehends the relationship between relentless structural violence and instances of personal attacks evidenced by the traumatic afterlives left in their wake. For Fanon, the Hegelian master/slave dialectic, as theoretical instrument for thinking about recognition, must be reconsidered through the experience of blackness in the French colonies. For Fanon, Hegel positions the terms of the dialectic (master/slave) outside history and thus does not account for the work of the psyche and the historicity of domination like racialized colonization and the epidermalization of that power. In other words, for Fanon, when the encounter is staged and the drama of negation unfolds, Hegel assumes a pure battle. Moreover, by understanding the dialectic singularly through the question of self- consciousness, Hegel, for Fanon, misrecognizes the battle as always and only for recognition. Informed by Alexandre Kojève and Jean- Paul Sartre, Fanon makes visible the absent figure of Enlightenment assumed by the Hegelian dialectic. For Fanon, colonization is not a system of recognition but a state of raw force and total war. The dialect cannot in the instance of colonization swing forward and offer the self- consciousness of its promise. According to Fanon, “For Hegel there is reciprocity; here the master laughs at the consciousness of the slave. What he wants from the slave is not recognition but work.”34 Hegel’s dialectic that, through labor, offers the possibility of self- consciousness, for the colonized is frozen in a state of domination and nonreciprocity.35 What is at stake for Fanon, which is also why this articulation is helpful for thinking near life, is not only the bodily terror of force; ontological sovereignty also falls into peril under foundational violence. This state of total war, not unlike the attacks that left Brazell, Paige, and Weaver dead, is at once from without — the everyday cultural, legal, economic practices — and at the same time from within, by a consciousness that itself has been occupied by domination. For Fanon, the white imago holds captive the ontology of the colonized. The self/Other apparatus is dismantled, thus leaving the colonized as an “object in the midst of other objects,” embodied as a “feeling of nonexistence.”36 While thinking alongside Fanon on the question of racialized difference, violence, and ontology, how might we comprehend a phenomenology of antiqueer violence expressed as “nonexistence”? It is not that we can take the specific structuring of blackness in the French colonies and assume it would function the same today, under U.S. regimes of antiqueer violence. However, if both desire and antiqueer violence are embrocated by the histories of colonization, then such a reading might help to make more capacious our understanding of antiqueer violence today as well as afford a rereading of sexuality in Fanon’s texts. Indeed, Fanon’s intervention offers a space of nonexistence, neither master nor slave, written through the vicious work of epistemic force imprisoned in the cold cell of ontological capture. This space of nonexistence, or near life, forged in the territory of inescapable violence, allows us to understand the murders of queers against the logics of aberration. This structure of antiqueer violence as irreducible antagonism crystallizes the ontocorporal, discursive, and material inscriptions that render specific bodies in specific times as the place of the nothing. The figuration of near life should be understood not as the antihuman but as that which emerges in the place of the question of humanity. In other words, this is not simply an oppositional category equally embodied by anyone or anything. This line of limitless inhabitation, phantasmatically understood outside the intersections of power, often articulated as “equality,” leads us back toward rights discourse that seeks to further extend (momentarily) the badge of personhood. The nothing, or those made to live the death of a near life, is a break whose structure is produced by, and not remedied through, legal intervention or state mobilizations. For those who are overkilled yet not quite alive, what form might redress take, if any at all?

#### Failure to remember the genocidal program of AIDS erases antiqueerness beneath a veneer of accidental discrimination that fails to explain the mass killing of the queer population. Str8 society treats infection as the justified punishment that comes with being queer. Only returning to the lost pasts of AIDS allows for us to fight the global epidemic that is made possible by the weapon of Human Immunodeficiency Virus.

Winnubst 2006 (Shannon, Asst. Prof. Women’s Studies, “Queering Freedom,” 2006 Pp. 196-197)CJQ

It is not coincidental that David Wojnarowicz died of AIDS. This epidemic, which has been sexualized, racialized, nationalized, and classed more vehemently than any prior to it, brings together these multiple strands of sovereign, queer politics and their reworking of our spaces, times, selves, and pleasures. Having undergone several interpellations since its emergence, AIDS continues to haunt the social psyche of the overdeveloped world as “the gay disease,” that horrible blight upon homosexual men for the sins of their perversions. Because its recognition was economically conditioned, the disease entering medical discourses only after communities of middle-class gay men began contracting it,17 AIDS remains a highly sexualized disease: it is the disease that infected our most intense pleasures—our sex lives. And it infected them in such a mysterious and forceful way that it had to be morally expunged, while still not medically cured. AIDS brought together the ultimate taboos of western, advanced capitalist, white supremacist cultures: sex and death. And no one but a pervert could do such a thing. Attaching itself to the practices of sexuality that undermined the utilitarian mandate, AIDS was always already a queer virus. But as the epidemic has allegedly departed the shores of the U.S., we white citizens of that country seem to have done what we are trained so well to do: we have forgotten all about it.18 Out of sight, out of mind—and out of existence, both past and present. As a “tropical” model displaces once again the “epidemiological” model that intermittently dominated AIDS discourse in the first two decades of the disease’s emergence, the normative space-time of colonialism has taken hold once more: ‘savage’ lands are again displaying their inherent inability to enter civilization, and we must remain securely separated from them—physically, economically, politically, and, most of all, psychologically.19 We must protect our own future, and the necessary condition for such security is the complete disavowal of those lives and pasts lost to AIDS: we must forget AIDS ever happened in our own lands. This forgetting is fraught for queer politics in several ways. It erases the explicit stigmatization of gay lives in the 1980s that now invigorates the only slightly more subtle politics of homophobia in the U.S. in the early twentyfirst century; and in so doing, it severs us from the radically transformative practices not only of sexuality, but of sexual acts as they are conjoined to a different disposition toward death.

#### While targeted for killing, queers are also made the object of overkill: queers must not only be killed but are pushed beyond death, corpses mutilated and made unrecognizable—whether a broken skull or a pile of AIDS infected corpses, the marks of queer death reveal antiqueer violence as a form of overkill.

#### Overkill is ontologically different from other types of violence: the law protects and sustains these forms of violence by treating them as criminal aberrations or as individual homophobia, failing to conceptualize the possibility that heterosexual society founds itself through a bargain bought at the price of queer life. The first question for this debate must be “what does it mean to do violence to what is nothing,” and until that question has been answered we can have no further impact calculus.

Stanley 2011 (Eric, “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture,” Social Text 107 s Vol. 29, No. 2 s Summer 2011)CJQ

Overkill is a term used to indicate such excessive violence that it pushes a body beyond death. Overkill is often determined by the postmortem removal of body parts, as with the partial decapitation in the case of Lauryn Paige and the dissection of Rashawn Brazell. The temporality of violence, the biological time when the heart stops pushing and pulling blood, yet the killing is not finished, suggests the aim is not simply the end of a specific life, but the ending of all queer life. This is the time of queer death, when the utility of violence gives way to the pleasure in the other’s mortality. If queers, along with others, approximate nothing, then the task of ending, of killing, that which is nothing must go beyond normative times of life and death. In other words, if Lauryn was dead after the first few stab wounds to the throat, then what do the remaining fifty wounds signify? The legal theory that is offered to nullify the practice of overkill often functions under the name of the trans- or gay- panic defense. Both of these defense strategies argue that the murderer became so enraged after the “discovery” of either genitalia or someone’s sexuality they were forced to protect themselves from the threat of queerness. Estanislao Martinez of Fresno, California, used the trans- panic defense and received a four- year prison sentence after admittedly stabbing J. Robles, a Latina transwoman, at least twenty times with a pair of scissors. Importantly, this defense is often used, as in the cases of Robles and Paige, after the murderer has engaged in some kind of sex with the victim. The logic of the trans- panic defense as an explanation for overkill, in its gory semiotics, offers us a way of understanding queers as the nothing of Mbembe’s query. Overkill names the technologies necessary to do away with that which is already gone. Queers then are the specters of life whose threat is so unimaginable that one is “forced,” not simply to murder, but to push them backward out of time, out of History, and into that which comes before.27 In thinking the overkill of Paige and Brazell, I return to Mbembe’s query, “But what does it mean to do violence to what is nothing?”28 This question in its elegant brutality repeats with each case I offer. By resituating this question in the positive, the “something” that is more often than not translated as the human is made to appear. Of interest here, the category of the human assumes generality, yet can only be activated through the specificity of historical and politically located intersections. To this end, the human, the “something” of this query, within the context of the liberal democracy, names rights- bearing subjects, or those who can stand as subjects before the law. The human, then, makes the nothing not only possible but necessary. Following this logic, the work of death, of the death that is already nothing, not quite human, binds the categorical (mis)recognition of humanity. The human, then, resides in the space of life and under the domain of rights, whereas the queer inhabits the place of compromised personhood and the zone of death. As perpetual and axiomatic threat to the human, the queer is the negated double of the subject of liberal democracy. Understanding the nothing as the unavoidable shadow of the human serves to counter the arguments that suggest overkill and antiqueer violence at large are a pathological break and that the severe nature of these killings signals something extreme. In contrast, overkill is precisely not outside of, but is that which constitutes liberal democracy as such. Overkill then is the proper expression to the riddle of the queer nothingness. Put another way, the spectacular material- semiotics of overkill should not be read as (only) individual pathology; these vicious acts must indict the very social worlds of which they are ambassadors. Overkill is what it means, what it must mean, to do violence to what is nothing.