In much of the world it is a crime to expose another person to HIV or to transmit it, especially through sex. Fundamentally unjust, morally harmful, and virtually impossible to enforce with any semblance of fairness, such laws impose regimes of surveillance and punishment on sexually active people living with HIV, not only in their intimate relations and reproductive and maternal lives, but also in their attempts to earn a living.

Proponents of criminalisation often claim that they are promoting public health or morality. Some may even harbour good-hearted, if wrongheaded, intentions, of safeguarding the rights and health of women. But criminalisation guarantees no one’s well-being. There is no evidence that laws regulating the sexual conduct of people living with HIV change behaviour in a positive way. Nor do such laws take into account the success of antiretroviral treatment (ART) in significantly reducing transmission risk and improving the quality of life and longevity for people with HIV.

AIDS service organisations report that the threat of prosecution neither empowers people living with HIV to avoid transmission nor motivates them to protect themselves. Indeed, the fear of prosecution isolates them and discourages them from getting tested, participating in prevention or treatment programmes or disclosing their status to partners. The criminal justice system fights the health care system—one repelling, the other reaching out to people vulnerable to or affected by HIV. By dividing populations into the sick and the healthy or the guilty and the innocent, criminalisation denies the complex social nature of sexual communities and fractures the shared sense of moral responsibility that is crucial to fighting the epidemic.

Some jurisdictions apply existing general offences to criminalise HIV exposure or transmission—from “administration of a noxious substance” (France) to attempted homicide (United States). Others have chosen to target HIV: the first HIV-specific laws were passed in the United States in 1987, with many other nations quickly following...
Criminalising HIV transmission and exposure: HIV-specific laws and HIV-specific provisions in laws in select regions

- **laws criminalising HIV transmission and exposure**
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The past decade has seen a new wave of HIV-specific statutes, notably in sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Asia and Latin America. The past decade has seen a new wave of HIV-specific statutes, notably in sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Asia and Latin America. The past decade has seen a new wave of HIV-specific statutes, notably in sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Asia and Latin America. Today, countries and jurisdictions in every region of the world have promulgated HIV-specific criminal statutes. They’re on the books in 37 of the 50 United States; in Africa, 27 countries have them; in Asia and the Pacific, 13; Latin America, 11; and Europe, 9. According to a 2010 report by the Global Network of People Living with HIV (GNP+), at least 600 people living with HIV in 24 countries have been convicted under HIV-specific or general criminal laws, with the greatest numbers reported in North America.

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

In Africa alone over the last seven years, numerous countries have adopted HIV-specific criminal legislation. In every case, the irony is glaring: these laws, which purport to be based on human rights principles, in fact trample human rights. This continent-wide contradiction derives largely from the Model Law on STI/HIV/AIDS for West and Central Africa, developed at a workshop held in N'Djamena, Chad, in 2004. This template, conceived as human rights legislation to combat discrimination and address HIV testing, takes a “rights and responsibilities” approach. For instance, it includes guarantees of pre- and post-testing counseling and anti-discrimination protections in employment and insurance for HIV-positive people. At the same time, it holds HIV-positive people legally responsible for disclosing their HIV status to anyone they have sex with and taking active measures to prevent transmission. Failure to do so brings criminal sanctions.

Some jurisdictions punish exposure even if there is no transmission of HIV, and some punish transmission even if the person wears a condom; prosecutions proceed in spite of the medical near-impossibility of determining who infected whom. And, because ART significantly reduces the likelihood of transmission, it is access to treatment, not criminalisation, that is effective in reducing infection.

WHAT GETS PROSECUTED . . .

The main “criminal activity” for people who are HIV-positive is sex, and the laws can be overly broad and the penalties draconian. For instance, Bermuda makes it a crime for people living with HIV to have any kind of sexual contact in which body fluids might pass to another person. As a consequence, two people have received ten-year sentences, though HIV was not transmitted in either case. In Singapore, those who merely have reason to believe that they may be HIV-positive or might have been exposed to significant risk of contracting the virus face ten years’ imprisonment if convicted of having sex without informing their partner of the possible risk or taking reasonable precautions against transmission.

But sex is not the only “crime” for which HIV-positive people may be punished. Spitting and biting have been prosecuted. Advocates worry that simply being pregnant or breastfeeding with HIV could land a woman in prison. In many penal codes these laws are extraordinary for the personal surveillance they represent and the wildly disproportionate sentences they carry.

. . . AND WHO

In 2008 in Texas, United States, an African-American mentally ill homeless man living with HIV spat at a police officer during an arrest for drunk and disorderly conduct. The jury was persuaded that his saliva was a deadly weapon, and he got a thirty-five-
year sentence—despite the fact that HIV cannot be transmitted by spitting. In 1998 an HIV-positive Minnesota prisoner was convicted of biting two prison guards: His mouth and teeth were found to be a “deadly and dangerous weapon”.

In Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom, migrants and asylum seekers have been disproportionately represented among those prosecuted for HIV transmission and exposure. In some jurisdictions, HIV-positive people convicted of a crime, such as rape, can face an exacerbated sentence—positive serostatus is viewed as an aggravating factor, akin to using a weapon in the crime’s commission.

As these last examples suggest, anti-transmission and exposure laws are often arbitrarily and disproportionately applied to those who are already considered inherently criminal—both reflecting and perpetuating existing social inequalities.

Sensational media coverage of HIV-transmission prosecutions exaggerates the alleged evil and dangerousness of HIV “perpetrators. Sarah Jane Porter, a forty-three-year-old British single mother and hair salon receptionist, was convicted in 2006 and sentenced to thirty months for grievous bodily harm in transmitting HIV to her former boyfriend. The press portrayed her as a wildly promiscuous “AIDS avenger” on a rampage against black men like her son’s father, from whom she had contracted HIV. The police, claiming she had dozens of potential victims, put out a nationwide call for accusers and three of the four they contacted tested negative for HIV. While describing Porter as “callous” and “manipulative”, the prosecution praised her accusers as “very articulate professional decent men who were trying to do their best in life”. Porter’s friends and neighbours, meanwhile, described a quiet, overworked mother whose boyfriend had asked for unprotected sex and whose only “crime” was her denial of her own HIV status—the reason she did not disclose it to others.

Although proponents often argue that criminalisation is needed to protect women, especially monogamous wives, from the risk of HIV infection by male sexual partners, in reality such laws make criminals of the same women they’re intended to protect. HIV-positive mothers are criminals under all of the HIV laws of West and Central Africa, which explicitly or implicitly forbid them from being pregnant or breastfeeding, lest they transmit the virus to foetus or child. The law does not acknowledge that women are frequently unable to disclose their HIV status or demand the use of a condom because they fear violence, abuse or abandonment by their husbands or partners and/or are worried that information might be used as a tool for revenge or coercion. As for alleging the intentional transmission of HIV from a mother to a child, the concept is so unlikely as to approach absurdity.

“The impact of HIV criminalisation on people living with HIV is ultimately destructive and divisive, creating a sense that there are ‘good’ HIV-positive people versus ‘bad’ HIV-positive people. The people who complain to the police, supported by the criminal justice system, believe that they should be warned when their sexual partner is HIV-positive. Never mind the incredible difficulties we might have disclosing this very sensitive information to people who we don’t trust; the deep denial we often face earlier on in our diagnosis; the difficulties we have negotiating or using condoms; or the fact that those of us on effective treatment are going to be far less infectious than people who are undiagnosed and who couldn’t possibly warn their partner”.

Edwin J. Bernard, Germany, High Income Countries Dialogue, 16-17 September 2011
IS CRIMINALISATION EVER JUSTIFIED?

Criminalisation is justified under one condition only: where individuals maliciously and intentionally transmit or expose others with the express purpose of causing harm. But existing laws—against assault, homicide and causing bodily harm, or allowing intervention where a person is spreading communicable diseases—suffice to prosecute people in those exceptional cases. Defining specific HIV offences is not warranted and, in fact, violates international human rights standards. For instance, in the International Guidelines on HIV and Human Rights, Guideline 4 directs States to ensure that their criminal laws "are not misused in the context of HIV/AIDS or targeted against vulnerable groups".

That said, such laws are virtually impossible to prosecute. Intentional transmission is difficult to prove in the context of consensual sex. Alleging “recklessness” or “negligent” transmission is equally problematic. It requires proving the defendant’s state of mind—getting testimony from health care professionals, diaries or emails offering insight into a defendant’s thoughts. UNAIDS and UNDP have called on governments to limit criminalisation to cases where a person knows his or her HIV-positive status, acts with intent to transmit HIV and actually transmits it. However, most Western legal systems allow the defence of consent, thus preventing the punishment of, for example, Roman Catholic husbands with HIV whose wives have consented to the risk of transmission rather than offend against religious proscriptions concerning non-procreative sex.

Myriad other considerations arise. Did the defendant know her HIV status? Did she know how HIV is transmitted? Did she think her partner already was aware of her status or consented to unsafe sex? Was the defendant under threat of violence from the complainant and thus unable to disclose her status or practice safer sex? Was it actually the defendant who transmitted HIV to the complainant? Phylogenetic analysis, which can establish whether the sub-type of HIV in the defendant’s body is the same as in the complainant’s, is far too costly for many low-resource countries. Additionally, it doesn’t offer incontrovertible proof of who infected whom.

DIFFERENT QUESTIONS, DIFFERENT LAWS

International bodies and national governments are starting to recognise the injustice of sprawling HIV criminalisation laws and amend them so as to zero in on intentional, malicious acts.

---

"Phylogenetic analysis examines small genetic differences in HIV. Unlike human DNA, which remains stable for a lifetime, HIV's RNA changes very rapidly, leading to a huge amount of genetic diversity. Phylogenetic analysis can only determine the degree of relatedness of two samples of HIV. It cannot create a definitive match."
UNAIDS issued recommendations that include alternative ways of phrasing some provisions in the N’Djamena model law to make them more precise. In the past few years Guinea, Togo and Senegal have revised their HIV-related legislation or adopted new laws that restrict the use of criminal law to the exceptional cases of intentional transmission. The Finnish Expert Group on HIV has also recently initiated efforts to change the law to avoid policies that reinforce HIV-related stigma and discrimination. Denmark and Norway are considering revision or repeal. In 2011, Guyana’s Parliamentary Select Committee rejected a bill calling for the criminalisation of HIV. And Mauritius revoked criminalisation of HIV transmission.

Arresting HIV-positive people for seeking pleasure and intimacy is a defeatist and cynical response to the failure of nations to confront the epidemic. The sad case of Sarah Jane Porter (see discussion earlier in the chapter) raises many questions not even approached by the criminalisation response to HIV. Was her son’s father aware of his HIV status and, if so, why did he persuade her to have unprotected sex and why did she consent? Why did she deny her illness and shy away from treatment? Why was she passive in defending herself in court? How can women—and men—be empowered to take care of themselves and others?
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Phylogenetic analysis examines small differences in HIV's genes using computational methods to calculate the genetic distance between strains. Unlike human DNA, which remains stable for a lifetime, HIV's RNA changes very rapidly, leading to a huge amount of genetic diversity. This diversity means that scientists, using phylogenetic analysis, have been able to ascertain where HIV...
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