

“I Don’t Know, Okay, I Guess, No... Wait... Oh, That Feels Good...
Stop! Rape!”

By Chris Abbott

What happens to a world when morals, ethics and social standards are changing so fast the human mind can’t possibly keep pace? You have a world in which two belief systems on either end of the common logic spectrum exist, simultaneously: Sharia Law in the Middle East and “The Five Second Rule,” in the West. Mirror opposites of each other, they are equally absurd.

Here is Sharia Law on what is to be done if a woman is raped: “[If a women] gets raped, she is considered guilty of adultery unless she can provide four adult muslim male witnesses who had watched the action and who would testify that the sex was actually forced on her and that she was not a willing partner in it. If she has only female witnesses, in case she was raped by an intruder in front of her fellow wives and slave girls or in a women’s dormitory full of women witnesses, then she is out of luck. Her punishment is stoning to death if she is married or a hundred (100) lashes if single.” Ahmet, Ayesha, *“Women Are Responsible For Rapes,”* www.islamreview.com

Now Western Civilization’s take on the same subject: “On April 16, 2008, the Maryland Court of Appeals, the highest court in the state, ruled that a woman may withdraw consent for vaginal intercourse after penetration has occurred. After consent has been withdrawn, the continuation of vaginal intercourse by force or threat of force may constitute rape. The ruling caused a news sensation because the defendant, Maouloud Baby, was convicted of first degree rape and related charges after his female victim testified that he ‘continued to have sex with her for five or ten seconds after she asked him to stop.’” Huff, Mary, *“The ‘New’ Withdrawal Of Consent Standard in Maryland Rape Law: A Year After Baby V. State,”* www.wcl.american.edu. [Washington College of Law website]

Five or ten seconds is the difference between consensual sex and a “felony punishable ... by a term of imprisonment in a county jail for 16 months, or two or three years.” California Penal Code § 1170 subd. (h). Maouloud Baby, fifteen-years-old, was sentenced to fifteen years in prison, even though he disengaged in five seconds, after which they went to MacDonald’s together and she gave him her phone number before they parted company.

If pressed to choose which is worse, I'd have to pick Sharia Law which stones to death its victims. But in our new, enlightened view of sexuality, in California, at least, a woman can file rape charges against a man with whom she had consented to have sex, whom she had allowed to penetrate her vagina, and then, changing her mind, make vulnerable to a potential three year prison sentence. And he's got five seconds to get the blood back to his brain, comprehend what she's saying, stop what he's doing and make sure he's got it all timed, because thanks to the legislature micromanaging our sex lives, he'd better have proof he beat the five second rule.

I would never say that just because a man buys a woman a hamburger and a coke, she owes him sex. I believe even married women are entitled to a "Not tonight, dear." And I don't believe that men are such uncivilized brutes that, once the amygdala has turned the sex switch on, they can't possibly stop themselves for the next ten or twenty minutes until they ejaculate and "Whew," — what happened to me? Contrary to long-held myth, men can stop. But here's a question that I'm sure will be seen as politically incorrect: if a woman has invited a man into her vagina, why should he have to stop? How does he know, in fact, if she's serious or it's just part of the "oh-baby" sex talk, and beyond all that, why has she invited him into her bedroom, much less into her body, if she didn't want him there?

What bothers me most about this new think, is that it makes women look like children — or idiots. How can we possibly know our own minds until a man has already penetrated us and then, when we finally realize we don't want it, if he doesn't get his randy member out of there in five seconds, the police better come and arrest him because, after all, we said "no!" It makes a joke out of what is, in truth, a horrific problem: real rape. I use the term "real rape" purposely, because you need only to read an article or two about how brutally women are raped and beaten to understand that the "five second" rule trivializes what has happened to them. We all know exactly what rape is. Along with the victim, we feel violated and hurt and abused by what has happened to her. And I think we all know what rape isn't: "Oh, sure, we can have sex, wait, no, *five seconds, buddy!*"

Honestly, I can't begin to understand why a girl would think she could crawl into bed with her friend, who's a boy, either clothed or unclothed, and think he's not going to take that as a signal to have sex. But I can, somewhat reluctantly, agree to prosecuting it if, when he made the advances, she said "no" and got up and slept somewhere else. But saying "yes" and then saying "no," and calling that rape, is the kind of doublespeak a seriously unhealthy society uses. By trying, however nobly, to ensure that everyone who feels violated is heard, we're drowning out the voices of those who have had truly monstrous acts committed against them.

Here's what I would like for us to say to our sisters and our daughters: don't go anywhere with a man you don't know; don't go out nights alone; don't get drunk or stoned and expect those around you to treat you well; don't say "yes," just because you don't want to hurt some guy's feelings or be thought uncool by your oh-so-hip peers; and don't accuse anyone of rape when you opened the door and let him in and said "yes."