

The New Definition Of Rape

By *Alexander Baron* - Nov 6, 2015



44
SHARES

In case you hadn't noticed, we are constantly being bombarded by propaganda about rape on both sides of the Atlantic. This propaganda emanates from many sources, but the two major ones are radical feminist activists and dedicated groups of women who work with rape victims – real victims and fake ones. This latter group are concerned not only with assisting victims but with reforming rape laws – read abolishing due process.

It should be stressed there is nothing ignoble about helping victims nor with seeking to reduce crimes of violence, but any good cause **can become tainted**, and this is what has happened here. There are many lies about rape but the statistics that are sprayed around like confetti at a mass wedding are a wonder to behold. **Laura Bates** is one person who is

fond of spouting the nonsense that there are 85,000 rapes every year in the UK. Another oft' repeated statistic is that the conviction rate for rape is only 6%.

Instead of facing up to the reality that rape is not a vastly under-reported crime and that many, many allegations are false, the UK authorities have decided that the conviction rate needs to be increased, so rape is being subtly redefined. Under the *Sexual Offences Act* 2003, forced oral sex is charged as rape; this is to be welcomed as it is surely no less unpleasant for the victim, but there are now attempts to redefine what is meant by consent.

In this connection the BBC has recently produced a documentary called *Is This Rape? Sex On Trial*. This entailed taking a mixed group of student-types, isolating them from the world and showing them a short dramatisation in three parts: simulated sex then two courtroom scenes. Their task was to answer the question, was what they saw rape?

The scene was the aftermath of a party, when the male, who was very drunk, asked if he could stay over. He ended up sharing a bed with the female. The two had had a previous relationship, although there was a difference of opinion as to what this was. Although the girl had been drinking, she was nowhere near as drunk as him, and wanted to sleep. He on the other hand wanted sex, made advances to her, which she ignored, then there was a scene of oral sex – heavily redacted, of course.

Two weeks later, she phoned the police, and he ended up being tried for rape.

Although this was presented as an honest discussion, it was anything but. The girl was clearly awake when the act was performed, but we were not shown her reaction. As one of the more perceptive of the group – a male – said, that rather than rape it was a horrible case of miscommunication, making the obvious observation that if he had a guy putting “his dick in my mouth” he’d make his lack of consent clear in no uncertain terms.

This was a point made by Jim Davidson in his book *No Further Action*. Davidson faced a plethora of allegations, every single one of them untrue; two women accused him of oral rape, one in totally surreal circumstances. Both women claimed to have bit him, and as he

pointed out, it is not a good idea for a man to put his penis in a woman's mouth without her consent because of what she might do. True, a woman who has a knife at her throat or a gun to her head will probably acquiesce, but this was not one of those circumstances.

The consensus was eventually that an act of rape had been committed; certainly this was a sordid act, but there is little doubt that although as one of the group said, this guy saw an opportunity and took it, there is little doubt either that in his mind he considered her to have consented. It was suggested that the girl was frozen in fear, but frankly that doesn't wash, nor does the confusion of consent with desire.

At this point the rad-fem mantra "teach men not to rape" will doubtless be heard, but women should likewise be taught to say no, because to paraphrase Warren Farrell, men can't hear what women don't say.

We are now heading into dangerous territory, in the absence of special circumstances, why should a jury or even the police credit a woman who waits two weeks to report an alleged rape? The other factor here is alcohol. Most of the noise about **rape culture** emanates from the campus, and for good reason, universities are traditionally hotbeds of promiscuity, alcohol and often drugs are seldom far away, both lower inhibitions, both sexes can end up doing things they regret, and with young women being brainwashed into believing they've been raped if they regret having sex the morning, the week or the year after, it is hardly surprising that allegations of rape are exploding.

The reason the conviction rate is so low is because when juries hear the evidence, they refuse to convict, and in many cases this is hardly surprising. So what is to be done? Feminist propaganda aside, it would be much better for all concerned if women didn't falsely accuse men of rape, and if men didn't misread the signals.

The ludicrous **affirmative consent law** is not the answer, and neither is the continual erosion of due process in rape cases. It is notable that both misunderstandings and rapes of this nature occur largely in the under 25s, certainly the under 30s, so it may be that in spite of its obvious propaganda content this offering by the BBC has some merit.

This opinion article was written by an independent writer. The opinions and views expressed herein are those of the author and are not necessarily intended to reflect those of TheLatestNews.com

44
SHARES

Articles From Around The Web



Alexander Baron

<http://www.infotextmanuscripts.org>