Lessons from the Paula Jones Case

April 15, 1998

Google Ads are provided by Google and are not selected or endorsed by Eagle Forum

We may never get satisfactory legal answers, or even political answers, to the many questions raised by the Clinton sex scandals. But we are learning some social and cultural lessons, and they are not pretty.

The dismissal of the Paula Jones case doesn't prove that Clinton is innocent of the alleged actions. It certainly doesn't prove that he is telling the truth. To believe Clinton, it would be necessary to believe that all those other women (who don't know each other) are lying.

The Paula Jones case succeeded in pulling the mask off of Clinton's secret lifestyle. He's a lecher who feeds his lust with young, low-level, powerless and vulnerable women, who uses government employees to facilitate his encounters, who makes the taxpayers support his castoffs, and who threatens, trashes or humiliates those who don't keep their mouths shut.

The women who talk or complain are put in their place by epithets such as "trailer trash," "tabloid tramp," or "that woman." He has the arrogance to think he can get by with this pattern of behavior because he is powerful and charming!

This is not a man who treats women as equals. This is a man who uses women as things to grab, grope, and discard.

The biggest lesson we learn from all this is to beware of men who talk about "women's rights" and boast that they are male feminists. They are usually men who exploit women on a personal level, and their exploitation of the targets of their lust is exceeded only by their shabby treatment of their wives.

There are several reasons why adulterous politicians hide behind advocacy of "women's rights." Sometimes conspicuous posturing about "women's rights" is a ploy to cover their promiscuous behavior. Sometimes it's a psychological subterfuge to pretend that their mistreatment of women is really a societal,

or inherently male, problem rather than a personal sin.

They learned the latter from the feminist movement. One of the major techniques used by the radical feminists to build their numbers is the consciousness-raising session, wherein those who attend are taught that their personal problems are really societal problems that demand legislative solutions.

The exemplars of this breed of male feminists are obvious. The most prominent Democratic advocates of "women's rights" and unlimited abortion are Bill Clinton and Ted Kennedy. The most prominent Republican advocate was Bob Packwood.

If the president of a corporation were accused of what Clinton is alleged to have done to Paula or Monica or Kathleen, he would be gone before you can say Independent Prosecutor. It is unlikely he would get by with claiming that his behavior was, as Judge Susan Webber Wright wrote in her decision, "a mere sexual proposition or encounter."

It's obvious why most public opinion polls show that higher percentages of men than women support abortion and are the pin-up boys of NARAL and NOW. The lifestyle of promiscuous men demands a way to kill off the evidence.

During the question period after one of my debates at a California university, a male student explained this explicitly. "We have to have abortion available so I can enjoy the pleasure and intimacy of sexual intercourse."

It comforts the conscience of the promiscuous man to mouth the mantra that abortion is a woman's "choice." After having invaded a woman's body, it gets the man off the hook to recite the slogan that a woman should be able to do what she wants with her own body.

If he wants to be generous, he can give her $300 to exercise her "choice." The men who preach "women's rights" even support late-term abortions and the gruesome procedure called partial-birth abortion.

The whole country is laughing about the double standards of the feminists who have promoted the aggressive use of the judicial invention of sexual harassment, and now find their hero impaled on its sword. But even worse than the forfeiture of their sexual harassment weapon against CEOs is the

humiliation of their icon, Hillary Rodham Clinton, and the destruction of her image as a New Kind of First Lady, the role-model of a Working Wife with an Independent Career.

When Hillary Rodham Clinton saved her husband from political oblivion in that famous CBS "60 Minutes" interview in 1992, she looked into the camera and said: "I'm not some little woman standing by my man like Tammy Wynette." She insulted country music fans in order to telegraph her message to the political feminists to stay the course because she could be counted on to advance their agenda.

Now, it is clear that Hillary is exactly what she said she wasn't: the little woman who stands by Gennifer's and Monica's man and pretends not to see her husband's gross misbehavior.

The rest of us don't have to pretend. Bill Clinton is a national embarrassment.