

The Judge's Decision is Outrageous

Judge Susan Webber Wright declared that IF Clinton did what Paula Jones described---that is, he grabbed her, touching her body and pulling her up to his body; when she pushed him away and went across the room to a chair, he followed her and sitting down by her, dropped his trousers in an aroused state with his penis swollen, distended and turgid as he masturbated himself while asking her to suck his penis---this was merely "boorish and offensive" and did not rise to the level of criminal sexual assault.

That is astonishing. If grabbing her and pulling her body to his is NOT an assault, what is it? It is NOT a request. It is NOT welcomed. It is NOT appropriate in a non-consensual situation and is totally inappropriate in the workplace between a powerful employer and a powerless employee.

Clinton exposed his aroused penis to Paula Jones as he masturbated himself while asking her to "kiss" his distended organ. What right does he have to assault her sensibilities? How dare a judge dismiss this as merely boorish?

The first definition of assault is, "a violent attack either PHYSICAL or VERBAL." Clinton's behavior toward Paula Jones in the hotel room at the hotel which was a "workplace assignment" for Jones includes both PHYSICAL (he grabbed her without any consent and thrust his body up against hers--AND compelled her to see something sexually physical---his swollen, distended, erect penis--and to watch something physically offensive---fondling and masturbating his own distended penis in front of her) and VERBAL (as he coaxed her to suck his sexually aroused penis.)

What kind of human being is Judge Susan Webber Wright that she does NOT regard this kind of behavior as an assault on an unwilling victim anywhere, let alone the workplace?

This behavior is a visual assault, an attack on human sensibilities. Why does anyone, including Bill Clinton, have the right to force someone to endure even one second of this type of sexual bullying?

Doesn't Judge Susan Webber Wright have a dictionary? Can't she see "boorish" is merely rudeness, being ill-mannered? Clinton's behavior AS DESCRIBED by the judge is by no means merely rude and ill-mannered. The word, "offensive" is slightly more appropriate since it means--in part--something unpleasant (an understatement in this situation) to the senses, something disgusting and repugnant.

So, we can agree that Clinton's visual sexual assault was disgusting and repugnant to the senses and violated another human being's personal privacy about her own body and to what she chose to expose her senses. Clinton gave her NO CHOICE. He grabbed her body without any opportunity for her to make a choice and pulled her body forcibly to his body. He had no right to touch her in any such manner.

(The Judge's Decision...)

-2-

Answer this: if Bill Clinton had done exactly the same thing as described by Judge Webber Wright (who said IF this description was accurate, it was merely boorish and offensive but did NOT rise to the level of a criminal sexual assault) to a young girl under 18 or to a child, say--12 or 13 years old, would the judge dismiss this exact same behavior as merely boorish and offensive? I think not.

If this same sort of physical touching---pulling one's body without consent to another person's body, exposing an aroused penis which the person is compelled to watch the offender masturbate while coaxing the individual to suck the penis---was done to a child, the judge would not have any hesitation in labelling such behavior molestation and criminal sexual assault against a minor.

Why is it that an adult woman cannot have the same right under the law? Why can any employer anywhere use a workplace assignment to take advantage of an employee, placing them in this kind of brutal dynamic---suffer in silence and fear that repercussions may follow or bring charges from a position of powerlessness against a person who had all the forces of power on his side.

Having a state trooper bring this young woman to a hotel room while she was acting as a state employee in this hotel was an abuse of power which Judge Webber Wright apparently totally ignores. The state trooper was being misused. Jones as a state employee was being abused to be placed in such a vulnerable circumstance.

If this bullying behavior is not "harassment" because it was not repeated, it was certainly an outrageous assault to which no one should be subjected. It was sexual from beginning to end---thoroughly repugnant. It contained elements of unwanted touching--without any chance to deflect the behavior, Clinton physically grabbed her and pulled--against her will--her body to his body--for how many seconds it does NOT matter. It is force.

Other than forcible entry of Paula's vagina with Bill Clinton's turgid penis, that is, other than forcible rape fully completed, how could his behavior have been any more outrageous than it actually was as described?? Yet this very behavior is fluffed off by the judge as only "boorish" and "offensive". Apparently it is all right with the judge if powerful men in the workplace behave in a "boorish and offensive" manner to female employees.

If the behavior attributed to Bill Clinton against Paula Jones does NOT exceed all bounds of decency, then what does, other than forcible rape? What Clinton did in that hotel room certainly exceeded all bounds of decency by people who have any moral sensibilities about decency. It was very offensive and deeply shocking. Why wouldn't it be to any decent person? Such behavior does great wrong to another. It injures a person to the core of his existence. It is a violation of another person's life experience. It is a bullying, degrading form of humiliation to be treated in such a calloused disregard to all inner dignity. THERE WAS NO CHOICE ALLOWED. It was a form of criminal sexual assault. It should make your blood boil to think of the arrogance that initiated this assault against Paula Jones.