

NOTE: This piece took its inspiration from some remarks by Attorney Gary Spence (defender of Randy Weaver) during a TV interview. If I recall, Spence was commenting on some remarks by a Washington Columnist who accused the "First Person" of being a liar. An outraged "Prez" indicated a desire to punch the newspaper type in the nose over the remark. Gary's remarks (in summary) said that Hillary was a very powerful person and should be given "her due!" My point here is that Hillary *shouldn't* be a very powerful person unless she's using an *inferior deodorant* or is *lifting weights* for entertainment. She **definitely** should not be a powerful person just because her husband is the President... in fact (in my opinion) **no one** should be able to glean power from their spouse's elected position. See if you agree...



Two For The Price Of One??

By "The Master Joustler"

End notes are indicated in (red)

Do you enjoy getting something for nothing? Sure sounds good, doesn't it? But... my dear ol' Daddy told me when I was a kid, "Junior," he sez, "never forget, there ain't nothing in this life for free!" In the light of these many years, do you know what I've found? He was absolutely *right!* What brought his words of wisdom to mind? Actually, they came back to me as I was watching the Headline News on CNN(1) this evening. "Slick Willie" was defending his wife's *White Water* activities to the "press persons" during a news conference. Now I have no heartburn with a man defending his wife's actions. When I was a youngster this would have been the gentlemanly thing to do. Following his performance, the news analysts' reminded us that a "campaigning Clinton" promised the American Public if they elected him, they would be getting "two for one". This was a reference to Bill's promise that if he was elected to the Office of President, we (the American People) could look forward to getting the services of old "*Elephant Ankles*"(2) thrown in as a "freebie"! Better we should have gotten a sharp stick in the eye.

Why the diatribe against this obvious paragon of virtue? Let me make it clear that this isn't a treatise on the guilt or innocence of the current First Lady(?). My hate and discontent has to do with what has become of the dual nature of the Presidency. I don't know about any of the rest of you, but when I elect an individual to office, I am electing that person and **only** that

person... I am not electing their spouse!! Kindly note here that I am not singling out male or female public servants here. My sole objection is *“the other half”* being involved in matters that do not concern them (other than as the wife or husband of a public official).

This “husband and wife team” concept of the Presidency is a relatively recent plague. I’m reasonably sure Martha Washington didn’t burden “George Baby” with her activities in *“Potomac Gate”* or travel to France making speeches demanding the dissolution of the French Monarchy, but then things were different in those days I suppose... No, our first taste of “free” assistance by a First Lady historically goes to Franklin Roosevelt’s missus, ELEANOR. If the “NOW”(3) movement is to be believed, Eleanor was a great heroine (or hero if you want to keep it ‘genderless’). Her constant presence in the Pacific Theater was a great comfort to our wounded servicemen, especially the Marines. Well, sort of anyway...

Assuming her overwhelming beauty and seductive charm would cheer up wounded GIs, Eleanor made trips all over the globe as the President’s representative. For all of you youngsters out there, let me assure you that the last thing a wounded Soldier, Sailor or Marine wanted to see was the leering face of a gal who could eat corn off the cob through a picket fence. Betty Grable, *maybe*... But Eleanor? ... I don’t think so!... The President’s Lady made no secret of her distaste for the U. S. Marines(4) and the feeling was returned in spades. That attitude along with an unspoken elitist paternalism did nothing for her popularity among our warriors of WWII. As a young lad growing up as a Marine junior, I remember that ol’ Eleanor was considered to be something of a joke. The problem is that she became a rallying point for later meddling “significant others” of our Chief Executives. Now I can understand her being bored since Franklin apparently had a mistress, and she (Eleanor) was (summoning all of my diplomacy) “double ugly”, but I sure wish she’d taken up quilt-making! There’s not a single thing she did that wouldn’t have gotten done in a superior manner by someone else... and we wouldn’t have wound up with a **terrible** precedent.

Bess Truman was there for Harry, and we all knew she was there. She was a great addition to the decor of White House, and bless her “pea picking lil’ heart” she stayed the hell out of politics! Mamie Eisenhower was also appropriate decoration for the Presidential Mansion but had the good sense to stay out of governmental affairs. Mrs. Kennedy was a marvelous hostess for JFK (a little *mercenary* perhaps, but then no one’s perfect..?) and accompanied him on many trips... and she too avoided dabbling in pure politics. JFK’s major malfunction was the appointment of his brother to the post of Attorney General (an appointment some of the “conspiracy crowd” feel contributed to his demise in Dallas a few years later). Nepotism(5) in Cabinet Post appointments rates right up there with “spouse meddling” in Presidential behavior .

“Lady Bird” Johnson did a great job of keeping Lyndon’s Beagles fed and being a good momma to Lucy and Linda... even let one of ‘em marry a Marine Captain. If she’d been a little more selective however, we wouldn’t be putting up with the likes of Charley Robb on the political scene... all else considered however, it did get him out of my beloved Corps! Perhaps the Almighty **does** take a hand occasionally!

Betty Ford and Pat Nixon personified the term “Lady” and were a credit to the Presidency, whatever you might think of their husbands. Jimmy (‘the Wimp’) Carter had a few weird relatives, but the ‘spousal contributions’ were mercifully minimal (however “Roz” certainly couldn’t have done any worse than the “Hero of Tehran”!).

Nancy Regan is rumored to have often consulted psychics and astrologers, passing her findings on to her husband. We'll never know if her private idiosyncrasies unduly influenced Ronnie... but if there **was** a cause and effect relationship, perhaps we should have her psychic's telephone number permanently mounted on a brass plaque next to the White House telephone...

Barbara Bush can hardly be faulted for being a faithful and loving wife even if her husband turned out to be a "pseudo-conservative" with "One World" tendencies.

Finally we come to our current President and her husband... Hillary seems to think it is her personal duty to project feminism during what she surely regards as her 'Presidential term'. She basks in reflected glory whenever she is compared to Eleanor Roosevelt. She considers it her personal 'holy grail' to right all wrongs and slights done to the more gentle sex over the last several thousand years... And she uses her husband's office (and our funds) to advance her agenda.(6) Hillary is physically more attractive than Eleanor, but we're talking **relative** beauty... and Eleanor wasn't a crook and a liar! Misguided and meddling perhaps, but not a crook and a liar. That's not to say Hillary is, but then..? Much more to the point, she's got her fingers into the entire Presidential Pie, and makes no bones about it. She went to China and openly took on the Chinese Government's policy toward women. She goes out at the President's behest and tests the waters of any left wing or social issue of the day to see what the public outcry will be (the President can then distance himself from the issue if it appears too sticky), Perhaps some of these things need to be done, but not by some crusading spouse using the elected office of the 'other half' as a soapbox. I didn't elect her and if she screws up, I have no legal way of removing her from the office she is abusing. She cannot be impeached, and the President's legal counsel is already talking about the 'Clinton's' using Executive Privilege with regards to any legal ramifications of the "White Water" scandal (I'm not too sure how she gets to take advantage of such, but then she **is** the President, is she not?). Folks, we are now getting into waters our Founding Fathers could not have foreseen. The question is, what can we do to remedy the situation?

Well, first off, I'd pass a law prohibiting the spouse of any elected official from becoming involved in any governmental functions or processes that were not strictly ceremonial in nature (balls, inaugurations, official dinners, etc.). I didn't elect 'em, and I sure don't want them representing me in any capacity, official or otherwise. I would also pass a law prohibiting the appointment of any immediate family member to any governmental post or job... no brothers, no sisters, no wives, no husbands, no fathers or mothers, continuing out I'd say, to at least first cousins. Sorta' like... "employees and family members of the '*Crumbled Grain Cereal Company*' are not eligible to participate in this contest" type of thing. Now if any of these family members are elected to office on their own merits, that's a different ball game. Why not? It's a free country and sometimes there ain't any accounting for peoples taste... but here we're talking elected family members, not appointed! Until we pass such laws, we seem to be stuck with the whims of our elected Chief Executive. If the "Prez's" predilection would be to turn over some (or all?) of his or her authority(7) to a "First Spouse" with an agenda not to the liking of the electorate, it'd be a loooong four years until we could turn the scoundrel out at the polls. Where the heck is Martha Washington?

ROC '96

Disclaimer: As I said above, this treatise is in no way meant to be sexist. First Ladies have gotten the 'heat' here for the simple reason that so far we haven't had any lady Presidents. I would vote for a lady President in a 'heartbeat' if the right one came along. While the thought of getting some "dingbat" like Bella Abzug, Diane Feinstein (Fineswine?) or Pat Schroeder, makes my blood run cold, I'd definitely vote for a lady like Helen Chenoweth (R-Idaho) or (if she were involved in U.S. Politics) someone like Maggie Thatcher (I never heard of *Mister* Thatcher even mentioned in British Politics). Lord knows we've elected plenty of male dingbats... my gentle nature prevents me from giving the most recent 'non-inhaling' example.

(End Notes for "Two for the Price of One"?)

(1) CNN in the Northwest is better known as "*The Communist News Network*".

(2) A term of endearment often used to identify Hillary Rodham Clinton.

(3) NOW is the National Organization for Women, a somewhat militant group of stalwart crusaders bent (among other things) on convincing the World that **GOD** is a Woman, or at least **not** a man!

(4) This was somewhat surprising considering her son was Lt.Col. Evans F. Carlson's Executive Officer in the 2nd Raider Battalion on the Makin Island Raid. Eleanor's bias against the Marines was **not** an opinion shared by the President who was a great fan of, and friend to the Marines.

(5) "Nepotism" is the use of a position of authority to supply family members with jobs... In the case of Presidential Nepotism, these jobs are usually extremely high profile, influential and well paying. The appointment of Bobby Kennedy to the post of Attorney General, was feared by many to be the start of a Kennedy Dynasty. Such an appointment during the Clinton Administration would have made it difficult if not impossible to have had a fair Senatorial or Congressional Hearing on Ruby Ridge or Waco.

(6) The *Virginia Military Institute* has marched in the Presidential Inaugural Parade(s) since the end of 'Reconstruction'. For the Clinton Administration, "Old Elephant Ankles" made sure that VMI was removed from the roster since they currently (at that time at any rate) had no female Cadets. She replaced them with a marching unit from an *all girls school*... such insight and rationale overwhelms me... Hummm...

(7) By convention you can only delegate **authority**. The **responsibility is always yours**, no matter how badly you want to get rid of it!