

Re: Airbus pic

Re: Airbus pic

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-02/msg01419.html>

- *From:* JosephKK <quiettechblue@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 12 Feb 2008 15:28:03 -0800
-

Richard Henry wrote:

On Feb 10, 9:44 pm, T <nospam.k...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article <MPG.2219544be39bb859989...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, k...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx says...

In article <47AE6FA7.9453...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, p...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx says...

krw wrote:

In article <47AE0968.AD5CC...@xxxxxxxx>, pa...@xxxxxxxx says...

krw wrote:

In article <47ACA15A.5B825...@xxxxxxxx>, pa...@xxxxxxxx says...

[snip]

Boeing
canned
Stoneciepher
for
writing
a
few

Re: Airbus pic

love
letters
to
his
girlfriend.
They
claimed
it
might
have
been
an
'embarrassment'.
There
are
far
more
embarrassing
things
going
on
over
there
than
Harry's
love
life.
Things
that
can
have
a
material
effect
on
shareholder
value.
I
dumped
my
stock
some
time
ago.

More
like
they
thought
it
could

Re: Airbus pic

put
them
in
the
middle
of
a
harassment
suit.
He
violated
the
rules,
bye.
...if
that's
the
whole
story.

Back when
I was at
Boeing
(when
Stoneciepher
was still
there) they
had
no rules
prohibiting
'fraternization'
between
employees,
unless it
became
unwanted.
If they did,
they'd have
to fire a
significant
portion
of their
workforce.
In fact it
was a den
of
nepotism.

Using their facilities and
time? I doubt they smiled
upon it and

Re: Airbus pic

told the kiddies to have fun,
but be safe.

In fact, they
did have a
few cases
where
employees
were paying
far too
much
attention to
their
co-workers
consensual
personal
affairs.
Management
informed
them that
their display
of moral
indignation
could
produce the
very 'hostile
work
environment'
prohibited
by policy.

That one goes both ways. It
depends on circumstances,
certainly.

In an
interesting
twist, one of
the people
expressing
disapproval
turned
out to be
gay and
pissed off
that the
subject of
his affection
was
dating
women.

Re: Airbus pic

Yes, that could easily go as far as harassment.

Boeing actually has a pretty enlightened policy regarding employee behavior when its not driven by company politics.

Again, on company time and with company resources? BTW, when is any thing in a large corporation not driven by company politics. ;-)

They have a pretty reasonable policy with regard to that as well. You could surf the 'net and use e-mail for non company purposes on breaks.

Different issue. My PPOE had a similar view of the Internet. It was available for "personal" use, but we were *strongly* reminded that use of their resources was at management discretion and that we were representing the company when doing so (I.e. no visiting playboy.com). They excused this use because they were in the computing business and the Internet was a big part of the industry.

When I worked for one state office in particular we had the same basic policy and it was supposed to apply to everyone. We proxied all web traffic and we did monitor the logs.

One day I noted our Chief of Staff liked to look for big, black and beautiful women. Then he'd look for hotels/motels, etc. In addition he'd visit some rather questionable porn sites.

Re: Airbus pic

I brought this to the attention of the director of my unit and was told that we do nothing about it. Huh?

Another systems guy joined our team and noticed the same behavior, brought it up and was told the same thing.

Oh yes, I took all the proxy logs with me on a couple CD's when I left that place.

You have just admitted to having committed a felony.

Please explain just exactly what law says so. The closest I can figure is that T did not send copies to appropriate LEA 30 or 60 days after separation. Non-complaint misuse of company property is rarely prosecutable. And unless the logs actually contain evidence of felony activity, LEA is unlikely to act. Besides in a properly designed system even the logs are backed up.