

Re: On good authority...

## Re: On good authority...

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-02/msg02896.html>

---

- *From:* MooseFET <kensmith@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sat, 23 Feb 2008 17:13:25 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Feb 23, 4:53 pm, James Arthur <dagmargoodb...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 23, 1:23 pm, MooseFET <kensm...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 23, 8:55 am, Jim Yanik <jya...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

James Arthur <dagmargoodb...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in  
[news:3f7dc710-93bd-4311-  
a6fd-32b4f6d6e...@xx](news:3f7dc710-93bd-4311-a6fd-32b4f6d6e...@xx):

On Feb 22, 7:23 pm, MooseFET  
<kensm...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 22, 5:27 pm, Jim  
Yanik <jya...@xxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

Andy Peters  
<goo...@xxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote

[...]

Bill  
Clinton  
was  
impeached  
for  
a  
blow

Re: On good authority...

job,  
which  
of  
course  
was  
unrelated  
to  
his  
Presidential  
job.

It was on  
"company  
time", by the  
employer  
and  
management  
of the  
intern, BESIDES  
the huge  
LIE to the  
American  
People, and  
the  
PERJURY  
for  
which he  
was  
disbarred  
for a  
too-short a  
period.

There was no perjury.  
Check the record. Perjury  
requires that the  
subject being lied about be  
germane. The topic on  
which he lied was  
not.

In a civil trial alleging improper relations  
(sexual harassment) with  
his subordinates, he lied about his relations  
with Monica Lewinsky, a

Re: On good authority...

subordinate.

The plaintiff was entitled to discover this in discovery in support of their theory that he had such habits, and had improperly pressed others—namely, had harassed—the plaintiff.

That's pretty important evidence in a he-said she-said affair.

Cheers,  
James Arthur

the corrupt Liberals are all too willing to excuse such behavior and lies, when it's their crook who's in the hot seat.

No, this argument is about whether it was perjury or not. Not about whether he lied. We know he lied. We also know that it was not perjury because it was not germane to the case.

It—showing a pattern of Mr. Clinton foisting himself on and/or expecting favors from subordinates—was central to the plaintiff's case.

Not in the judge's opinion it didn't. Anybody reading the facts would see a huge difference between someone having an affair with a willing adult and someone who "expected favors" etc. The judge, like all reasonable people, can see the huge difference.

More interesting—Mr. Clinton argues that since there exists a convoluted parsing of his words that, though tortured, is factually correct (in his mind), he didn't lie.

Re: On good authority...

Re: On good authority...

He asked the court to define "sex". The court did define it. He answered correctly for that definition. There is no doubt he is a clever lawyer. The one thing he missed was the bit about not correcting an obviously mistaken impression. He lied by misdirection. If it had been a germane topic, it would have been perjury but it wasn't so there was no perjury.

I call that "telling a Clinton"—a statement intended to mislead, but which has alternate interpretations, at least one of which is technically true.

Yes that is exactly what he did. It wasn't germane so he got away with it.

.

Re: On good authority...