

Re: On good authority...

## Re: On good authority...

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-02/msg02918.html>

---

- *From:* mpm <[mpmillard@xxxxxxx](mailto:mpmillard@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 23 Feb 2008 18:01:18 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Feb 23, 8:13pm, MooseFET <[kensm...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kensm...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Feb 23, 4:53 pm, James Arthur <[dagmargoodb...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dagmargoodb...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Feb 23, 1:23 pm, MooseFET <[kensm...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kensm...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Feb 23, 8:55 am, Jim Yanik <[jya...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jya...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

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

On Feb 22, 7:23 pm,  
MooseFET  
<[kensm...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kensm...@xxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote:

On Feb 22,  
5:27 pm,  
Jim Yanik  
<[jya...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jya...@xxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote:

Andy  
Peters

Re: On good authority...

<goo...@xxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote

[...]

Bill  
Clinton  
was  
impeached  
for  
a  
blow  
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

Re: On good authority...

for  
a  
too-short  
a  
period.

There was  
no perjury.  
ýCheck the  
record.  
ýPerjury  
requires that  
the  
subject  
being lied  
about be  
germane.  
ýThe 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  
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.

Re: On good authority...

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.  
ýNot about  
whether he lied. ýWe know he lied. ýWe 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. ýAnybody reading the facts would  
see a huge difference between someone having an affair with a willing  
adult and someone who "expected favors" etc. ýThe 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.

He asked the court to define "sex". ýThe court did define it. ýHe  
answered correctly for that definition. ýThere is no doubt he is a  
clever lawyer. ýThe one thing he missed was the bit about not  
correcting an obviously mistaken impression. ýHe lied by  
misdirection. ýIf 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.

Re: On good authority...

Re: On good authority...

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

– Show quoted text –

I'm really curious now....

Generally, what are your feelings about this Bill Clinton sex scandal with Monica Lewinsky?

Are you OK that it happened? Furious that it happened? Don't care either way? Upset that he mostly got away with it? Thought he should be removed from office? Or what???

I'm just trying to get the frame of reference here.

Personally, I could care less. And it's not a partisan issue for me.

A person's sexuality belongs to the individual, not to any relationship (marriage, etc..)

And to think otherwise, frankly, is a bit delusional IMO.

And when I say "sexuality", I'm not just talking about some act committed behind closed doors. I'm talking about the way a person thinks, fantasizes about sex, the way the brain works and hormones are produced, (how they're "wired" internally) and the way all that manifests in the physical world. Note: much of which is controlled by biology and completely outside the "control" of the individual.

Not to say that their behavior can't be counter to this biology.

.

Re: On good authority...