

Re: On good authority...

Re: On good authority...

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-02/msg03021.html>

- *From:* Jim Yanik <jyanik@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 24 Feb 2008 18:26:01 GMT
-

mpm <mpmillard@xxxxxxx> wrote in
<news:19ac68f2-c06b-470a-9669-1d244d9ea697@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:

On Feb 23, 8:13i½pm, MooseFET <kensm...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

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

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

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

James Arthur
<dagmargoodb...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote in
<news:3f7dc710-93bd->

4311-

a6fd-32b4f6d6e...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:

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

Re: On good authority...

Re: On good authority...

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

Andy
Peters
<goo...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote

[...]

Bill
Clinton
was
impeached
for
a
blow
job,
which
of
course
wa

s

unrelated
to
his
Presidential
job.

It
was
on
"company
time",by
the
employer
and
management

Re: On good authority...

of
the
intern,BESIDES
the
huge
LIE
to
the
American
People,and
the
PERJ

URY for

which
he
was
disbarred
for
a
too-short
a
period.

There
was
no
perjury.
ï¿½Check
the
record.
ï¿½Perjury

requires that the

subject
being
lied
about
be
germane.
ï¿½The
topic
on
which

he lied was

Re: On good authority...

not.

In a civil
trial
alleging
improper
relations
(sexual
harassment)
w

ith

his
subordinates,
he lied
about his
relations
with
Monica
Lewinsky

, a

subordinate.

The
plaintiff
was entitled
to discover
this in
discovery in
suppor

t of

their theory
that he had
such habits,
and had
improperly
pressed
others—namely,
had
harassed—the
plaintiff.

Re: On good authority...

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. ¶½Not

about

whether he lied. ¶½We know he lied.
¶½We 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 judges opinion it didn't. ¶½Anybody reading the facts wo

Re: On good authority...

Re: On good authority...

uld

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.

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.— 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???

Re: On good authority...

Re: On good authority...

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.

Much of it is NOT controlled by biology, much is LEARNED behavior.
people CAN make themselves "insane", it's not all genetic or "chemical".

Of course, labelling homosexuality "genetic" excuses them from their
behavior....

—

Jim Yanik
jyanik
at
kua.net

.