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Clinton wasn't impeached for sex, but for lying. He was disbarred for lying. The bar for democrats is pretty low. What they have to overcome is that even though Bill Clinton was a world class wife cheater, and a liar, he was still a fairly effective president. His personal difficulties of keeping his privates in his pants didn't make him a bad president. There is the democrat quandry.
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<quote orig\_author="AquaAthena">

<quote orig\_author="whitehall">

There is nothing weird about it. It's the good old double standard. Clinton wasn't just a philanderer, he was a world class sexual pervert enabled by his wife who is now the secretary of state.

</quote>

And Clinton had a string of women going all the way back to Paula Jones, when he was governor and then a long relationship with Gennifer Flowers and others and all before he was president, I think. The public knew of these women and so did Hillary, and Bill Clinton still became president, and continued with his follies until he was impeached.

I don't feel that any of his infideliities made him a lesser president. In fact, I think they helped. He was a good looking man with power and lust for young beautiful women, and it all worked well for him, until it didn't.

Newt is a changed man and I don't believe he would ever be a serial womanizer. He has been married since 2000 to Calista, and had a relationship with her for 6 years prior. It will be interesting to see how it all plays out. But Newt knew this would come up, before he tossed his hat in the ring, and I am sure he will be a better man regardless of how it ends.

</quote>

I don't think Newt's sex life is relevant, and I don't care about Bill Clinton's blow job either.

</post>
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<quote orig\_author="Katzndogz">

Clinton wasn't impeached for sex, but for lying. He was disbarred for lying. The bar for democrats is pretty low. What they have to overcome is that even though Bill Clinton was a world class wife cheater, and a liar, he was still a fairly effective president. His personal difficulties of keeping his privates in his pants didn't make him a bad president. There is the democrat quandry.

</quote>

Say what you want but the only reason he was even put into the position for lying is that the puritanical neo-cons were chasing down sex rumors (and spending millions of taxpayer dollars in the process). And Newt was one of them leading the charge.

So when someone says, "It wasn't about the blowjob, it was about lying", it was about the blowjob. <img src="http://www.usmessageboard.com/images/smilies/eusa\_hand.gif"/>
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Actually, I think your instance on it being the blow job is the it was all about states rights rather than slavery deal. And hypocrisy in politics is not that big a deal either.

All the efforts and bribes etc etc were to avoid the loss of the civil rights case.

It wasn't just the issue of he got a blow job from a dim intern. It was that you got your job by going down. do we really want government officials appointed on the casting couch? And if you said no, then you were out of a job. Blow job or no job. And the man was a feminist icon. What kind of feminism is that that promotes that kind of employment 'opportunity.'

If you can swallow that it was 'just a blow job' than you swallow everything.

Now, fellatio aside, did Clinton's tomcatting gett in the way of his job? By all accounts, he was good at multitasking. Is this really all that relavent to his job performance?

Now if you could find proof that he was sleeping with someone from the Mafia or the KGB, that would be interesting sexual exchanges. Or that he was sleeping with lobbyist as payment for legislation, that would be interesting and worthwhile to discuss.

</quote>

<quote orig\_author="whitehall">

There is nothing weird about it. It's the good old double standard. Clinton wasn't just a philanderer, he was a world class sexual pervert enabled by his wife who is now the secretary of state.

</quote>

The Cons can say what they want but yes, it was about the blowjob. And now they want to turn a blind eye to Newt's philandering and desire for an open marriage?

Pure hypocrisy.

</quote>

Telling yourself that it was about the blow job allows you to howl hypocrisy. Facing the truth of the matter, that he treated women like dirt and that if a woman had the courage to say no to him she had better shop the resume is beyond you.

But we still face the question of what is more important to us as citizens. Voting for incompetent and uxorious like Carter and Obama, or voting for comptent slime like Clinton and Gringrich.
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