

Chapter 1 : Did he, or didn't he? | Daily Tribune

Did he, or didn't he? This is the question to paraphrase the Bard's Hamlet. Sen. Antonio Trillanes' amnesty has been revoked by the Palace, as stated by Department of Justice (DoJ) chief Menardo Gueverra, who also serves as the Officer in Charge while the Chief Executive and his Executive.

Of a hangman and the royal blood on his hands by Anna Belfrage Being an executioner has never been a career choice to endear you to your neighbours. While our ancestors may have liked to witness a good hanging or two, they were wary of bonding with the man responsible for this gruesome entertainment. After all, one never knew if, someday, it would be you on the receiving end of the brutal justice dispensed by the executioner. However, being an executioner came with some perks, like a steady income. Plus, someone had to do the dirty deed, right? Very often, the job passed from father to son. This was the case with Richard Brandon, the common hangman in London in the s. His father, Gregory Brandon, had been the hangman before him, and had somehow managed to acquire a coat of arms to go with his name and chosen profession. Gregory does not come across as a nice cuddly person. At one point he was even accused of murder but somehow wiggled out of by claiming benefit of clergy. This, of course, makes one wonder how he could do that – were executioners also priests? Still, Gregory Brandon had no reason to refute the rumour. And once he retired, he passed the baton to his son. Did Richard dream of another life? Maybe wielding a head-axe appealed to him. Supposedly he spent his childhood practising his axe-work on stray cats and dogs, and as his father grew older, Richard helped him with his duties, thereby perfecting his noose-tying skills. Something to be grateful for, I suppose. By , Richard had replaced his father as common hangman. The first few years of his tenure were marred by an accusation of bigamy, and for a while Richard lingered in Newgate before being released and allowed to return home to Whitechapel and his wife Mary. Thomas was a loyal servant of the king whom Charles I abandoned when parliament turned against him. As we all know, the coming years were turbulent. People died in the battlefield, of wounds and injuries. Some died because of their crimes, and if they were sentenced in London, it is likely Richard did the killing –oops, execution. In January of , Brandon added another famous scalp to his belt when he executed the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud. I have little time for Laud, whom I consider to have fanned the flames of religious intolerance and thereby contributed to the outbreak of the English Civil War, but beheading an infirm old man seems a bit harsh. Charles refused to plead, informing the so-called court that they had no right to try their king. Apparently, Brandon was not that keen on beheading the king. In fact, he refused. This did not help. A company of troopers was dispatched to fetch him, and on January 30 a disguised Richard Brandon was standing on the scaffold, wearing a false beard and periwig. He had to wait a long time for the king to appear, as Parliament was rushing through an Ordinance making it treason to claim the throne after Charles I was dead. Finally, the legalese was done and Charles was ordered to present himself on the scaffold which had been erected beside the Banqueting House. The king, famously wearing two shirts so as not to shiver, was calm and collected. He spoke his piece, kneeled, and at his signal the axe came down. An hour or so later, Richard was back home in Whitechapel, 30 pounds richer. And an orange, studded with cloves, which he sold for ten shillings. At the time, Richard kept a low profile. In March of , Richard did some more axe work. Or maybe he was worried about the consequences for his immortal soul: Richard died in June of . After his death, various pamphlets circulated naming Brandon as the man on the scaffold. However, royalist propaganda spread a different story, stating the common hangman was a man of integrity who had refused to do the foul deed, thereby obliging two troopers to handle the axe themselves. Nothing points to this being the truth. At least it only took one blow As such a profession does not exist, she became a financial professional with two absorbing interests, namely history and writing. And yes, Edmund of Woodstock appears quite frequently. This is the story of two people who should never have met – not when she was born three centuries after him. Posted by Anna Belfrage at

Chapter 2 : Judge Brett Kavanaugh: Did He or Didn't He ? | Chaim R. Landau | The Blogs

1 - It is "Why did he not come to work?" 2 -The shortened form is "Why didn't he come to work?" This is something that confuses learners. But almost everybody discovers by reading that in the long form (1) "did" and "not" don't stand together.

LinkedIn When it first surfaced that, 18 years ago, a young reporter had accused Justin Trudeau of groping her, it seemed the prime minister was caught in a trap of his own making. Deny the accusation, published in an unsigned article in the newspaper she worked for, the Creston Valley Advance, and he would be contradicting his own admonition to believe all women. Admit it, and he would be confessing to an offence that, if it did not expose him to criminal charges, would certainly expose him to accusations of hypocrisy, given the swift justice he has meted out to others in similar circumstances. And so he froze. For two months after the article and its incendiary accusation came to light, the prime minister said nothing. For weeks, after it was given new life last month on social media, his office issued the same lawyerly statement: But then, as many asked, what else could he say? Knowing the question was coming, Trudeau took the occasion of a press conference Thursday to give an answer that managed neither to deny the charge nor to admit to it. Or rather it seemed at times both to deny it and to admit it. It was in short a masterpiece of calculated ambiguity – and an unmitigated disaster. It started out as a fairly straightforward denial. But then he went on. And yet the judge is required to return a verdict all the same. Stripped of the pseudo-subjectivist cant, there would seem two possibilities. Either he did in fact grope her, and his statement is untrue. Or he did not grope her, and it is her repeated contemporaneous accusations that he did that are untrue. At one point Trudeau seemed to suggest the former. So was that the case with this man? Is that his explanation? In subsequent remarks, Trudeau has hinted at the latter possibility. Then, as if conscious of the unpleasant implication: In two sentences Trudeau manages both to slyly suggest his accuser was delusional, and to honour her, in impeccably feminist terms, for her subjective experience. There is simply no way to reconcile these statements with his earlier story. An apology does not prove he did anything wrong, of course: And here we get to the nub of the matter. An accusation, even a credible and contemporaneous one, is not sufficient for conviction. It is enough, however, to demand an explanation. A coherent one would be nice.

Chapter 3 : I didn't do it or I didn't did it. | WordReference Forums

didn't is nothing but an abbreviated form of did not. don't is an abbreviation of do not. doesn't is an abbreviation of does not. Wherever you can use did not, or do not, or does not, you can use didn't, don't and doesn't respectively.

The opinions, facts and any media content in them are presented solely by the authors, and neither The Times of Israel nor its partners assume any responsibility for them. Please contact us in case of abuse. In case of abuse, Report this post. And the huge elephant in the judicial court is: Does it really matter, and if it does, what happens now. Ford as a victim, as well as others possibly in a most inappropriate manner considering his current position. However, at the time these events allegedly occurred, the audiences in which they were said to have taken place were parties of teenagers, allegedly inebriated, including some of those bringing the charges against the judge. And these charges are being brought at the worst time in America. For at no other time have we been so polarized at every level in society as we are today. Not only polarized but extremely fanatically attached to our set standards and opinions that there is possibly no compromise anywhere available between any of the varying antagonistic groups that exist between us all. Today, you are either fanatically left or uncompromisingly right; either fanatically Democrat or extremely Republican; either fanatically liberal or uncompromisingly conservative; either fanatically religious or extremely secular. Where does it ever stop? Have you ever noticed how difficult and dangerous it is to have a discussion in public with anyone for fear of hurting some entrenched position or other held by the recipients? Already both of the combatants, Judge Kavanaugh and Professor Ford have been on the receiving end of death threats. What happened to civil norms and civic debate? The Center just imploded into bi-polar opposites. American society has become so bankrupt and bereft of civil discussion that we have to leave it to the late night comedy shows to de-intensify the apoplectic nature of American debate. Blame it on whomever you wish and there are plenty of candidates out there, from the President, through Congress, and the loudest selection of groups representing their own sectional interests. But it comes down to this: And can there be no forgiveness for an undisciplined moment of behavior that might have been neutralized by 30 years of national service? Or are you always going to have to answer to that indiscretion? You would have to need an absolutely sterling character in future to pass this test of inscrutability to be acceptable to everyone. However, the bottom line for the judge is as follows: To stand accused by one individual against your word may justify reproof and response; perhaps even against two individuals. But when there are now five making accusations against you and pointing their fingers at you, there can only be one direction for Brett Kavanaugh to go, and that is to do the decent British thing, which is to recuse himself from the appointment. Because the truth of the matter is that Trump does not really need Kavanaugh. What he needs is a hard leaning Conservative judge in the Supreme Court, and there are plenty of other choices lining up for the position. Is there anyone out there who can do that? Meanwhile Judge Kavanaugh must go, for even if he miraculously passes this test, there is no question of the stench he will cause in the highest court of the land as such issues continue to swirl around his appointment, and the horrible odor that will possibly effect any of his judicial decisions while joining his colleagues. This is a sad and terrible day for America, but it, and the Supreme Court will survive because there are just better people to choose whose integrity and character have risen to higher standards than what we have been forced to hear and watch on American TV.

Chapter 4 : He Did and He Didn't () - IMDb

he told reporters, when asked if he had heard about Warren releasing the results of her DNA test. Another reporter brought up his promise of a \$1 million charity donation. "I didn't say that," Trump said.

Chapter 5 : He Did and He Didn't - Wikipedia

He didn't receive. Let's assume it's positive and not negative. So, he received = he did receive.. That implies that he did

DOWNLOAD PDF DID HE OR DIDNT HE?

received equals he did did theinnatdunvilla.com's quite obviously wrong.

Chapter 6 : Did he or didn't he? - theinnatdunvilla.com

Or he did not grope her, and it is her repeated contemporaneous accusations that he did that are untrue. At one point Trudeau seemed to suggest the former. "I'll be blunt about it," he said.

Chapter 7 : word order - "Why didn't he" vs. "Why did not he" - English Language & Usage Stack Exchange

This post has been updated to add comments Franken gave to reporters Monday on Capitol Hill. A week-and-a-half and four accusers later, Sen. Al Franken (D-Minn.) keeps issuing apologies without.

Chapter 8 : Did He or Didn't He? | Christian Forums

"And if we didn't tie the game, no, because the last time out he threw pitches." The Indians made it with a run in the sixth, but did not tie the score.

Chapter 9 : Did he or didn't he? | The Trek BBS

did he or didn't he?. This story may or may not be true, but legend has it that during one of Lyndon Johnson's congressional campaigns he decided to spread a rumor that his opponent was a.