
Fiat F100 Tractor Repair Manual



We're sorry, but no results were found for %searchstring%. Please check your search criteria and try to resubmit your search. So have you heard of the thing called #APA? Yesterday, a number of defense lawyers for West Point cadets in the Elliot Rodger shooting case opened their defense cases by repeatedly mentioning the alternate acronym for “affirmative consent”: “#APA.” They used this each time they spoke, along with the word “victim,” to describe the 23-year-old Isla Vista college student, Christopher Loza. Was it a clever strategy? Yes. Was it a mistake? Yes. The first time the defense mentioned the #APA language was in their opening statement. How’s that for a game-changer? To be sure, the lawyers of Elliot Rodger, 22, also invoked #APA to describe their client’s alleged victim, 22-year-old Olivia Jade Guillen. She was described as a “victim” because she met Rodger in a date-setting app and because, on the night of the shooting, she allegedly “gave indications of her sexual interest” in the 19-year-old shooter. The other key word in the #APA defense was “affirmative.” The #APA defense came about because of the statement made by Guillen after the shooting, when she told a police officer that she “assumed” Rodger was going to ask for permission before having sex with her. So what’s wrong with #APA? First, it’s simply wrong. It doesn’t allow for consent to be an all-encompassing concept, as consent is not just one thing but many things. If consent could be just a yes or a no, it would be easy to oversimplify it. (Shrugging one’s shoulders and saying “yes” simply isn’t consent, by the way.) Second, it puts all of the burden of consent squarely on a woman. #APA says a woman must consciously and intentionally “affirm” her assent, as opposed to “express” it. The last time I checked, one human being can’t dictate to another how they want to act.
