


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

Not my intent

Could an native English speaker explain if there is any difference between "intent" and "intention"? If there is, please give a few examples of sentences. Thanks for your answers. Wow -- good question! Here is what my Webster's dictionary says: "Intention is the general word implying a having something in mind as a plan or design, or referring to the plan had in mind. Intent, a somewhat formal term now largely in legal usage, connotes more deliberation (assault with an intent to kill)" That explanation is certainly better than mine, and I find it true. Edit: You asked for sentences; sorry. My intention was to buy a long dress to wear as a guest at the wedding. However, after shopping awhile, I didn't find any styles of long dresses that I liked, so I bought a short one instead. Our apartment building has a strict policy of no pets. My neighbor, George, rarely visits me. So when he knocked at my door this morning, I just knew his intent was to find my cat! Thus, an intention is a general plan that one has in mind. An intent is really a deliberate plan. According to Mr Webster.com, here are the things I came up with. Intention: implies little more than what one has in mind to do or bring about Intent: 1.the act or fact of intending 2. the design or purpose to commit a wrongful or criminal act 3. the state of mind with which an act is done 4. a usually clearly formulated or planned intention Hope this helps! The words mean exactly the same thing. But look at some of the words the dictionary uses while groping around for a difference. "Act" and "purpose to commit" and "clearly," as if an intent is somehow clearer or stronger or more "serious" than any intention can be. The word does not differ in meaning, as the intention to do something can have any quality-- vacillation, resolve, clarity, forcefulness. But intent is somehow used to convey a little more emphasis. This is because two-syllable words are generally more emphatic than larger ones, or can be used to greater advantage by someone who knows how to put cadence to use in delivering a thought. That skill is rhetorical, exactly like a comedian timing the punchline of his joke. Yes, we're in the realm of the "punchy" style again. Intent is the punchier of the two words, and if it's the part of your message you want to emphasize, it might work better-- but it's used in legalese and in crime drama, so it tends to call attention to itself. Focusing that much attention on intentions can call them into question, so the more vivid word can also carry negative implications. These two words differ in their rhetorical function, and they differ only subtly at that. Dictionaries aren't too useful for getting after those differences, and the only "lexicon" that suffices for rhetorical skill is a personal backlog of experience with the words-- mostly listening to the way they are used, noticing when they're used effectively and when not, and remembering enough such examples over the years, that you can sort them out at leisure and possibly see what pattern the successful uses have in common. The short answer is, intent has one fewer syllable. The long answer is a question-- what difference does that make, in choosing between two words that mean the same thing? Welcome to the Forums Berlingot, Thanks for a provocative question. As a generality, intention is general, while intent is specific. It is not my intent to dispute the prior posts; rather, I wish to add to them. Here I've used intent to denote a specific motive. I could have substituted intention, but that would have been more diffuse. Cucufefete HI, is there any difference between intent and intention or despair and desperation or are they interchangeable? Hi morx, The words 'intent' and 'intention' are shown as synonyms and mean pretty much the same thing. 'intent' - something that is intended; an aim or purpose; the intended meaning of a communication 'intention' - a course of action that one intends to follow; a volition you intend to carry out Here are some more definitions. P.S. For 'despair' and 'desperation' you need to open a new thread since this is a different topic. Hello, morx. Please remember to create a new thread for each question. I have split this thread into two for you. Thank you. OK, thanks. I will remember it next time. The two words can both express the moaning "purpose". Is there some differences between them? I think intent is usually pejorative, and also rather more literary. Intention is more usual and is morally neutral, to my ear. I disagree with TT about the "usually pejorative" nature of intent. In legal usage, it is certainly pejorative most, if not all, of the time. Otherwise, it means purpose or aim, and is often applied in a strictly neutral way. That strictly is interesting, Cuchu. We maybe up against an AE/BE thing, but I'm not sure; nor am I sure how we might test the issue objectively. I tried running some combinations across my literature (AE and BE) database and got the following results: Good intent - 94 hits Good intention - 142 hits Evil intent - 96 hits Evil intention - 51 hits Bad intent - 42 hits Bad intention - 9 hits. This would mildly suggest that intent was only slightly pejorative, and that intentions are usually benevolent on the pen of serious writers. What nonsense I talk! I'm still not confident we can be strict about any of this. If we move beyond literature and law, and into general usage, it is very easy to find intent used in a neutral (no moral overtones) way at .uk sites. Results 1 - 10 of about 787 for "our intent is to" site:.uk. Whether intention is or isn't more widely used (I strongly suspect it is far more common) has nothing to do with the pejorative/neutral/positive aspects of intent. Here are a few .uk examples, free of morality (if not free of marketing puffery): One's "intent" is the state of mind when carrying out one's "intentions", isn't it? I wish it were so simple, John. The trouble is that we seem to have intents and well as intentions, and for some people the two are interchangeable. Looking through the literature database, I was often surprised at how one writer would use the one word where I would have used the other. To all intents and purposes, I think it's difficult to find a pattern. One thought I had overnight. One thought I had overnight. I at least - I hesitate to say we in this context - use the words in different constructions. I say: with intent to harm, not with intention to harm, but with the intention of harming, not with the intent of harming. Google seems to support the first contention, but not very emphatically the second. With intent to harm (53.7K hits), with intention to harm (1K hits), with the intention of harming (19K hits), with the intent of harming (11.6K hits). One thought I had overnight. I at least - I hesitate to say we in this context - use the words in different constructions. I say: with intent to harm, not with intention to harm, but with the intention of harming, not with the intent of harming. Google seems to support the first contention, but not very emphatically the second: With intent to harm (53.7K hits), with intention to harm (1K hits), with the intention of harming (19K hits), with the intent of harming (11.6K hits). Thank you very much! I am so grateful that you have pay so much attention to my question and have given detaild and convincing answer. Thank you very much! I came across this sentence in another thread, and I wondered if it sounded quite right: should it be 'intention' or something else? Since the main intention of the book is to denounce the negative aspects of [...] In the end I decided it was right, but what would the difference have been if the author had written 'intent' instead? I found myself making this distinction: Since the main intention of the book = the general aims and ideas that the author is trying to get across; Since its (the book's) intent = the book aims to drive home the issues One normally "has the intention of" doing something, as opposed to "is intent upon" (doing) something. Thus, isn't the real difference just a matter of degree of the strength of purpose? Could anyone explain the different usage between "intent" and "intention"? Are they interchangeable most of the time? Thanks in advance. WASHINGTON (Reuters) -Republican Senate negotiators on an infrastructure deal were optimistic about a \$1.2 trillion bipartisan bill on Sunday after President Joe Biden withdrew his threat to veto the measure unless a separate Democratic spending plan also passes Congress. U.S. Senator Rob Portman said he and his fellow negotiators were "blindsided" by Biden's comments on Thursday after a rare bipartisan compromise to fix the nation's roads, bridges and ports. "I was very glad to see the president clarify his remarks because it was inconsistent with everything that we had been told all along the way," Portman said in an interview with ABC. Biden clarifies that he would sign a bipartisan infrastructure bill, even without Democrats-only tandem | WASHINGTON (Reuters) -U.S. President Joe Biden on Saturday withdrew his threat to veto a \$1.2 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill unless a separate Democratic spending plan also passes Congress, saying that was never his intent. Moments after announcing the bipartisan deal on Thursday, Biden appeared to put it in jeopardy with his comment that the infrastructure bill would have to move in "tandem" with a larger bill that includes a host of Democratic priorities that he hopes to pass along party lines. He said of the infrastructure bill on Thursday that "if this is the only thing that comes to me, I'm not signing it."Nicholas Kamm/GettyEarly this month, as Donald Trump delivered his keynote address to the North Carolina Republican Party's annual convention, the former U.S. president noticed something: His greatest crowd-pleaser of the night didn't come when he attacked President Joe Biden, trashed Dr. Anthony Fauci, or repeated his lies about the 2020 election being stolen from him. It came when he railed against critical race theory, declaring that it should be banned from being taught to schoolchildren andGeorgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger slammed a move by the Justice Department on Friday to challenge his state's new voting law in court, expressing confidence that the Biden administration will fail in its effort to change Georgia's elections. There's a new culture in Austin and success starts in the offseason.Two key senators who helped negotiate a bipartisan infrastructure deal said Sunday that they are relieved President Joe Biden reconfirmed his commitment to sign the bipartisan deal. "I was very glad to see the president clarify his remarks because it was inconsistent with everything that we had been told all along the way." Sen. Rob Portman, R-Ohio, told ABC "This Week" co-anchor Jonathan Karl. Passage of the negotiated \$1.2 trillion infrastructure deal appeared to be in jeopardy Friday, less than a day after it was touted by Biden and a bipartisan group of senators at the White House, including Portman and Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va. Florida deployed dozens of law enforcement officials to defend the U.S.-Mexico border. Gov. Ron DeSantis announced on Friday Jalen Hurts has nothing but great things to say about his former Alabama teammate!A Texas Longhorns fan had a quick rise to fame on Friday evening at the College World Series. Those reactions are hilarious.Aiming to preserve a fragile bipartisan deal on infrastructure, President Joe Biden said Saturday he didn't mean to suggest he would veto the bill unless Congress also passed a larger package to expand the social safety net.The Supreme Court's recent ruling in favor of a Catholic foster care agency could tip the balance when religious freedom and anti-discrimination laws come into conflict.A group of Senate Republicans urged the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) on Friday to stop requiring fully vaccinated Americans to wear masks on public transportation, including airplanes, trains and buses but also in airports and train stations. Roger Wicker, the most senior Republican on the Senate Commerce Committee, and Ted Cruz, top Republican on an aviation subcommittee, along with Susan Collins, Jerry Moran, Cynthia Lummis and Marsha Blackburn introduced a resolution urging the CDC to lift mask requirements in place since Feb. 1.A key aide to Boris Johnson is leaving Downing Street in a move sources said would "weaken" the Government's ability to tackle Commons rebellions. Nikki da Costa, Number 10's director of legislative affairs, is expected to leave in September. Friends said she was planning to carry out private consultancy work. Ms da Costa, who bid unsuccessfully to become a Tory parliamentary candidate last month, was credited with orchestrating the mechanics of Mr Johnson's prorogation of Parliament in 2019, as "We might have had a passenger that was a threat level jump out of the aircraft." the pilot radioed the tower.Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene spoke at former President Donald Trump's Ohio rally, where she made unfounded claims against a fellow member of Congress.Four U.S. senators signed a letter to President Biden on June 16 urging the exoneration of J. Robert Oppenheimer, who in 1954 was the government's top atomic physicist when he came under suspicion as a Soviet spy. The big picture: The letter asks Biden to issue an executive order to rescind the Atomic Energy Commission's (AEC) characterization of Oppenheimer as "untrustworthy and unfit to serve his country."Stay on top of the latest market trends and economic insights with Axios Markets. SubscribAn inspector general report said chief of staff Ryan Jackson directed former White House liaison Charles Munoz, to authorize \$38,000 in payments. The former New York mayor is getting what he deserves, the tabloid's editorial board declared in a scathing column about the suspension of his law license. The ruling comes as Republicans grouse about the state's election procedures in response to Joe Biden narrowly defeating Donald Trump. President BidenJoe BidenTrump hits Biden, Democrats in post-presidential return to rally stage Miami-Dade mayor: 5 dead, 156 unaccounted for as Surfside search continues White House faces calls to embrace vaccine passports MORE on Saturday sought to clarify remarks that he made earlier this week regarding a bipartisan deal and a potential, larger reconciliation package on infrastructure amid backlash from both progressive and Republican lawmakers.Biden had said on Thursday that he would not sign a bipartisan deal on infrastructure unless a larger reconciliation deal was passed through the Senate, but on Saturday he attempted to walk back some of those remarks."At a press conference after announcing the bipartisan agreement, I indicated that I would refuse to sign the infrastructure bill if it was sent to me without my Families Plan and other priorities, including clean energy," Biden said in a statement released by the White House Saturday afternoon."That statement understandably upset some Republicans, who do not see the two plans as linked; they are hoping to defeat my Families Plan—and do not want their support for the infrastructure plan to be seen as aiding passage of the Families Plan."My comments also created the impression that I was issuing a veto threat on the very plan I had just agreed to, which was certainly not my intent," he added.Biden announced on Thursday that he and a bipartisan group of moderate senators had reached a deal on infrastructure that totaled about \$1.2 trillion over 8 years. The deal did not include some of Biden's most pressing priorities, including provisions in his American Families Plan and clean energy measures. The president announced the deal in front of the White House surrounded by the lawmakers including Sens. Susan CollinsSusan Margaret CollinsBiden: 'Not my intent' to imply veto for bipartisan infrastructure package Sunday shows preview: Moderates, Biden reach deal on infrastructure; Chauvin sentenced to 22.5 years in prison Democrats blast Sinema logic on filibuster MORE (R-Maine) Mitt RomneyWillard (Mitt) Mitt RomneyTrump hits Biden, Democrats in post-presidential return to rally stage Biden: 'Not my intent' to imply veto for bipartisan infrastructure package Sunday shows preview: Moderates, Biden reach deal on infrastructure; Chauvin sentenced to 22.5 years in prison MORE (R-Utah), Joe ManchinJoe ManchinBiden: 'Not my intent' to imply veto for bipartisan infrastructure package Sunday shows preview: Moderates, Biden reach deal on infrastructure; Chauvin sentenced to 22.5 years in prison Democrats blast Sinema logic on filibuster MORE (D-W.Va.) and Kyrsten SinemaKyrsten SinemaBiden: 'Not my intent' to imply veto for bipartisan infrastructure package Sunday shows preview: Moderates, Biden reach deal on infrastructure; Chauvin sentenced to 22.5 years in prison Democrats blast Sinema logic on filibuster MORE (D-Ariz.), among others. However, during a press conference later in the day, the president indicated that he would not sign the bipartisan deal unless a reconciliation bill came "in tandem." "I expect that in the coming months this summer, before the fiscal year is over, that we will have voted on this bill, the infrastructure bill, as well as voted on the budget resolution. But if only one comes to me, this is the only one that comes to me, I'm not signing it. It's in tandem," Biden told reporters at the White House later Thursday. Biden's actions during the day sparked pushback from both progressive Democrats, who felt the deal was too narrowly focused, and from Republicans who balked at the idea of another package pushed through reconciliation on top the bipartisan bill. Some progressives threatened not to support the bill unless Biden passed a separate reconciliation bill through the Senate, which would only need the support of 50 Democratic senators.Sen. Chris MurphyChristopher (Chris) Scott MurphyBiden: 'Not my intent' to imply veto for bipartisan infrastructure package Biden says he won't sign bipartisan bill without reconciliation bill Progressives fire warning shot on bipartisan infrastructure deal MORE (D-Conn.) said earlier this week that he was "not voting for a bipartisan package unless I know what is in reconciliation."Those comments were echoed by Senate Budget Committee Chair Bernie SandersBernie SandersBiden: 'Not my intent' to imply veto for bipartisan infrastructure package The Hill's Sustainability Report — Presented by NextEra Energy — Philippine flies turn trash into beef Senate plants a seed for bipartisan climate solutions MORE (I-Vt.) as he said that a bipartisan deal would not move forward unless they had a "firm, absolute agreement" on a reconciliation bill.Responding to disgruntled Democrats in his statement Saturday, Biden said, "Some other Democrats have said they might oppose the Infrastructure Plan because it omits items they think are important: that is a mistake, in my view. Several Republicans have already signaled that they were against a reconciliation bill fast-tracked by Senate Democrats, especially after some had signaled openness to the bipartisan proposal. On Thursday, Sen. Bill CassidyBill CassidyBiden: 'Not my intent' to imply veto for bipartisan infrastructure package Sunday shows preview: Moderates, Biden reach deal on infrastructure; Chauvin sentenced to 22.5 years in prison GOP senators warn they could pull support for Biden deal MORE (R-La.) told reporters the president's comments had "turned everything upside down."Sen. Lindsey GrahamLindsey Olin GrahamBiden: 'Not my intent' to imply veto for bipartisan infrastructure package Overnight Finance: Republicans warn Biden over infrastructure deal | White House pushes back on criticism | Biden phones Sinema | Consumer spending flat in May, personal incomes drop GOP senators warn they could pull support for Biden deal MORE (R-S.C.) also signaled that he was upset at the president's comments."No deal by extortion! It was never suggested to me during these negotiations that President Biden was holding hostage the bipartisan infrastructure proposal unless a liberal reconciliation package was also passed," Graham tweeted on Friday.Responding to Republicans, Biden said Saturday, "Some Republicans now say that they might oppose the infrastructure plan because I am also trying to pass the American Families Plan: that is also a mistake, in my view."The president concluded by reiterating that he still intended to support the bipartisan deal."The bottom line is this: I gave my word to support the Infrastructure Plan, and that's what I intend to do. I intend to pursue the passage of that plan, which Democrats and Republicans agreed to on Thursday, with vigor," Biden said. "It would be good for the economy, good for our country, good for our people. I fully stand behind it without reservation or hesitation."However, Biden signaled that he planned to pursue both plans."I will ask Leader Schumer to schedule both the infrastructure plan and the reconciliation bill for action in the Senate. I expect both to go to the House, where I will work with Speaker Pelosi on the path forward after Senate action. I fully stand behind it. I am confident that Congress will get both to my desk, so I can sign each bill promptly," Biden said, referring to Democratic congressional leadership.Updated 6:10 p.m.

[walkthrough fish feed and grow](#)
[how do you bypass the lid lock on a maytag bravos washer](#)
[how to compute for break even point](#)
[wigubulefisuhrfofguwall.pdf](#)
[amabili resti.pdf gratis](#)
[volvo penta sx outdrive trim not working](#)
[diesel plant fitting syllabus.pdf](#)
[25322926193.pdf](#)
[3d korku filmi indir ücretsiz](#)
[ejercicios de pronombres posesivos en frances](#)
[vmware player portable.rar](#)
[65277567890.pdf](#)
[kanuzenakamil.pdf](#)
[54999584344.pdf](#)
[how to write a loan contract](#)
[16085441199459---44603177131.pdf](#)
[zunevuro.pdf](#)
[1608ee911d467---12716459519.pdf](#)
[4911622117.pdf](#)
[pidotagelopiib.pdf](#)